

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, April 5, 1977

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

PETITION: PORNOGRAPHY

Dr. EASTICK presented a petition signed by 88 electors of Light, praying that the House urge the Government to take urgent action to increase penalties to deter persons from producing or selling pornographic material, particularly when young children were involved.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

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

CEDUNA HOTEL

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. What were the reasons for the Superintendent of Licensed Premises visiting Ceduna late last year?
2. Who accompanied the superintendent, and how did he travel to Ceduna?
3. Was he investigating a complaint about the Ceduna Community Hotel or the management thereof and, if so, who made the complaints and what were the findings of the Superintendent's visit?

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

1. The Superintendent of Licensed Premises last visited Ceduna in September, 1976, to investigate a complaint alleging a breach of the Licensing Act, 1967-1976.
2. He was accompanied by a licensing inspector, Mr. C. B. Claxton, and travelled by commercial aircraft.
3. The nature and details of the complaint and the superintendent's findings are confidential.

BARLEY BOARD

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. On whose recommendation is the Government considering alterations to the Australian Barley Board?
2. What are the alterations, and from when is it anticipated that such alterations will operate?
3. Has the Government had discussions with the Victorian and New South Wales Governments on this matter and, if so, does he know their attitudes to the proposals?

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

1. A suggestion has been put by the United Farmers and Graziers of S.A. Incorporated that the Australian Barley Board market oats.
2. The matter is still under consideration.
3. The Minister of Agriculture has discussed the concept of a three State coarse grain board with the Victorian and New South Wales Ministers. They have reacted favourably to the suggestion.

LEIGH CREEK

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. When is it anticipated that the township of Leigh Creek will be relocated?
2. Who is preparing the plans for the new town?

3. Who will be the constructing authority?
4. Will the views of the local community be taken into consideration before the site is chosen?
5. Will the townspeople be consulted as to what type of housing should be constructed?

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

1. Over the next few years. There are many detailed factors still to be considered and a definite programme has not yet been prepared.
2. The Monarto Development Commission, which has been engaged by the Electricity Trust as a town planning consultant.
3. The Electricity Trust of South Australia, which will engage consultants and contractors as necessary.
4. Yes. A committee of local residents has been formed to advise the trust on the most suitable site for the town. There has already been a high degree of local involvement in this part of the project.
5. Yes.

EGG BOARD

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. How many people are currently employed by the South Australian Egg Board?
2. How many people were employed at March 31 last year?
3. What are the current charges levied by the Egg Board on egg producers?
4. By how much have they increased in the last two years?

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

1. 37.
2. 38.
3. As at April 4, 1977, the charge levied by the board is 4c per dozen.
4. The charges have not increased but have decreased over the last two years. The decrease has been 7c a dozen eggs.

PENONG HOUSING

Mr. GUNN (on notice): What plans has the Housing Trust to build housing accommodation in the Penong area?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: None. The trust is not aware of any local demand.

CLEVE ROAD

Mr. GUNN (on notice): What plans has the Highways Department to seal the road from Cleve to Kimba?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Funds are not available to commence the sealing of the Cleve-Kimba road during 1977-78. The availability of funds from the Federal Government is not known beyond 1977-78, but it is expected at present that funds will not be available to commence the Cleve-Kimba road for at least five years.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Is it the intention of the Government to extend local government to those areas not so covered in South Australia and, if so:

- (a) when;
- (b) why; and
- (c) what system of local government will be introduced?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The matter is under study by a working party which has not yet reported.

- (a) Until the working party has completed its report, including further consultation with the people in the affected areas, no decision will be taken by the Government.
- (b) To enable communities in isolated areas to share in Federal Revenue funds which have been made available for local government purposes.
- (c) The working party is looking in particular at a form of local government tailored to meet the circumstances of isolated communities.

CEDUNA AREA SCHOOL

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. What is the present building programme for the proposed new Ceduna Area School?
2. When is it expected that the work will commence on the agricultural science block?
3. When will work commence on the rest of the proposed new school?

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

1. It is planned to submit the project to the Public Works Standing Committee in June, 1977. If it is approved, then documentation would be completed by January, 1978, and the tender call for civil works would be made at that time. Construction is planned to commence in April, 1978. The building programme must be phased to allow the school to maintain its educational programme and it is expected that about 60 per cent of the new accommodation will be available by February, 1979, with the remainder available by April, 1979.
2. Site works will commence in May, with the building available in early July, 1977.
3. April, 1978, if the planned programme is maintained.

EYRE HIGHWAY

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Has the Highways Department carried out any investigations into the possibility of linking the Eyre Highway with the Stuart Highway and, if so, what routes have been studied?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Highways Department has carried out a preliminary examination of the viability of two alternative routes which would connect the Eyre Highway with the Stuart Highway west of Port Augusta.

The first of these required a new road of about 180 kilometres connecting Ceduna with Tarcoola, and utilisation of the 80 kilometre length of road between Tarcoola and Kingoonya or the 130 kilometre track connecting Tarcoola with the Stuart Highway at McDouall Peak. The cost of providing a formed and rubbled road just for the section between Ceduna and Tarcoola is estimated to be about \$2 400 000.

The second route considered was to upgrade the existing road from Wirrulla to Kingoonya via Kokatha. This road is 250 km long, and upgrading to an acceptable rubble surfaced standard is estimated to cost about \$1 500 000. Even making generous allowance for any potential value these routes may have for the movement of stock and other traffic, the project would have a relatively low priority and it would be extremely difficult to vindicate expenditure of the order required. Because of the present acute shortage of road finance, no possibility can be seen of providing funds for such a facility, and further investigation of the routes is not proposed.

ANDAMOOKA DRAINAGE

Mr. GUNN (on notice): What plans has the Highways Department to improve drainage in the main street of Andamooka, especially the installation of suitable culverts so that the road can be negotiated in times of heavy rain?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The installation of suitable culverts in the main street of Andamooka will be carried out next financial year, 1977-78.

TOURISM DIRECTOR

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has a Director of Tourism been appointed and, if so:
 - (a) were applications called for the position;
 - (b) when were they called;
 - (c) how many applicants were there;
 - (d) when was the appointment made, and who was the successful appointee;
 - (e) at what annual salary;
 - (f) when will the appointee begin work;
 - (g) what are his qualifications for the post; and
 - (h) is the Government satisfied that the appointee is the best suited of the applicants and why?
2. Who was responsible for recommending the appointment?
3. What inquiries were made concerning each applicant?

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

1. A Director of Tourism has been appointed and:
 - (a) applications were invited;
 - (b) September, 1976;
 - (c) 108 applicants;
 - (d) on March 3, 1977, the Governor approved the appointment of Geoffrey Frank Edward Joselin;
 - (e) at an annual salary of \$24 896;
 - (f) Mr. Joselin has advised that he will be able to commence by the end of July this year;
 - (g) academically he possesses degrees in Law and Science; he has experience in the travel and tourist industries in various capacities and countries; he has lectured in tourism, transport and travel;
 - (h) the Government accepted the Public Service Board's recommendation that in terms of experience, qualifications, and aptitudes Mr. Joselin was the superior candidate.
2. The Public Service Board recommended the appointment.
3. The short-listed applicants were interviewed and referee checks were made.

KOONGAWA SCHOOL

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Where does the Education Department intend to move the buildings that were used at the Koongawa school?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: One building to Penong Primary School, one to Kimba Area School, and one to Nunjikomkita Rural School.

COOMUNGA CROSSING

Mr. GUNN (on notice): What plans are there to install warning lights where the railway line crosses the Flinders Highway at Coomunga?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Before flashing lights are installed at the Coomunga railway crossing on the Flinders Highway, the road alignment needs improvement and the pavement strengthened. Design work is proceeding to determine the best road alignment and rail crossing angle so that the safety of both road and rail traffic is ensured. The matter is being discussed by officers of the Highways Department and the Rail Division with the aim of work at the site being undertaken in 1977-78.

ROXBY DOWNS

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. What minerals have been found in the Roxby Downs area?
2. Is it expected that commercial mining operations will take place in this area in the future and, if so when?

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

1. Western Mining Corporation has announced the discovery of a significant deposit of copper and uranium in the Olympic Dam area on Roxby Downs Station. The association of other minor metals such as gold can be expected, but these remain to be determined.
2. It is expected that commercial mining operations will eventuate but timing is uncertain. Much work remains to be done, including drilling to delineate the limits and grade of the deposit, metallurgical investigations to establish recovery, and a satisfactory mining method designed to provide data for evaluation of economic feasibility.

DOG FENCE BOARD

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. How much money has been allocated to the Fowlers Bay Dog Fence Board?
2. When will this money be available?
3. Why was the member for the district not informed that the Government had approved the project in view of the fact that he had introduced the matter and had forwarded considerable correspondence in relation to it?

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

1. \$85 000.
2. These funds are now available. The Secretary and a member of the Dog Fence Board visited the subject area

in company with the Fowlers Bay Local Dog Fence Board on March 29 to determine construction specifications for the proposed fence. Tenders for line clearing, materials, cartage, and construction will be called forthwith in the Adelaide and local press, as well as the *Government Gazette*.

3. The only correspondence received by the Minister of Lands from the member for Eyre relating to closure of the dog fence is a letter dated March 2, 1977. Comprehensive information was provided in the Minister's reply of March 23, 1977, following a meeting of the Dog Fence Board.

MINNIPA AND POOCHERA SCHOOL

Mr. GUNN (on notice): To where were the old buildings from the Minnipa and Poochera School moved?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The buildings from Minnipa were disposed of as follows:

One to Whyalla Technical College; a shelter shed to Port Pirie High School; one building demolished, because it was not suitable for re-use or re-location; a dual timber, which will be re-located in a school which has yet to be determined; and a stone building will remain on site.

The buildings from Poochera were disposed of as follows:

One to Hawker Area School; one to Wirrulla Special Rural School; one to Wudinna Area School; one to Mudamukla Rural School; one small room, which is not suitable for re-location, will probably be demolished or disposed of in a way which will probably be determined by the Regional Director of Education; a toilet block will remain on site; and a shelter shed will remain on site.

EYRE PENINSULA HOUSING

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. How many Teacher Housing Authority houses were built on Eyre Peninsula in the year ending March 31, 1977, and where were the houses constructed?
2. How many houses does the Teacher Housing Authority intend to build on Eyre Peninsula during the next 12 months and where?

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

1. The following units have been completed for occupation since the Authority became responsible for the housing programme on July 1, 1976:
Single teacher units—Education Department:

Town	Address	No.	Programme	Date occupied
Ceduna	Job 1, Mueller Street	1	1976-77	February, 1977
	Job 5, Mueller Street	1	1976-77	February, 1977
	Job 11, Mueller Street	1	1976-77	February, 1977
	Job 24, Mueller Street	1	1976-77	February, 1977 by married teacher
	Job 7, Talbot Street	1	1976-77	February, 1977
Cleve	1/267 Sims Crescent	1	1976-77	March, 1977
	2/268 Sims Crescent	1	1976-77	March, 1977
Elliston	Job 135, Lot 4, Tenth Street	1	1976-77	January, 1977
Kimba	Lot 8, Caldwell Drive	1	1976-77	February, 1977
	Lot 9, Caldwell Drive	1	1976-77	February, 1977
Kingoonya	16 Harvey Street	1	1976-77	Not yet occupied
Lock	15A McLachlan Street	1	1976-77	November, 1976
	15B McLachlan Street	1	1976-77	February, 1977
Minnipa	Job A, 125 James Street	1	1976-77	February, 1977
	Job B, 125 James Street	1	1976-77	February, 1977
Port Augusta	Job 125, 26 Larkin Street	1	1975-76	February, 1977
	Job 114, 3 Naisbitt Street	1	1975-76	February, 1977
	Job 101, 19 Cummins Street	1	1975-76	February, 1977
	Job 48, 4 Barrett Close	1	Special	February, 1977

Town	Address	No.	Programme	Date occupied
Streaky Bay	Lot 13B, Flinders Highway	1	1976-77	Not yet occupied
Whyalla	Wattle Street	4	1975-76	July-December, 1976
	5 Needlebush Street	1	1975-76	January, 1977 by married teacher
	9 Needlebush Street	1	Special	January, 1977 by married teacher
	33 Needlebush Street	1	Special	January, 1977 by married teacher
	8/2 Benier Street	1	1975-76	October, 1976
	18/30 McGee Street	1	1975-76	October, 1976
	33/57 Menard Street	1	Special	February, 1977
	3/MacKellar, 5 Sugarwood Crescent	1	Special	January, 1977
	25 Harpur, 7 Sunray Street	1	Special	February, 1977
	Total	32		
Single teacher—Kindergarten Union:				
Port Augusta	Job 602/1, 2 Richardson Crescent	1	1976-77	—
Whyalla	5 Hold Court	1	1976-77	—
	Total	2		
Married teacher accommodation—Education Department:				
Ceduna	1 Mueller Terrace	1	1974-75	October, 1976
Cleve	38 Edwards Terrace	1	1975-76	March, 1977
Karcultaby	House No. 1	1	1974-75	January, 1977
	House No. 2	1	1974-75	January, 1977
Minnipa	Cnr. James and Clive Streets	1	1974-75	February, 1977
Streaky Bay	88 Montgomerie Terrace	1	1976-77	February, 1977
			(purchased by THA)	
Whyalla	39 Risby Avenue	1	1975-76	September, 1976
	43 Risby Avenue	1	1975-76	September, 1976
	49 Risby Avenue	1	1975-76	September, 1976
	25 Hannaman Drive	1	1976-77	September, 1976
	Harrison Close	1	1976-77	October, 1976
	30 Robinson Street	1	1975-76	September, 1976
	38 Robinson Street	1	1976-77	October, 1976
Wudinna	Lot 116, Ballantyne Street	1	1975-76	January, 1977
	Total	14		
Married teacher accommodation—Department of Further Education:				
Whyalla	21 Harrison Close	1	1976-77	December, 1976
	32 Robinson Street	1	1976-77	December, 1976
	Total	2		

2. It is not possible at this stage to say how many houses will be constructed on the Eyre Peninsula within the next 12 months.

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. How much was allocated to South Australia for national highways for the next financial year?

2. Where will the money allocated to South Australia be spent?

3. How much does the Government intend to spend on the Stuart Highway?

4. Does the South Australian Government intend to use any of its own funds on national highways?

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

1. National Highway construction—\$15 000 000.

National Highway maintenance—\$1 900 000.

2. (1) Construction:

South-Eastern Freeway (Crafers-White Hill), Swanport Deviation of National Route 1, including Swanport Bridge, Port Pirie to Port Augusta main road, Port Wakefield Road, Cavan railway overpass, Mount Barker Road (Eagle-on-the-Hill to Cross Road).

(2) Maintenance—various.

3. Construction—Nil. Maintenance—Normal.

4. Yes.

PREMIER'S FUND

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is the Premier's Fund?

2. When was it started?

3. For what purpose is it used?

4. How much money is at present in it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Premier's Fund is a fund subscribed to by people who wish to support the aims and policies of the South Australian Labor Government. Such a fund has been held by, and disbursed at the discretion of, the Leader of the Labor Party within the State for very many years. It is totally and completely separate from any Government finances and, as such, it is not the business of this House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. By how much did the Premier's Fund benefit from the dinner held on Friday, March 25, 1977, at the Old Lion Hotel?

2. How many guests were invited to the dinner?

3. How much did each guest pay to attend?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: See reply to previous question.

LAND SETTLEMENT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What consultation, if any, has there been between the State and Commonwealth Governments, pursuant to clause 4 of the agreement in the schedule to the War Service Land Settlement Act, 1945, concerning those soldier settlers on Kangaroo Island to whom the Minister of Lands wrote on January 25, 1977?

2. If such consultation did take place:

(a) when;

(b) who took part in it on behalf of the State Government?

(c) what views were expressed by such person or persons; and

(d) what was the result of it?

3. Is it proposed that there should be any further consultation concerning this matter and, if so, when and between whom?

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

1. There has been consultation between the State and Commonwealth Governments at Ministerial and officer level that was formalised by a Ministerial meeting in Sydney.

2. (a) December 22, 1976.

(b) Minister of Lands.

(c) The Minister for Primary Industry made specific proposals.

(d) The results were expressed in the letters of January 25, 1977, to certain soldier settlers.

3. No.

NORTH MALAYSIA WEEK

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What was the purpose of North Malaysia Week?

2. Has the purpose been achieved and, if so, how?

3. Why was North Malaysia week held during a Royal visit?

4. How much has North Malaysia Week cost the Government and how is this amount made up?

5. In addition to this cost were services provided by public servants, the police or other Government employees and, if so:—

(a) at what estimated cost to the Government; and

(b) how was that cost made up?

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

1. To extend the friendship and goodwill that exists between the two regions as a result of our unique relationship with Penang, to create increased opportunities for economic co-operation, and to promote liaison between our respective countries.

2. The extent of goodwill was indicated by the response of our Malaysian guests to South Australia's hospitality. Economic co-operation is a long-term objective and will grow with the continuation of our relationships with North Malaysia.

3. The Royal visit and North Malaysia Week overlapped by one day which provided an opportunity for this State to demonstrate to Her Majesty the friendship that has developed between the two Commonwealth nations.

4. Payments to non-government bodies are estimated at \$82 797, to Government departments \$117 203, whilst receipts were \$33 282·30, that is, total net cost is estimated at \$166 717·70. However, more than \$61 000 was paid for

capital items that will be used for a wide range of future events.

5. The only costs not included in these estimates are for salaries of public servants and police cadets employed on a full-time basis at an estimated cost of \$20 000 to departmental budgets.

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the estimated total cost to the State of North Malaysia Week?

2. What is the total amount of accounts paid to date, and to whom and for what purpose?

3. Do payments of the accounts include accommodation and, if so:

(a) where was the accommodation;

(b) what was the daily tariff; and

(c) what meals did it include?

4. What was the Malaysian Government's contribution in monetary and personnel terms?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: See reply about North Malaysia Week.

MINISTERS' TRIPS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Which Ministers have been overseas since Parliament last sat on December 9, 1976, and in each case:

(a) what was the reason for the trip;

(b) who accompanied the Minister and why;

(c) how long did the trip last;

(d) has the trip been a benefit to the State and if so, how;

(e) what has been the cost and how is such cost made up; and

(f) which other Minister acted for each Minister during his absence?

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

The Hon. D. W. Simmons, M.P., and the Hon. B. A. Chatterton, M.L.C., went overseas at their expense on private trips, although both had some negotiations which were of public benefit. The amounts paid by these two Ministers are not the business of the House.

The Attorney-General and Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs had an overseas trip during the relevant period, and the answers to the questions are as follows:

(a) To investigate developments in the areas of legal aid, company law, law reform with particular reference to the use of solar energy, and consumer protection legislation and administration in Canada, the United States of America and Great Britain.

(b) The Minister was accompanied by his press secretary, Ms. Carol Treloar, for the duration of the study tour. The Minister's wife, Mrs. S. Duncan, accompanied him during his stay in Great Britain. Ms. Treloar carried out the duties of her position as press secretary.

(c) Two months.

(d) The State will undoubtedly achieve great benefit from important new ideas and initiatives which the Minister has studied.

(e) \$15 350, made up of air fares—\$5 749; accommodation, meals, etc.—\$9 494; and insurance—\$107.

(f) The Minister of Works acted as Attorney-General and Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs for the first month; the Premier acted as Attorney-General, and the Minister of Community Welfare as Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs for the balance of the absence.

The Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport undertook a trip to Hong Kong since Parliament last sat on December 9, 1976:

(a) To attend the annual conference of the Pacific Area Travel Association.

(b) Accompanied by his wife, Mrs. Casey, and the Acting Director, Division of Tourism, Mr. E. G. Correll.

(c) Between February 5 and 11, 1977.

(d) And has made valuable contact with leaders involved in the development of the tourist industry in the Pacific area; in particular it has assisted in an appraisal of how South Australia might obtain a greater share of oversea visitors and the inclusion of the State in more of the package tours organised to Australia.

(e) \$7 356, made up of: air fares—\$5 776; accommodation, meals, etc.—\$1 430; and insurance—\$150; totalling \$7 356.

(f) Minister for the Environment.

SOCCKER

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is the Government to give financial assistance to soccer players to go overseas and, if so:

- (a) how many of them;
- (b) who are they;
- (c) where are they going;
- (d) why is such assistance being given; and
- (e) how much assistance is to be given?

2. What other sporting teams, if any, have received such assistance?

3. Is it proposed to give such assistance to other sporting teams in the future and, if so, why and under what conditions?

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

1. Yes.

- (a) not available.
- (b) not available.
- (c) Yugoslavia.
- (d) to foster exchanges—goodwill activity—recognition of mutual arrangements made between South Australia and the Government of Yugoslavia.
- (e) \$5 000.

2. None.

3. Each case will be considered on its merits, but a trade benefit for South Australia is a major factor.

MINISTERS' HOLIDAYS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): How many Ministers have taken holidays (other than oversea trips) since Parliament last sat on December 9, 1976, and, in each case:

- (a) who are they;
- (b) what was the reason for such holiday;
- (c) how long did each last; and
- (d) which other Minister acted for the Minister during his absence?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot see the point, other than to waste time, in the honourable member's asking which Ministers of the South Australian Government took Christmas holidays. The absurdity of such a question is evidenced by the request of "what was the reason for such holiday".

Ministers have considerably less holidays than provided for public servants or the work force at large. It is not the intention of the Government to start discussing the personal holiday or leave arrangements of individual Ministers.

I suggest the honourable member stop wasting the time of the Government and the House.

LEADER'S TRIP

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has the Leader of the Opposition been abroad at Government expense since Parliament last sat on December 9, 1976, and, if so:—

- (a) why did he go;
- (b) at whose suggestion;
- (c) who accompanied him and why;
- (d) what was the total cost of the trip and how is this amount made up; and
- (e) what benefit, if any, has accrued to South Australia as a result?

2. How often is this Government prepared to pay for a trip abroad by a Leader of the Opposition and under what conditions?

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

1. Yes. The Leader travelled abroad at Government expense between January 24 and March 3, 1977.

- (a) To study matters of current public interest, with particular emphasis on the prevention of juvenile crime; drug dependence; unemployment and other social problems of young people; developments in urban public transportation systems; and electoral systems.
- (b) The purpose, itinerary and timing of the tour was on the Leader's own initiative, within the standing Government approvals set out in the answer to part 2 of this question.
- (c) The Leader was accompanied by his wife, a privilege normally accorded to Ministers and the Leader on official visits overseas.
- (d) All accounts are not yet in, but the estimated total cost is \$12 137, made up of fares—\$5 755; accommodation, meals, entertainment and incidentals—\$6 338; and insurance—\$44.
- (e) I would expect that the Leader is better equipped to carry out the duties and responsibilities of his office.

2. The Government accords the Leader of the Opposition a trip abroad once in the life of each Parliament. He is allowed to take with him one member of his staff, and conditions otherwise are those applicable to Ministerial travel overseas.

SQUASH

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is the Government aware that the World Open Squash Championships are to be held in this State during this year and, if so, when did it become aware of this?

2. Has any request for financial assistance to hold them been made to the Government and, if so—

- (a) by whom;
- (b) when; and
- (c) what response, if any, did the Government make to such request, and when and why?

3. Is it now proposed to give any financial assistance and, if so, how much, and, if not, why not?

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

1. The Government was aware that the World Open Squash Championships may be held in South Australia, as of August 6, 1976.

2. Yes.

- (a) Mr. Len Atkins, Tournament Director, of Squash Racquets Association of S.A. (Inc.)

- (b) August 6, 1976, is the date of Mr. Atkins' application.
- (c) The application was not recommended on December 3, 1976, as the championship was considered to be a professional tournament.
3. No, for the same reasons as in 2 (c) above.

RUNDLE STREET EAST

Mr. WOTTON (on notice): Has the Rundle Street Redevelopment Committee released a report regarding possible redevelopment of Rundle Street East in the vicinity of the East End Market and, if so:

- (a) will this committee continue to function following the release of the report;
- (b) will it be necessary to change either the terms of reference or the personnel engaged on that committee; and
- (c) is the report to be made available to the general public and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows: Neither the Government nor the Adelaide City Council knows of an official Rundle Street Redevelopment Committee.

EAST END MARKET

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. Is the East End Market relocation committee still functioning, following the release of that committee's yellow report and, if so:

- (a) have the terms of reference set down changed since the release of the yellow report and, if so, what are the present terms of reference;
- (b) have the personnel of the committee changed since releasing the report and, if so, who are the new members and why were the changes necessary; and
- (c) is it anticipated that a further report will be released by the committee and, if so, when, and is it expected that such a report could mean any changes in the present marketing system at the East End Market;

2. In view of concern expressed and the growing speculation amongst growers and merchants regarding the future of the market, will the Minister terminate such speculation by issuing a firm statement on this matter?

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

1. Yes.

- (a) Yes.—See *Hansard*, pages 1433 and 1434, October 12, 1976.
- (b) Yes. The new members are Messrs. B. Tugwell and D. Harvey. Since the inquiry was broadened into a study of fruit and vegetable marketing in general, the new members were added to the committee because of their knowledge of technical aspects of storing and handling fruit and vegetables, as well as the marketing of agricultural products.

(c) Yes; within the next three months. At this stage, the committee has not provided any recommendations on the present marketing system of the East End Market.

2. No final statement on the future of the East End Market will be made until the Minister of Agriculture

and Cabinet have considered the East End Market Relocation Committee's report in conjunction with the report of the East End Area Redevelopment Committee and the Anderson Enquiry into Post Secondary Education.

ELIZABETH MARKET

Mr. WOTTON (on notice): Is the Minister of Works aware that a committee has been formed to investigate the possible setting up of a growers' market at Elizabeth and, if so:

- (a) what are the terms of reference for this committee;
- (b) when is it anticipated that a report will be released by this committee; and
- (c) is it the intention of the Government that further investigations should be made regarding the possibility of setting up growers' markets in other areas of metropolitan Adelaide?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows: A working party inquiring into the feasibility of establishing a retail market at Elizabeth was set up in January, 1977.

(a) The terms of reference of the working party are as follows:

"To report to the Minister for Planning on the desirability and feasibility of establishing a retail market, in or near the Elizabeth Town Centre. In particular, the working party should have regard to:

- (a) the demand for such a market;
- (b) the reaction of traders in the Elizabeth Town Centre, fruit and vegetable traders in the Elizabeth and Salisbury area, the Elizabeth City Council, and the South Australian Housing Trust;
- (c) the location of the market;
- (d) the form and content, and times of operation of the market, including whether it should be temporary or permanent;
- (e) financial arrangements, including sources of finance and rents."

(b) The working party is expected to present its report, which will be of a preliminary nature, to the Minister for Planning within six weeks.

(c) The idea of establishing regional markets in the metropolitan area is being examined by the East End Market Relocation Committee.

GRAIN MARKETING

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. Is it the intention of the Government to negotiate with other States regarding the formulation of a single grain marketing authority and, if so:

- (a) which States will be involved in negotiations; and
- (b) have negotiations commenced and, if so, at what stage are they?

2. Is it the intention of the Government that a new single authority will replace the existing Barley Board or widen its powers?

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

1. No.
2. No.

WELLINGTON WEIGHBRIDGE

Mr. WOTTON (on notice): Does the Government plan to build a permanent weighbridge at Wellington on the River Murray and, if so:

- (a) when; and
- (b) where is it to be located?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There is no such proposal at present.

RETICULATED WATER SCHEME

Mr. WOTTON (on notice): Why has the interim report on the Hartley, Woodchester, Strathalbyn reticulated water scheme not been released as promised by the Minister of Works on November 30, 1976, and when is it now expected to be released?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The results of the investigation carried out by the Engineering and Water Supply Department are now being evaluated by departmental officers. A firm date as to the release of the report cannot be made at this stage.

LAND VALUATIONS

Mr. BOUNDY (on notice):

1. What are the criteria used to arrive at the valuations of the various types of broad-acre perpetual and Crown leasehold land in South Australia?

2. Do those criteria differ from those used for freehold land and, if so, in what way?

3. What percentage relationship does the annual rental levied on such Crown and perpetual leasehold bear to their total valuation?

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

1. There are 19 different types of perpetual lease and many other forms of terminating tenure held by lessees of the Crown, but the basic criteria for all valuations is "market value" derived from the analysis of sales of comparable land.

2. The criteria used for valuing leasehold land is basically the same as for freehold land—the difference lies in the interests to be valued.

3. The annual rent levied on Crown and perpetual leasehold is not related to the total valuation.

ST. LEONARDS PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. When will the St. Leonards Primary School yard be repaired?

2. What has caused the delay in starting these repairs?

3. When are the buildings due for repainting?

4. What consideration has been given to replacing the temporary classrooms?

5. What is the age of each temporary classroom at the school, and when are they likely to be replaced?

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

1. The repairs to the yard have been programmed for the 1977-78 financial year.

2. The delays have been caused primarily through the limitations on funds which could be made available for work of this type.

3. The buildings are due to be repainted in 1979. It should be noted that they were painted during November, 1972, at a cost of \$11 000.

4. No definite plans are in hand for the replacement of the temporary classroom. There is no doubt that new buildings will be provided when funds can be made available for this purpose, but it is impossible to say at this time when work of this nature will be able to be done at the St. Leonards Primary School.

5. A single timber classroom was provided in 1956. A dual timber classroom was provided in 1951, and additions were made to this in 1957 to form a quadruple classroom block. The canteen was provided in 1960.

The dual timber classroom was provided in 1961 and another of the same type in 1964. The shelter shed was erected in 1962.

PATAWALONGA

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. When will the Coast Protection Board take further action as promised last year to remove the sand bar at the Patawalonga mouth?

2. What has caused the delay?

3. What alternative methods for removing the sand have been considered?

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

1. There has been no promise given by the Coast Protection Board that it will remove the sand bar at the Patawalonga mouth. The problems caused by the presence of this natural sand bar to users of small boats are neither simple nor inexpensive to solve. To alleviate the effects of this sand bar the board has, in the past, removed sand from the beach on the southern side of the Patawalonga outlet, using conventional earth-moving equipment. Tenders for a further contract of this kind will be called this year.

2. There has been no delay. It is intended that the work will be carried out before the start of the summer boating season when maximum benefit will be obtained by the boating community.

3. Dredging and the installation of a sand by-pass system (the latter alternative is being investigated further). These are two alternative methods that have been considered, but the board presently favours the method already adopted, that is, to lower the sand level of the beach on the southern side of the outlet with conventional earth-moving equipment.

S.G.I.C.

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Does the S.G.I.C. participate in reinsurance and, if so:

(a) to what extent;

(b) what types of insurance; and

(c) what was the total amount involved for each financial year since its inception?

2. What are the countries of origin of companies accepting reinsurance from S.G.I.C.?

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

1. Yes.

(a) Reinsurance is effected to protect S.G.I.C. against catastrophe.

(b) Excess of loss—unlimited liability.

Fire catastrophe—\$25 000 000 excess of \$500 000.

Surplus treaties—if required 35 times S.G.I.C. net retention.

Facultative reinsurance—on a reciprocal basis with other insurance companies.

(c) Premium income paid for reinsurance in each of the five years to 1976 was as follows:

1972 \$111 220

1973 \$712 324

1974 \$1 901 917

1975 \$1 736 947

1976 \$1 958 555

2. Excess of loss and fire catastrophe reinsurance placed in London, as no market available in Australia. London in turn reinsures throughout the world. Surplus treaties placed in Australia. Facultative reinsurance placed in South Australia.

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How much has the S.G.I.C. spent to date this financial year on advertising on:

- (a) press;
- (b) radio; and
- (c) television?

2. How do these allocations compare with the previous financial year?

3. Why is it necessary to spend such an amount on advertising, and how does this figure compare with other companies in this field?

4. What is the estimated result in each field of insurance for S.G.I.C. this financial year?

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

1. (a) Press: \$4 400·69—representing ·011 of 1 per cent of premium income.

(b) Radio: \$17 025—representing ·043 of 1 per cent of premium income.

(c) Television: \$23 209—representing ·058 of 1 per cent of premium income.

2. (a) Press: 43·33 per cent reduction.

(b) Radio: 3·67 per cent increase.

(c) Television: 25·11 per cent increase.

Total advertising allocation over all forms has been increased this year by 14·28 per cent having remained unaltered for three years.

3. Any organisation marketing a product advertises, and S.G.I.C. is no exception. Comparable figures relating to other insurance offices are not available.

4. The results at January 31, 1977, indicate that a net profit can be anticipated in each fund in 1976-77. This will further reduce the accumulated loss which was reduced by a net profit of \$698 916 in 1975-76.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Who were the members of the working committee who investigated the movement of the S.G.I.C. into the field of life assurance and what were the qualifications and the position held by each member of this committee?

2. What were the full recommendations of the committee?

3. Will the Government release to the Opposition copies of the report of this committee and, if not, why not?

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

1. Membership (and position held at the time) of the working party:

Chairman: Mr. G. J. Inns, Chairman of the Public Service Board;

Members: Mr. R. D. Bakewell, Director-General, Premier's Department, Deputy Chairman, State Government Insurance Commission;

Mr. P. C. Gillen, General Manager of the State Government Insurance Commission;

Mr. P. O. Whelan, Deputy Public Actuary;

Secretary: Mr. M. Forwood, Committee Secretariat, Premier's Department;

Research Officer: Miss B. Edwards, State Government Insurance Commission.

2. The recommendations of the working party are set out in section v of the report, "Summary and Conclusions" to be found on page 28 of the working party report.

3. Copies of this report were made available to the press and media, and to other interested people who

requested such copies at the time of the Government's announcement (January 17, 1977), and after. Indeed, the member for Eyre asked the Premier for a copy of the report on Thursday afternoon, March 31, and a copy was made available to him as soon as possible on Friday morning. The report has been available for almost three months.

ASSURANCE LICENCE FEES

Mr. BECKER (on notice): How much was collected by the Government in licence fees from life assurance companies on life assurance policies and superannuation contributions each year for the past five financial years?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Annual licence fees received by the State Taxation Office in respect of life assurance policies during the past five financial years have been—

Financial Year	Fees Received
	\$
1972-73	750 375
1973-74	819 600
1974-75	1 370 951
1975-76	1 507 963
1976-77	1 617 808

The amount received in respect of the 1976-77 financial year is the total received to date. Only a small amount is still outstanding from one company. The figures include the annual licence fees payable by assurance companies on life policies issued for superannuation purposes.

CENTRAL-SOUTH FREEWAY

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the total cost to date and the number of properties acquired by the Government in the electorate of Hanson, for the proposed construction of the Central-South Freeway?

2. What is the total cost to date and the number of:

- (a) residences;
- (b) industrial properties; and
- (c) small businesses,

purchased for the Central-South Freeway, and where are these properties?

3. What is the proposed route of the Central-South Freeway from Adelaide through the south-western suburbs?

4. What is the estimated cost and commencement date of construction?

5. How many properties purchased have been demolished, and why?

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

1, 2 and 5. These statistics are not readily available and would require considerable effort and expenditure to obtain.

3. As shown in the report "Metropolitan Development Plan—Supplementary Development Plan No. 1—Transportation Routes 1971", published by the State Planning Authority.

4. No estimates have been prepared since the M.A.T.S. report of June, 1968. No date has been set for construction to commence.

BOUNDARIES REDISTRIBUTION

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many persons representing the Government appeared in London at the Privy Council hearing of an appeal on the redistribution of boundaries?

2. Who were these people, and what were their duties?
3. What is the estimated total cost involved?

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

1. Three.
2. Messrs. B. R. Cox, Q.C. (Solicitor-General), F. R. Fisher, Q.C., and G. C. Prior (Crown Solicitor) appeared as counsel for the South Australian Government.
3. Not yet known, and depends on the outcome of the case. If the appeal is rejected, it is likely that an order for the payment of costs will be made against the appellants.

M.V. TROUBRIDGE

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the age of the m.v. *Troubridge*?
2. Why is it being replaced?
3. Have any approaches been made to the Government by persons wishing to take over the service and, if so
 - (a) who;
 - (b) what proposals have been made; and
 - (c) when will a decision be made on this matter?

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

1. Sixteen years.
2. By the time a replacement is built, the *Troubridge* will be at or near the end of its optimum economic life.
3. No. However, Mr. George Nimmo has intimated that he proposes to operate a landing barge from Rapid Bay to American River, and a company with which he is associated proposes to operate a hovercraft from Glenelg to Kangaroo Island.

REVENUE ACCOUNT

Mr. BECKER (on notice): What is the estimated Revenue Account commitment for each financial year for the next three years for:

- (a) health;
- (b) welfare; and
- (c) education services in this State?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Revenue Account commitment for Government services in future years is dependent upon the extent to which the Government: (a) is required to vary the operation of its services to meet demonstrated community needs; and (b) has funds available to meet those needs.

Whilst assessments can be made in respect to (a), it is difficult to predict the likely level of available funds, given the uncertain nature of future Commonwealth Government support that forms a significant part of the State's revenue budget. This uncertainty has been created by the Commonwealth's present attitude to public spending and its announced intention to review State relativities under the personal income-tax sharing scheme. Nevertheless, as I announced when presenting the revenue budget last September, my Treasury officers will be asking departments to review their budget requirements for both 1977-78 and 1978-79. That exercise has commenced. The extent of the Government's likely commitment to the areas referred to by the honourable member will be better known when departmental reviews have been completed and Commonwealth intentions have been announced at the June, 1977, Premiers' Conference.

EXCESS WATER

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the present estimated income the Engineering and Water Supply Department will receive this financial year from excess water accounts?
2. How does this compare with last financial year, and what is the reason for any variation?

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

1. The present estimated income is \$13 500 000.
2. The above figure is \$1 000 083 higher than in 1975-76. The reason for this increase is:
 - (a) \$583 000 was estimated as the additional revenue that would accrue resulting from the 2c increase in the price of water to 16c a kilolitre.
 - (b) An additional sum of \$500 000 has now been added to the original estimate due to the hot, dry conditions that prevailed during the past summer causing a higher consumption than anticipated.

STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What action, if any, has the Government taken as a result of the letter of January 20, 1977, to the Premier from the President and Secretary of the Stipendiary Magistrates Association of South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A letter was sent to Mr. V. C. Matison, S.M. in his capacity as President of the Stipendiary Magistrates Association of South Australia as follows:

I acknowledge the letter dated January 20, 1977, which you sent to me as President of the Stipendiary Magistrates Association of South Australia. The Public Service Board advised in reply to notification of the formation of the association that it could not be recognised industrially at the present time. I have, however, noted the views that you have expressed in your letter, regarding the appointment of a lay magistrate, pursuant to the provisions of the Licensing Act. I point out that a lay magistrate has been appointed in the Industrial Commission, and that this is therefore not the first appointment of this type. As well, the person appointed to the Licensing Court will not be a Special Magistrate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Does the Government propose to accede to the request of the Stipendiary Magistrates Association of South Australia in its resolution of January 17, 1977, to the effect that if a person unqualified in the law must be appointed to a position presently occupied by a special magistrate such position be given a name other than "magistrate" and, if so:

- (a) when; and
- (b) how will this be done?

2. If the Government does not propose to accede to the request, why not?

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

1. No.
2. See reply to previous Question on Notice.

LICENSING COURT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Have any Licensing Court magistrates been appointed since the passing of the Licensing Act Amendment Act, No. 75 of 1976, and, if so:

- (a) who have been appointed;
- (b) what are the qualifications for appointment, if any, of such persons;
- (c) what are to be the duties of such appointees;
- (d) to whom are they responsible in carrying out their duties; and
- (e) has there been any appeal against such appointments, and with what outcome?

2. If no appointments have been made, when is it expected they will be made?

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

1. Yes.
 - (a) Mr. W. C. Langcake, J.P.;
 - (b) extensive administrative experience in Public Service over a period of 40 years, including 16 years as Permanent Head of Attorney-General's Department, which department administered the Licensing Act; a member of several commercial tribunals for many years;
 - (c) hear applications in court and in chambers, and in particular will deal with applications for permits, changes of manager, directorship, etc.; sit as member of Full Bench as required;
 - (d) the Licensing Court judge.
 - (e) Yes—appeal was withdrawn during the hearing of the appeal proceedings.
2. Does not apply.

RADAR TRAPS

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice): Has the Government issued an instruction to the Police Department that radar traps operating on the edge of roadways should not be deliberately concealed and, if so, when was the instruction issued and why?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No.

KINGSTON COLLEGE

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What long-term plans does the Government have for the use of the facilities and staff at the Kingston College of Advanced Education?
2. Is there any likelihood that this C.A.E. may become a portion of an existing education institution and, if so, which institution?
3. Is there any possibility that the Kingston College of Advanced Education may cease to operate under that name and, if so, who or which body would make such a decision, and has there already been any consideration given to such a decision?

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

1. The question seems to be based on the assumption that the Government has already accepted the recommendations of the Board of Advanced Education in relation to the future of Kingston College of Advanced Education. This is not so. No long term plans can be developed until such a decision is made.
2. See 1.
3. See 1.

HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What administrative units are now incorporated into the new Housing and Urban Affairs Department?
2. Outside of these existing administrative units, how many staff have been employed within this new department, and what are the functions of these additional staff members?
3. What will be the additional cost, for the first 12-month period, of establishing this new department?
4. What will be the major functions of the new department?

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

1. The following administrative units are now incorporated into the new Department of Housing and Urban Affairs:

the office of the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Minister for Planning, Premier's Department; the State Planning Office, Environment Department; the Urban Land Price Control Unit, Environment Department; and the office of the South Australian Land Commission, Lands Department.

2. At present, the Director-General, Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, who is the Permanent Head of the department, and a steno-secretary grade II, who is responsible for the provision of a steno-secretarial service to the Director-General, together with two officers seconded from the Monarto Development Commission.

3. It is not possible to provide this information at this stage as financial estimates are at present being prepared.

4. The major functions of the new department are:
- to assist the Minister in promoting more efficient and equitable urban and regional development;
 - to assist the integration of urban and regional development programmes and projects of all State Government agencies;
 - to develop a comprehensive housing policy; and
 - to monitor and advise Cabinet on the achievement of urban and regional development planning objectives.

RAFFLES

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What was the total amount collected by the Government during 1975-76 by way of fees and levies for raffles conducted in South Australia.
2. How many raffles were conducted during this period?
3. How many staff are involved in the administration associated with these raffles?
4. What does the Government do with the revenue collected from raffle fees and levies?

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

1. \$453 330.
2. 149 259 plus 10 900 sessions of bingo.
3. Eight.
4. Appropriated to General Revenue.

LANGUAGES IN SCHOOLS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What foreign languages taught at primary and secondary school levels are taught at universities in this State?
2. Why is Malay taught at some secondary schools but not taught at the higher level, and is not this a waste of resources and students' time?

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

1. The following languages are offered at primary, secondary, and tertiary levels: French, German, Italian, Japanese and Malay/Indonesian.

2. (1) In several cases this is because it has been recently introduced and is still making its way through (for example, Dover, Mawson, Heathfield, Underdale, Salisbury East, Modbury Heights, Kidman Park).

(2) Even strongly established languages, such as French, sometimes find it difficult to keep viable numbers in years 11 and 12.

The implication of the second part of this question is that no subject is worth doing unless it is pursued to matriculation level. Most educators consider that the study of a modern language should be an integral part of a liberal education; and the surrender value of Malay/Indonesian is probably the greatest of all the languages now on offer because a student can rapidly learn to use it and generally get further in it in a shorter time.

DYSLEXIA

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What arrangements will the Education Department now make to screen all children for dyslexia prior to their entry to infant school and, if no arrangements are to be made, why not?

2. Will a special school be established for dyslexia children and, if not, why not?

3. Will special classes be established at selected metropolitan and country schools for dyslexia children and, if not, why not?

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

1. The word "dyslexia" has no generally accepted meaning. The House of Representatives Select Committee on specific learning difficulties brought down a report in October, 1976, on this whole question. With respect to definition, the report says, *inter alia*, "It is questionable whether placement, treatment and funding for children with special needs are really dependent on a definition, particularly as no acceptable definition exists" (page 11 (f)). In these circumstances screening for dyslexia is not a practicable task.

There are methods of screening young children which are orientated towards predicting those likely to have "learning difficulties" of a variety of kinds. The difficulty with these screening arrangements includes that the prediction has a fairly low validity—predictions of learning difficulty are often in error and predictions of freedom from difficulty almost equally so. This department considers that the anxiety raised by predictions of no great validity would more than outweigh any advantage from indicating possible future learning difficulties for some children. In any case, "solutions" to the problem of "learning difficulties" are generally "good teaching", "sensitivity of approach" and the avoidance of failure—solutions which answer the needs of all children. As the committee report states (same reference) "there has been a lack of reliable evidence that justifiably ties a particular treatment to a particular group, or conclusively determines the validity of placement of children in one classification category".

2. As there is no agreement about such a category of children, it would not be possible to establish a special school for the group. In any case, one of the few items of agreement between experts in the field of special education would be that to remove children of "ordinary"

intelligence, but with "learning difficulties" from their peers into a special school would be quite inappropriate. This department already provides a considerable range of special classes—both full-time and part-time—and support teachers in ordinary schools for the purpose of assisting the schools provide for children with more than ordinary learning difficulties.

3. Classes have been established for many years in metropolitan and country schools to assist children with a variety of learning difficulties. In addition, selected teachers are being trained in "adaptive and remedial education" to help schools more capably meet the educational needs of all their students.

NEAPTR

Mr. COUMBE (on notice):

1. What stage has now been reached in the North-East Area Public Transport Review?

2. When is it anticipated that this study will be completed?

3. How many individuals and organisations have been contacted by the committee?

4. What is the total cost of the review so far, including the production of printed material?

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

1. The first and largest of the four stages of the North-East Area Public Transport Review is complete and has been presented publicly in the form of reports, exhibitions and meetings with groups of people. A range of alternative future public transport systems has been developed from this and detailed descriptions and assessments are now being prepared.

2. It is expected that the study will be completed by the end of this year.

3. There are 1 730 people listed on the NEAPTR contact file for individuals, and an additional list of 440 persons representing organisations. It is estimated that about 5 000 persons have been contacted overall.

4. The total cost to March 31 is \$350 113·81, including the full cost of printing and overheads such as salaries and office equipment and accommodation.

STANDARD GAUGE RAILWAY LINE

Mr. VENNING (on notice):

1. What has been the cost to date, in planning, surveying and acquisition of the proposed Adelaide to Crystal Brook standard gauge line?

2. Were the contracts let in total, or for the various stages and, if the latter:

(a) how many contracts have been let for the actual surveying of the route; and

(b) what were the contract prices for each?

3. When was the last field survey commenced?

4. When did the Federal Minister for Transport call a halt to the scheme prior to asking for a further report on the project?

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

1. The costs to date are as follows:

	\$
Departmental planning and administration	573 000
Investigation and design by consultants and other Government departments	1 231 000
Land acquisition	57 000
	\$1 861 000

2. Commissions were let for various functions of investigation, survey, design, preparation of contract documents, and supervision of construction in convenient geographic areas.

- (a) Three major commissions involved the main line route between Dry Creek and Port Pirie, with several other smaller commissions applying to localised areas in the metropolitan area. \$
- (b) Port Pirie to Crystal Brook to Nantawarra section, completed to preparation of tender documents 475 000
- Nantawarra to Two Wells section, survey and design partially completed—commission curtailed .. 75 000
- Two Wells to Dry Creek section, completed to preparation of tender documents 297 000
- Minor localised commissions including Government departments .. 115 000
- Master Plan Phase 1 and 2 Reports 270 000

\$1 231 000

- 3. September, 1975.
- 4. February, 1976.

SHARK FISHING

Mr. BOUNDY (on notice):

1. What action, if any, has the Government taken in the interests of public safety to declare jetties, wharves, and a distance of a nominal 300 metres adjacent thereto, out of bounds for the practice of shark fishing and the dropping of lures and baits for the purpose of shark fishing?

2. If no action has been taken, will the Government take heed of public concern and implement immediate action to ensure public safety in this area?

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

- 1. Nil.
- 2. The matter will be kept under review.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOANS

Mr. BECKER (on notice): What are the total loan borrowings for each local government area for each of the past six financial years, and what is the percentage of interest and repayments to income for each area?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This information is not readily available. It could be obtained only by approaching each council, a time-consuming and expensive exercise.

MORPHETTVILLE BUS DEPOT

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

- 1. What was the total cost of the official opening of the Morphettville bus depot?
- 2. Who were the caterers?
- 3. How many invitations to the opening were accepted?

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

- 1. \$1 650.
- 2. State Transport Authority, Rail Division.
- 3. 360.

LITTER

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many persons have been apprehended to date for littering, since the introduction of on-the-spot litter fines?

2. How many persons have been fined?

3. Have any summonses been issued for non-payment of these fines and, if so, how many and what is the outcome of this action?

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

1. Information available indicates that to March 31, 1977, 288 expiation notices have been issued.

2. 169 persons had paid the expiation fee; 91 notices have not yet expired; 8 notices have been waived.

3. 20 summonses have been issued; 2 summonses could not be served because a false address had been given; 2 summonses failed because of insufficient evidence; 4 summonses issued and cases still pending; 12 summonses issued and prosecuted successfully.

HANDICAPPED PERSONS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many rental and rental-purchase properties are now available for handicapped persons?

2. What is the current waiting time for both categories?

3. What encouragement and assistance is the Government giving invalid pensioners to own their own homes and, if neither is being given, why not?

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

1. 42.

2. 13 applications are on hand. Because of the limited number of dwellings that the trust has available to meet the requirements of the 13 applicants mentioned, they unfortunately can face a wait of several years before it is possible to offer them suitable housing.

3. The normal operations of the trust ensure that invalid pensioners are given encouragement and assistance that would not be available from the private sector. In addition, the trust has assisted such groups as Minda Home Incorporated (by providing a pair of renovated maisonettes in King William Road, Goodwood), the Central Districts Mentally Retarded Children's Society (by providing them with rental accommodation in Main North Road, Pooraka and Forde Street, Elizabeth West), and the Mentally Retarded Childrens' Society of South Australia (with housing in Balmoral Road, Port Pirie.) In addition, premises in King Street, Mile End, are currently undergoing renovation and extensive modification prior to being allocated to the Woodville Spastic Centre.

CONTAINER TERMINAL

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What was the total cost of the official opening of the Outer Harbor container terminal?

2. How many invitations to the opening were accepted?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:

- 1. The accounts have not yet been finalised.
- 2. 270.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. For what reasons was the railway line entering the new container berth at Outer Harbor not run adjacent and parallel to the wharf so that containers could be moved

directly from railway trucks to container ships or *vice versa*, necessitating the double handling of all containers transported by rail?

2. Who was responsible for those design aspects of the container terminal that determined that the railway line would not run adjacent to and parallel to the loading wharf?

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

1. During the design stages of the container terminal consideration was given to having rail tracks on the wharf apron running parallel with the wharf but the proposal was rejected for a number of reasons, mainly:

- (a) the difficulty of spotting containers correctly in relation to the ships' cells;
- (b) the inhibiting effect of a rake of railway waggons on other traffic;
- (c) the overall effect would have resulted in a greatly reduced rate of handling containers to and from the ship; and
- (d) that method of working had been rejected in all modern container terminals.

2. The Department of Marine and Harbors.

SCHOOL DENTAL CLINICS

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. How many school dental clinics are currently in operation in this State, and where are they situated?

2. How many new school dental clinics will be established in South Australia as a result of the Federal grant announced recently?

3. When is it expected that the new clinics will begin to operate?

4. Have the areas of location been selected for the new clinics and, if so, where are they to be established and, if not, when is it likely that they will be decided?

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

1. Sixty-nine—they are located in the following areas: Seven at Whyalla; six at Elizabeth; three at Port Augusta, Port Pirie, Para Hills; two at Mount Gambier, Port Lincoln, Murray Bridge, Modbury; one at Peterborough, Kingscote, Renmark, Loxton, Berri, Millicent, Cummins, Tailem Bend, Kadina, Maitland, Bordertown, Keith, Naracoorte, Penola, Ridgehaven, Mansfield Park, Woodville Gardens, Pennington, Port Adelaide, Taperoo, Birkenhead, Ethelton, Para Vista, Salisbury, Brahma Lodge, Gawler, Seacombe Gardens, Reynella South, Morphett Vale, Seaciff, Christies Beach, O'Sullivan Beach, Christie Downs, Eden Hills, Belair, Clapham, Seaton Park, Fulham Gardens, Brighton (Minda Home).

2. Application has been made to the Commonwealth Government for funds to be made available for the construction of 14 clinics for 1977-78. Commonwealth approval has not yet been received.

3. A time table cannot be set until funds are available.

4. Decisions cannot be made on the location of new clinics until the Commonwealth Government approves the proposed number of clinics and advises the amount of money to be made available.

CATTLEMEN'S UNION

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. Has a Cattlemen's Union proposal to reduce the interest rate under the beef assistance plan been considered by the Government and, if so, has a conclusion been reached?

2. If a conclusion has been reached, what decision has been made and, if not, when is it expected it will be made?

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

1. No.
2. See 1.

DEAF EDUCATION

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. How many persons are attending centres which cater for the education of deaf children at:

- (a) primary level; and
- (b) secondary level?

2. How many such centres are operating and where are they situated?

3. How many persons are employed in the teaching of deaf children and where are they employed?

4. Is it possible at present for deaf children at secondary level to be taught basic skills as well as general subjects?

5. Does the Government have any specific plans to enable centres for deaf children to have teachers at secondary level engaged to teach basic skills as well as general subjects?

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

1. There are 139 pupils in primary school speech and hearing centres and 41 pupils in secondary school speech and hearing centres. In addition to the pupils in primary and secondary centres, 10 hearing-impaired pre-schoolers are integrated with pre-school aged hearing children at the S.A. Pre-School for Hearing and Hearing-Impaired Children, Townsend House, Brighton. Six visual/hearing-impaired children attend the Deaf/Blind Centre, Gilles Street Primary School. As well as Education Department speech and hearing centres, the S.A. Oral School, Gilberton, a private school, has 42 children and the Pembroke College centre has six children enrolled.

2. There are eight primary speech and hearing centres in Education Department schools. There are four secondary centres. There is one Deaf/Blind centre. There is one pre-school centre.

Primary centres are situated in the following primary schools:

Brighton Primary School
 Elizabeth Park Primary School
 Klemzig Primary School
 North Adelaide Primary School
 S.A. School for Deaf Children
 King George Avenue, Brighton—with classroom annex at Dover Gardens Primary School
 McDonald Park Primary School, Mount Gambier
 Woodville Primary School
 Memorial Oval Primary School, Whyalla

Secondary speech and hearing centres are located as follows:

Croydon High School
 Seacombe High School
 Smithfield Plains High School
 Strathmont High School

Other facilities are located accordingly:

Pre-school Kindergarten, S.A. School Pre-school for Hearing and Hearing Impaired Children, King George Avenue, Brighton
 Deaf/Blind Centre, Gilles Street Primary School
 Parent Guidance Centre, Education Department (to be located as soon as accommodation ready, Savings Bank Building, 158 Rundle Street, Adelaide).

- 3. 13 principals
 - 1 deputy principal
 - 46 assistant teachers (a small number are employed part-time)
 - 3 visiting teachers for primary and secondary hearing-impaired children in regular schools
 - 1 visiting teacher for hearing-impaired children in special schools
 - 1 visiting teacher for trade school apprentices
 - 1 visiting teacher for pre-schoolers

66

In addition, there are nine teacher aides.

4. Yes. This has always been done. Art, craft, home science, commerce subjects and allied subjects are taken by the subject teachers in co-operation with the teachers of the deaf.

5. Yes. There are three secondary craft/home science teachers undertaking the teacher of the deaf training course this year. The Principal of the Croydon Speech and Hearing Centre is himself a secondary level craft trained teacher. There is considerable merit in having ordinary craft or basic skill teachers involved in teaching hearing-impaired children, as their expertise is specific and can be provided with the supportive help of the teachers of the deaf.

ECHUNGA PRE-SCHOOL FACILITIES

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. Is the Minister of Education aware of the untenable situation whereby 32 children at Echunga are forced to meet in a private home, three days a week due to the lack of pre-school facilities in the area?

2. Is the Minister aware that land will be made available, if required, for a pre-school on the recreation ground adjacent to the Echunga Primary School?

3. What steps are being taken to provide assistance to enable adequate facilities for a pre-school to be built?

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

1. A child-parent group had been meeting in the hall adjacent to the school. This year it transferred to the football clubrooms. There seems to have been a problem regarding the storing of equipment and the group voluntarily moved into the verandah of a home for its two sessions each week. The school offered to accommodate the group in its activity room.

2. The Echunga group has received an equipment grant from the Childhood Services Council, which is at present investigating the needs of Echunga and Meadows. A meeting of parents is being called with Kindergarten Union and Education Department representation to determine the best way to provide for the small numbers in each area within the financial resources available.

3. See above.

ENERGY

Mr. WARDLE (on notice):

1. Has the State Energy Committee completed its inquiry into the State's energy needs and resources and, if so, has the report been made public?

2. Has the Monarto Development Commission carried out technical and economic studies related to the energy needs and potential energy sources of the proposed City of Monarto?

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

1. The report of the South Australian State Energy Committee was tabled in Parliament on October 21, 1976, and a copy was personally provided to the honourable member.

2. Yes.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. WARDLE (on notice): How many applications for farm build-up were received in the calendar years, 1975 and 1976, and in each year:

- (a) how many were approved;
- (b) how many were rejected; and
- (c) how many are still under consideration?

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

Farm build-up applications, 1975:	
Number received	176
Number approved	72
Number declined	47
Number on hand	57
Farm build-up applications, 1976:	
Number received	209
Number approved	95
Number declined	49
Number on hand	65

Mr. WARDLE (on notice): How many applications for debt reconstruction were received in the calendar years 1975 and 1976 and, in each year:

- (a) how many were approved;
- (b) how many were rejected; and
- (c) how many are still under consideration?

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

Debt reconstruction application, 1975:	
Number received	96
Number approved	19
Number declined	54
Number on hand	23
Debt reconstruction applications, 1976:	
Number received	67
Number approved	8
Number declined	45
Number on hand	14

Mr. VENNING (on notice):

1. How many primary producers applied for rural assistance under the Rural Industry Assistance (Special Provisions) Act from December 1, 1976, to March 1, 1977, and, of these, how many have been assisted?

2. What moneys have so far been expended on the successful applicants?

3. Have sufficient State moneys been expended to attract Commonwealth moneys for rural assistance in South Australia?

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

- 1. 56 applications received, 4 declined, and 52 on hand.
- 2. Nil.
- 3. Nil.

TAVERN BAR

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Are the toilets in the Tavern Bar at the Adelaide Railway Station closed at 5 p.m. daily and, if so, why?

2. Have the tables and chairs been removed from the Tavern Bar and, if so, why and when?

3. Does the Tavern Bar now close at 7.30 p.m. instead of 9.30 p.m. and, if so:

- (a) why; and
- (b) when were the new hours introduced?

4. Has patronage declined during the past six months and if so, why?

5. How do receipts and profits for the quarters ending September 30, 1976, December 31, 1976, and March 31, 1977, compare with the same quarters 12 months previously?

	Revenue		Gross Profit		Net Profit	
	1976	1975	1976	1975	1976	1975
September quarter	59 240	61 271	33 037	34 062	12 446	13 082
December quarter	59 761	71 962	34 131	38 864	12 002	16 123
Total	119 001	133 233	67 168	72 926	24 448	29 205

6. What is the future of this bar and is it proposed to review the trading hours further?

7. Have there been any altercations in the bar or toilets during the past six months and, if so:

- (a) to what extent;
- (b) is any one particular group of people involved; and
- (c) what action has the staff taken and recommended?

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

1. The toilets are closed at 5 p.m. daily following two assaults and robberies in the men's section.

2. Tables and chairs were removed on February 9, 1977, to deter groups from occupying the bar for long periods. Stools were replaced in the bar on March 14, 1977.

3. Yes. The Tavern Bar was closed from 7.30 p.m. at the beginning of November last as a result of attacks on staff.

4. Patronage has declined due to the foregoing, but also because construction work on the Gateway Hotel and the Festival Plaza has been completed, and we have lost patronage from workmen engaged on these projects.

5. The quarterly figures requested for September and December are as follows. Those for the quarter ending March 31, 1977, are not available.

6. The trading hours will probably remain as at present but as from April 1, 1977, the toilets have again been fully reopened.

7. There have been altercations in the bar and toilets, but the exact number is not known. Tables and chairs have been removed and toilets have been closed, and railway police eject undesirables. Offenders are advised they are banned and are not permitted to enter again. The present situation is satisfactory and has been so for the past month.

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many persons employed in the Tavern Bar at the Adelaide Railway Station are currently on workmen's compensation, and:

- (a) what is the extent of the injuries;
- (b) when did they occur;
- (c) what was the cause of the injuries;
- (d) when are these persons expected to return to work?

2. What is the total amount of damage to property during the past 12 months in the bar?

3. What was the total cost of equipping and establishing the Tavern Bar?

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

- 1. One employee
 - (a) Injured back;
 - (b) October 25, 1976;
 - (c) Physical assault;
 - (d) Not known;
- 2. Estimated \$500;
- 3. \$76 000.

SMALL BUSINESSES

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What assistance will the Government give small businesses to enable them to continue their operations for the next 12 months?

2. If the Government cannot make direct assistance, why not?

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

1. The Government through its Small Business Advisory Unit will continue to provide a range of advisory services to help small businesses identify and overcome their problems and where appropriate funds may be made available for firms to employ consultants to resolve problems in financial or other areas. The unit is able in particular to help firms with liquidity problems in areas such as locating sources of finance, presenting a sound application for finance and developing better systems of financial control. In fact, since February, the unit has assisted over 350 small firms; of these, about 100 received advice on sources of finance and financial control. In addition to the assistance available through the unit, firms requiring finance which cannot be obtained on reasonable terms through the financial institutions, have access to the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation. I should stress that the assistance available to small businesses is designed primarily to foster a more efficient and prosperous small business sector. It is not our policy to sustain, on a continuing basis, firms which do not have long term prospects of success.

2. The present arrangements provide substantial direct assistance to small businesses and it is considered that additional measures are not needed at this stage. However, the situation in the small business sector is being reviewed continually.

WELLINGTON PUNT

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. Is the Minister aware of the extreme inconvenience being experienced by motorists crossing by punt at Wellington resulting in lengthy delays due to an increase in traffic flow, including a large number of road transports?

2. Are steps being taken to alleviate this situation by providing an extra punt and, if not, will the Minister take the appropriate steps to give priority to those who are engaged in farming of properties on both sides of the river, and who find it necessary to cross by punt on a regular basis?

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

1. The department is aware of motorists experiencing some difficulty in using the Wellington Ferry.

2. No decision will be made regarding a second ferry at Wellington until after the opening of the Swanport bridge, which is expected to alleviate the situation at Wellington. Consideration will be given to requests for priority from local farmers with each case being considered on its merits. Application should be made to the department's office at Murray Bridge.

PERPETUAL LEASES

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. When will answers be received to letters written by the member for Heysen to the Minister of Lands on January 18 and 26, 1977, concerning perpetual lease rentals?

2. In view of the considerable concern and mounting speculation amongst leaseholders, will the Minister ask the Minister of Lands to make himself available to answer questions at a public meeting?

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

A reply to Mr. Wotton's letter of January 18, was forwarded on March 21, 1977. In his letter Mr. Wotton referred to two particular properties with specific reference to one and, although the reply mentioned only this property, the Government's policy concerning the fixing of rents on perpetual leases where a change of purpose is indicated on transfer was outlined. The appropriate quotation from the letter outlining the policy is as follows:

The transfer would probably be effected by way of surrender for a new lease at a rental appropriate to the proposed new purpose. It is policy that if the purchaser wished to continue as a full time *bona fide* dairyman or was prepared to amalgamate this lease with another lease for dairying purposes, consideration would be given to not altering the rent. A further alternative which might be considered would be surrender of the lease for a new lease with the rental reduced on agricultural values whilst the lease was used for *bona fide* agricultural purposes. An application for consent to transfer would be treated on its merits if received and if a change of purpose is indicated, approval would be on the basis of surrender for a new lease at an appropriate rental which, based on current Crown's interest, would be in the vicinity of \$1 000 per annum.

A thorough search has been carried out within the department and there is no evidence to indicate that a further letter dated January 26, 1977, has ever been received.

Mr. WOTTON (on notice): In view of the massive increases in perpetual lease rentals which in turn have resulted in a great deal of speculation on whether the leaseholder's property is saleable or not, what justification does the Minister have for making a charge for the provision of information on what the rental would be on perpetual lease if the land use is to change or a change of title occur and:—

- (a) how much is the charge for such an inquiry;
- (b) how long has this charge applied; and
- (c) has this charge been levied as a deterrent to numerous inquiries?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Appropriate investigation must be undertaken before an inquirer can be advised what rental would apply to a perpetual lease in these circumstances. The charge has been introduced to cover part of the administrative costs involved in the investigation. The charge has been introduced to limit inquiries to those with a genuine intention because of the increasing magnitude of work involved in providing the information. It is considered reasonable to provide this information where a genuine transfer is contemplated to enable the parties to negotiate the transfer with the knowledge of the conditions which will apply to the new lease which

would issue to the transferee. If a formal application is lodged as a result of the original inquiry, the basic transfer fee of \$15 is waived.

- (a) \$15.
- (b) Since September 27, 1976.
- (c) Yes. See above.

BUS ROUTES

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What proposed alterations are to be made to bus routes from Adelaide to Fulham, Henley Beach South, West Beach, Netley, Novar Gardens and Glenelg North in the near future?

2. What are the proposed routes and time tables?

3. What is the estimated maximum distance passengers will have to walk to catch a city-bound bus in any of the above suburbs and:—

- (a) what action is being taken to reduce this distance;
- (b) what provision is being made to make public transport more accessible for handicapped persons on these routes; and
- (c) when will the new services commence?

4. Why cannot the proposed new City to Glenelg North bus travel north along Patawalonga Frontage to service residents on that side rather than make them cross a busy road in peak period traffic from the east side where there are no houses; will the Minister have this proposal reviewed and, if not, why not?

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

1. The State Transport Authority has tentative plans to extend or otherwise improve public transport services in the Fulham, Henley Beach South, Novar Gardens and Glenelg areas when sufficient additional buses are available for this purpose. The authority has no plans at present for varying the existing bus services in the Netley or West Beach areas.

2. The proposed routes and time tables have not yet been determined.

3. Approximately 400 metres.

- (a) Nil.
- (b) No special provision is planned at present.
- (c) No date has yet been fixed.

4. The proposed route for the City to Glenelg North service includes Patawalonga Frontage north to Stanley Street.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICE

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What has been the increase in the staff in the Local Government Office in each financial year for the past seven years and what is the present total number of employees?

2. Of the present employees:

- (a) how many are not subject to the Public Service Act;
- (b) what are their duties; and
- (c) why were these positions not filled from within the Public Service?

3. What is the reason for any fluctuation in the number of staff in the office?

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

1.

1970	0
1971	1
1972	1

1973 1
1974 0
1975 0
1976 2
1977 2

Present number of employees, 13.

2. (a) 1.

(b) Local Government advisory officer temporary pending an appointment to the vacant position of Secretary for Local Government, at present under consideration.

(c) The position required the appointment of a person with administrative experience at a senior level and a knowledge of local government.

3. The fluctuation in 1972 and 1973 occurred as a result of the introduction of the Swimming Pool Safety Act and the Rates and Taxes Remission Act. The increases in 1976 and 1977 were brought about by the need to have the services of people with experience and expertise in local government following the death of the Secretary for Local Government in 1976, and the retirement of his successor in 1977.

MONARTO

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. How much has been spent on the Monarto project, and how much came from:

- (a) South Australian revenue;
(b) Loan Funds; and
(c) the Commonwealth Government?

2. How many people are currently employed by the Monarto Development Commission?

3. For how much longer does the Government intend to keep the Monarto Development Commission operating?

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

1. As at April 1, 1977, funds have been provided from the following sources:

To March 31, 1977, net expenditure totalled \$18 000 000 and was provided as follows:

	\$m
South Australian revenue loan funds ..	0.1
South Australian Government	4.3
Debenture borrowings	6.1
Commonwealth Government	10.5
	21.0
Net expenditure to March 31, 1977 ..	18.2
	2.8
Funds in hand March 31, 1977	2.8

2. 35.

3. It is the intention of the Government that the Monarto Development Commission will continue to operate with a staff of 34 people until such time as the Monarto project is recommenced. The project has been deferred initially until June 30, 1978, and the question of a recommencement date will be considered before that date. In the meantime, the commission will be fully engaged on consultancy work for Government departments and authorities maintaining its land holdings at Monarto and meeting its other responsibilities at the site as the local government and planning authority.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Has the Government now dropped any reference to transfers to Monarto when recruiting employees for the Government departments which were to have been relocated in Monarto and, if so, why?

2. Has the Government now abandoned plans for relocating Government departments at Monarto and, if not, what are the current plans?

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

1. Job advertisements do not now make reference to the need for appointees to transfer to Monarto. By minute dated March 8, 1977, the Premier suggested to the Chairman, Public Service Board, that the special condition referring to transfer to Monarto be laid aside from job advertisements until the date of recommencement of the Monarto programme has been clarified. It was further suggested that at that time the decision concerning the departments required to relocate to Monarto ought to be reviewed. This seems necessary owing to the marked changes in the organisational structures of the Lands Department, the Agriculture Department, the Fisheries Department and the Environment Department stemming from amalgamations of various departments and functions.

2. See 1.

DOMICILIARY CARE

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What domiciliary care services are provided in South Australia, and:

- (a) at what locations;
(b) how are they funded;
(c) what is the charge per client; and
(d) why is the southern branch funded by the Federal Government and services provided free?

2. What improvements and extension of services does the Government propose to implement in the next 12 months?

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

1. (a) There are 17 services in the State which service whole geographic areas and are not restricted to the location of their administrative headquarters:

Southern (Daw Park)
Western (Woodville Park)
Eastern (Northfield)
Para (Elizabeth Vale)
Port Augusta
Mount Gambier
Port Pirie
Whyalla
Port Lincoln
Walleroo
Millicent
Barossa (Nuriootpa)
Loxton
Mannum
Murray Bridge
Bordertown
Waikerie

(b) Mount Gambier and Southern are funded through the Commonwealth Community Health Programme funding arrangement, the remainder through the provisions of the States Grants (Paramedical Services) Act and the States Grants (Home Care) Act, both of 1969.

(c) Except for Mount Gambier and Southern, there is no standard schedule of fees. Charges for service are based on a professional assessment of the patient's ability to pay.

(d) As stated in (b) the Southern Service was established under the 1973 conditions of the Commonwealth Community Health Programme, one condition being that no fees be charged for services provided.

2. For the current financial year, the Commonwealth Government has restricted development of domiciliary care services and advice has yet to be received of its intentions for the next financial year.

PREMIER'S BODYGUARD

Mr. COURCEL (on notice): Is a personal bodyguard still used by the Premier and, if so, why is this practice thought necessary and what are the officer's duties and responsibilities?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Premier has no official bodyguard. An officer on the Ministerial staff, the Private Secretary, Mr. S. R. Wright, is skilled in aspects of personal defence and is responsible for the security for the Premier, but this is incidental to his normal duties as Private Secretary to the Premier.

HILLS BUSES

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. Which areas in the Adelaide Hills are currently being serviced by the State Transport Authority's Bus and Trams Division?

2. Is the Government currently negotiating to take over other private bus companies and, if so, which areas are included?

3. Have special rosters been introduced by the State Transport Authority enabling bus drivers in the Hills to operate on regular routes on a static roster and, if so, what areas are currently being served under such rosters and, if not, when is it anticipated that such rosters will be introduced?

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

1. Crafers, Stirling, Aldgate, Carey Gully, Uraidla, Summertown, Bradbury, Heathfield, Belair, Glenalta, Blackwood, Aberfoyle Park and Flagstaff Hill.

2. No.

3. Yes. Belair, Glenalta, Blackwood, Aberfoyle Park and Flagstaff Hill.

HOUSING TRUST

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. When was the South Australian Housing Trust priority housing scheme established?

2. Why was this scheme established, and what purpose does it serve?

3. How are the applicants who merit priority determined?

4. How many applications are currently receiving priority treatment?

5. When was the Housing Trust Priority Review Committee established?

6. Who are the members of the committee and what Government departments are represented?

7. What purpose does this committee serve and how often does it meet?

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

1. December, 1972.

2. The scheme was established after lengthy consultation with the South Australian Council of Social Services regarding the housing of low-income families in emergency. The scheme is a referral scheme which enables social

agencies and social workers to make direct representation to the trust on behalf of clients who seem to have an urgent need for housing.

3. Special consideration is given each week by a panel of experienced trust personnel.

4. At present 20 referrals are being considered for priority in housing. During the past 12 months, 374 referrals were received and of these 101 were granted an immediate priority for housing.

5. The Review Committee was established at the outset of the scheme in December, 1972.

6. The committee comprises representatives of the trust, the Community Welfare Department and the South Australian Council of Social Services.

7. The Review Committee meets monthly to review and discuss the referrals submitted. Should any agency desire to have a referral resubmitted then such resubmission can be made at these meetings.

HOUSING LOANS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What is the current delay between listing of names and call up to lodge formal application for both new and established homes in respect of State Bank of South Australia housing loans?

2. What is the current delay between lodgment of formal application and the availability of funds for the same loans?

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

1. The bank is now calling up prospective applicants who listed their names as follows:

New homes—October, 1975

Established homes—April, 1974.

Applicants presently listing their names for loans for new homes are being informed that the waiting time to call-up for lodgment of a formal application could be 2½-3 years. No further names are being listed for established homes.

2. Lapse of time between lodgment of formal application and availability of funds is:

New homes—4-5 months

Established homes—3 months.

RECREATIONAL CENTRES

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. On what basis were schools chosen to become recreational centres for the 1976-77 school holiday period?

2. Is it intended that eventually all schools will be used for these or similar activities in the future and, if not, why not, and which areas will be denied such assistance?

3. What was the estimated cost to the Education Department of the conduct and/or servicing of these facilities?

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

1. All schools were given the opportunity to apply for some financial assistance to conduct recreation programmes during the 1976-77 school holiday period. An item seeking applications for this assistance appeared in the *Education Gazette* dated September 29, 1976, volume 4, No. 31. There were 142 applications, with 11 schools being denied assistance due to late application and to insufficient funds being available. The system of deadlines has been made necessary so that the organisational procedures required could be carried out prior to the start of programmes.

2. While it is agreed that all schools could be centres for vacation recreational activity, decisions concerning this are made at the school level based on an expressed need

and in a positive relationship with other existing local opportunities. The ability of the Education Department to provide financial assistance to every school is extremely doubtful. The important issue is not whether it is the intent of the Education Department to include all schools, but the fact that schools themselves wish to become involved. While there are sufficient funds, schools will not be denied assistance.

3. The estimated cost to the Education Department for the 1976-77 school holiday programme was \$101 000 for part-time instructors' salaries. Administration costs through the Physical Education Branch cannot be clearly delineated. School facilities and equipment have necessarily incurred normal wear and tear. In some cases costs for maintenance have been borne by the schools. In most of the centres parents have been asked to contribute to the running costs of the centre.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Has the report been received yet of a departmental investigation into Justices of the Peace over 70 years of age?

2. If it has been received, has any action been taken to implement the recommendations contained therein and, if not, why not?

3. Will the report be made available to members of the House and, if not, why not?

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

1. The investigation referred to took the form of discussions between the Attorney-General, departmental officers and the Justices Appointment Committee. No formal report was prepared on the matter.

2. It was decided to defer implementation of a proposal that justices should not sit in court after reaching 70 years of age. An effort is to be made to train younger justices for court work, and to this end more courses of instruction will be held this year. It is also intended to endeavour to recruit more women for appointment as justices, particularly in country areas, where there is the greatest need for justices for court work. There never has been any intention of imposing restrictions on "over 70" justices undertaking the witnessing of documents and swearing of affidavits.

3. Not applicable—see 1.

COMMUNITY WELFARE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What action has been taken in respect of the recommendations contained in the report of the Community Welfare Advisory Committee on adoption matters?

2. In particular which, if any, of the recommended criteria in section 3 of the report have been either implemented or rejected and, if the latter, has any alternative decision been taken and, if so, what?

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

1. Following release of the report, interested people were allowed one month during which time they might submit their views. Responses received were considered by the Community Welfare Advisory Committee and some alterations were made to the report.

2. No decisions on the report have been made by the Government.

LANDS TITLES

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What is the average delay time for registration of titles at the Lands Title Office and is the position considered to be satisfactory and, if not, what is being done to improve the situation?

2. Are there any times of the year when delays are longer than others and, if so, is there a solution and what is being done to institute the necessary procedure?

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

1.1. There is no delay time for registration of instruments where no new certificates of title are to issue. These represent approximately 85 per cent of all instruments lodged for registration and they are processed in five working days.

1.2. The average delay time for the registration and issue of new certificates of title regarding instruments from which new certificates of title must issue is four weeks. Some backlogs occurred when four senior drafting officers' appointments were delayed by appeals against nominations. This accounted for a loss of 48 man weeks.

1.3. The position is not considered to be satisfactory.

1.4. Measures being taken to improve the situation:

1.4.1. There are five vacant senior drafting officers' positions. These positions have been advertised, and two positions are under review by the Public Service Board.

1.4.2. The 1977-1978 manpower budget provides for nine additional positions in the Drafting Branch, and it is anticipated that this will assist in reducing backlogs.

2. There are no times of the year when delays are longer than others.

LAND COMMISSION

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Has the Land Commission yet sold, from its land bank, any parcels of broad acres for private development and, if not, is it anticipated that such transactions will be undertaken and, if so, when?

2. What constraints have been or will be placed on private developers in any such transaction?

3. What policy has been established, if any, for extension of the Land Commission's activity in South Australia?

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

1. The terms and conditions under which land owned by the S.A. Land Commission might be made available in broad acre form for private development have been the subject of discussion within the Urban Development Advisory Committee, which includes membership representative of the private development industry, and the Government is at present considering a report on this matter.

2. See No. 1 above.

3. The resources of the S.A. Land Commission will continue to be employed to the extent necessary, to ensure that the urban land accommodation requirements in South Australia are met by an adequate supply of land thereby ensuring orderly co-ordinated development and price stability.

MAIN ROAD No. 39

Mr. RUSSACK (on notice): When will urgent maintenance work be carried out on the very poor section of Main Road No. 39 between Wallaroo and Moonta?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Wallaroo-Arthurton Road is maintained by the Highways Department and the district councils of Kadina and Clinton. The department will continue to maintain its section of the road to a satisfactory condition.

ROAD FUNDS

Mr. RUSSACK (on notice):

1. What amounts have been allocated by the Commonwealth Government and the Highways Department, respectively, for 1976-77 in the following categories:

- (a) rural local roads;
- (b) urban local roads; and
- (c) minor traffic, engineering and safety improvement?

2. Is it anticipated these amounts will be increased for the financial year 1977-78?

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

Road Category	Commonwealth	Highways
	1976-77	Department 1976-77
(a) Rural local	5 300 000	3 100 000
(b) Urban local	1 100 000	500 000
(c) Miters	1 500 000	Nil

2. It is anticipated that the Commonwealth Government allocations in these categories will be increased. State contribution to rural local and urban local roads will be decreased. State contribution to Miters will be nil.

NEW YEAR'S EVE BUSES

Mr. RUSSACK (on notice):

1. Did the State Transport Authority buses operate for an extended period on New Year's Eve last and, if so, how many passengers were carried?

- 2. What is the estimated cost of such additional service?
- 3. What were the revenue returns?

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

- 1. Yes. 1 355 passengers were carried.
- 2. \$650.
- 3. \$325.

DOG-RACING CONTROL BOARD

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Has the Dog-Racing Control Board been appointed and, if so, who are the members, when were they appointed, and when did they first meet?

2. On what date was the Racing Act proclaimed, were all sections proclaimed at the same time and, if not, what were the varying dates and why?

3. Has the Dog-Racing Control Board appointed any officers, who are they, and on what dates were they appointed?

4. Has the Dog-Racing Control Board established an office and, if so, where is it, who occupied the premises previously, what change-over arrangements applied, and how was any arrangement negotiated or advised?

5. Has the Dog-Racing Control Board established any specific liaison with the National Coursing Association and, if so, what is the nature of the liaison?

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

1. The Dog-Racing Control Board has been appointed. Members are: Mr. J. R. Dunsford (Chairman); Mr. R. McGee; Mr. R. H. Nicholson; Mr. R. Chapman; Mr.

H. L. Ashton. They were appointed as from February 1, 1977. The first meeting of the board was held on February 1, 1977.

2. The Racing Act, 1976, except for Division III "Controlling Authority for Dog-Racing" was proclaimed to come into operation on January 1, 1977. Division III of the Act was proclaimed to come into operation on February 1, 1977, to allow dog-racing clubs to submit to the Minister nominations for the appointment of members of the board.

3. Officers appointed by the board as from February 1, 1977, are: Mr. P. J. L. McCarron (Secretary); Mr. C. K. Viney (Chairman of Stewards); Mr. J. McMurdo (Grader and Deputy Chief Steward).

4. Offices of the Dog-Racing Control Board have been established at Aston House, 17 Leigh Street, Adelaide. The premises were previously occupied by the National Coursing Association. The board assumed responsibility for the offices formerly occupied by the National Coursing Association and for the staff previously employed by the National Coursing Association. These arrangements were made in pursuance of agreements reached in earlier discussions.

5. Yes, the board has established liaison with the National Coursing Association. The board is at present pursuing discussions with the National Coursing Association with the objective of ensuring the National Coursing Association is able to continue with its functions in relation to the conduct of open coursing. The board has agreed to provide administrative services required by the National Coursing Association to enable it to carry out its functions and to give the National Coursing Association access to all the necessary information it requires for its activities.

GOVERNMENT CLOTHING FACTORY

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Who were the members of the working committee who investigated the establishment of a Government clothing factory and what were the qualifications and the position held by each member of this committee?

2. What were the recommendations of the committee?

3. Will the Government release to the Opposition copies of the report of this committee and, if not, why not?

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

1. Members of the committee were:

Chairman: Mr. J. Haslam, Senior Projects Officer, Trade and Development Division, Premier's Department.

Members: Mr. K. J. Collins, Secretary, Clothing Trades Union; Mr. P. H. Palmer, Assistant Director, Department of Services and Supply.

2. The committee recommended that a detailed financial analysis should be undertaken on the feasibility of a Government clothing factory. As well, the committee recommended that the analysis should look at whether the range of products produced should be limited to certain items and whether such a clothing factory could be located in a country centre, following the success of the Fletcher Jones factory at Mount Gambier.

3. When the Government receives the working party report of detailed financial considerations and when it has considered its policy to the total question, it will also consider the question of releasing all the information relevant to the Government's decision.

INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice): Is the Minister of Labour and Industry informed of decisions to be handed down in the Industrial Commission before they are actually handed down and, if so, for what reasons?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: No.

FISHING

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is it the policy of the Government that bodies corporate and partnerships which conduct business as fish buyers and/or processors be not permitted to operate fishing vessels in controlled fisheries and, if so:

(a) when was this policy adopted;

(b) why; and

(c) is it proposed to persist with the policy and, if so, what are the reasons for so persisting?

2. If this be not the policy, what is the policy concerning such bodies corporate and partnerships being permitted to operate fishing vessels in controlled fisheries, and why?

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

1. The policy of owner-operated fishing vessels applies to the managed fisheries.

(a) 1971.

(b) Because the Government believes this to be an equitable way to distribute a common property resource among a large group of fishing families.

(c) Yes. As above.

2. The policy is stated above.

URAILDA SIGNS

Mr. WOTTON (on notice): When will work commence on the children's crossing signs, aged persons' warning signs and the rezoning of speed limits on Greenhill Road, Uraidla, referred to in correspondence from the Minister dated August 4 and December 17, 1976, replying to a request made to the Minister by letter dated June 9, 1976?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The items referred to were approved for installation by the Road Traffic Board on April 1, 1977. It is expected that the work will be commenced during this week. There may be a short delay in erecting the signs due to the time required for their manufacture.

JUVENILE REHABILITATION CENTRES

Dr. TONKIN: Is the Minister of Community Welfare satisfied that members of the Niess Committee of Inquiry into the Training Facilities Programmes and Security at Brookway Park, Vaughan House and McNally Youth Assessment and Training Centres and Other Matters have been given full access to all sections of the facilities they are investigating; when will their report be made available; and when will it be made public? Growing concern has been expressed in the community that the Niess committee may not have been given an opportunity to examine all of the facilities at these training centres. Obviously it is important that the committee should be able to see everything concerned with them. It is generally acknowledged that both rehabilitation of the young offender

and protection of the community should go hand in hand and, indeed, that it is in the best interests of everyone. Will then the Minister undertake to submit the Niess committee's report to the Royal Commission into the Administration of the Adelaide Juvenile Courts Act as soon as it is available?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It sounded as though the Leader asked about 31 questions but I will do my best to satisfy his curiosity. I think he asked when the report will be available; the answer is "Shortly." He also asked me when will it be made public; the answer is "Shortly after that." He also asked whether I am satisfied that the Niess committee has had full access in McNally. He took much longer to say that but that is actually what he asked. The answer is "To the best of my knowledge"; I have had no report whatsoever from the Niess committee that it did not have access to any or all of the facilities at McNally at its own request.

Dr. Tonkin: Are you yourself satisfied?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I sympathise with the Leader; because of matters going on elsewhere, he has had to sit and chafe for some time without perhaps raising the matter he would have liked to raise, and presumably he has chosen this back-door method. That is his right; I do not quarrel with that. However, I will try to say in simple terms what I have just said, so that the Leader will eventually understand. I have had no information that the Niess committee was restricted in any way from looking at any or all of the facilities at McNally.

Mr. WOTTON: Does the Minister consider that security precautions and procedures in this State's rehabilitation centres (and I refer to Vaughan House, Brookway, and McNally) are adequate to safeguard members of the staff from injury during the course of duty, and can the Minister say how many officers have suffered personal injury in institutions in the past 12 months as a result of internal disturbances? It has been suggested that too much emphasis is being placed on qualifications and not enough on field experience in regard to the staffing of rehabilitation centres generally in this State. This in turn is resulting in the staff of such centres being too young to cope with the discipline needed to control those responsible for internal disturbances.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I believe that the honourable member asked me whether I was satisfied with security arrangements at various State rehabilitation centres. First, I thank the honourable member for recognising these places for what they are, that is, rehabilitation centres. I do not think that any Minister representing this area of society has been able to say that he was fully satisfied with security arrangements. I can say that they are under constant review, and much action has been taken. However, in the final analysis, incidents involving the staff are always possible. I think that the honourable member would agree with me that this possibility may equally apply to a prison or any sort of institution in which people are being detained. I do not see much profit in trying to reply to the honourable member further on that aspect. Also, I do not have the actual figures about how many staff have been involved in incidents. Was the honourable member asking how many staff had suffered injury?

Mr. Wotton: Suffered personal injury.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will try to obtain that information for the honourable member.

METRIC MEASURES

Mr. SLATER: Can the Attorney-General say whether an extension of time to that already announced will be given for introducing the proposed changeover to metric dispensers for the retailing of spirits to meet certain requirements and specifications? I understand that the measures in question are in short supply. Further, will the dispensing of spirits by the pour-top method, provided it is a metric measure, still be allowable under the regulations? I understand that certain clubs have already had some expenditure in relation to the changeover from imperial pour-top dispensers to the metric measure dispensers. As I understand it, the requirements relating to the changeover involve a reversal type of dispenser rather than a pour-top dispenser.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: It is proposed eventually to require all retail outlets for spirits to use these new types of dispenser which were given some publicity in the press last week. However, I assure the honourable member that there will be an interim period during which the administration will be flexible and we will try to ensure that the changeover from imperial measures to metric measures is made as painless as possible for the retailers concerned. We certainly are not setting out to police these regulations very aggressively from the outset. We will, in due course, require all hotels, clubs, etc., in South Australia to use these new methods of dispensing liquor, because, as has been said, they ensure that a person purchasing a measure of spirits will be given the exact measure that he has paid for. This Government certainly believes that that reform is long overdue. As soon as industry has been given a reasonable period to convert to these new measures we will start enforcing the regulations. I assure the House that we certainly do not intend to be Draconian about this. The administration will initially be reasonable and understanding of the problems of hoteliers and club managers in this matter, and will ensure that everybody is given a fair and reasonable opportunity to introduce the new measures according to his circumstances and ability.

JUVENILE COURTS

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Community Welfare give the House his assurance that there will be no reprisals against any of the employees of his department and that neither they nor their chances for future promotion will be prejudiced—

The SPEAKER: Order! I think at this stage I must remind the honourable member that this matter is *sub judice*.

Mr. MATHWIN: Quite, Sir. I am just asking for an assurance.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow the Minister to answer.

Mr. Gunn: He hasn't said what it is.

The SPEAKER: Up to date it would seem so, and if the honourable member continues in that vein I am telling him that I will not allow the Minister to answer.

Mr. MATHWIN: If I can finish the question, with due respect. I refer to those people giving evidence at the Royal Commission on the Juvenile Courts Act.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is definitely out of order. The honourable member cannot ask any question in any vein regarding something that is before a Royal Commission.

Mr. MATHWIN: With due respect, this is asking for the protection of people giving evidence, which they have not as yet submitted.

The SPEAKER: We cannot discuss such a matter.

204

GLANVILLE-SEMAPHORE RAILWAY

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister of Transport say what is planned regarding future rail services between Glanville and Semaphore? Whilst the present line is regarded as safe, a considerable sum of money would be required to upgrade the track thoroughly. In addition, the Semaphore Traders' Association has submitted sketch plans to the State Planning Authority with a view to redeveloping as a shopping mall the area between Military Road and the Esplanade, which contains part of the line. However, it seems that there can be limited progress in that regard until the future of the railway line has been decided. If the rail service is to be curtailed, can the Minister indicate what alternative transport system will be available to passengers presently using the service?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Glanville-Semaphore line has been under review for a considerable time. I am informed by railway officers that the line is rapidly reaching the stage where much expenditure will be required to ensure the continued safety of patrons. As a result, it appears that now is the opportune time to determine whether that money ought to be spent or whether the line should be replaced by a feeder bus from the Glanville railway station. Officers are currently proceeding to do some detailed work, and on-site inspections, surveys, and the like will be undertaken. Discussions will take place between the department and members of the Port Adelaide council and, in due season, a decision will be reached. I shall be pleased to let the honourable member have that decision as soon as it has been made.

JUVENILE ABSCONDERS

Mr. BOUNDY: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether anything can be done to improve liaison between country police officers and the Community Welfare Department regarding information concerning absconding juveniles? Recent events in my district have pointed out the need for local police to know when juveniles have absconded. Many cases of theft, attempted robbery and acts of vandalism to motor vehicles are proved to be caused by juveniles who have absconded. Several justices of the peace have contacted me about the frustrations felt by local police officers when they discover that the juvenile they have apprehended is already an absconder. The justices consider that notification of absconding juveniles, if provided to local police, could have prevented further offences and even tragedy.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member's question is similar to a question he asked some time ago; I presume that he has dragged it up again. I point out that I am not the Minister responsible for the police, but my understanding of the system is that, when persons abscond, the police are notified. I take it that the honourable member's complaint is that the local police are not notified of the absconding. I think that he suggests that that be a requirement of the local Community Welfare Department office, and that would seem to be somewhat unusual.

Dr. Tonkin: He said that the police weren't informed on many occasions.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Is the Leader going to answer the question for me? If he wishes to do so, I shall be happy to make way for him. I am trying to be reasonable and to explain to the honourable member that he has directed his question to the wrong Minister. Surely if he

is asking for something to happen in police circles, he needs to take up the matter with the Minister responsible for the police, and I shall be only too pleased to do that on his behalf.

AEROSOL SPRAYS

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister for the Environment tell the House whether there is anything South Australians should know about the danger, or suspected danger, of using spray cans of various kinds? My question stems from the reported decision of environmental health authorities in Oregon, U.S.A., to ban the sale of aerosol products immediately. If Oregon sees dangers in the use of aerosols in products such as hair spray and insecticide, should we not also be taking care?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I thank the honourable member for her question. This matter has also concerned my officers and me and, in fact, should concern us all because it possibly affects the health of all people on earth. The short answer is that, as we are not well equipped, as a State, to do any research in this area, we necessarily have to have a watching brief on what the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation is doing. Research is being carried out throughout the world on this matter. The honourable member would know the basis for Oregon's suspecting the role of aerosols as propellants for various commercial products. It is on a par with the threat also believed to be posed to the stratosphere from high-flying aircraft such as the *Concorde*. The fear is that propellant gases from aerosols eventually find their way to the stratosphere and tend to deplete the earth's ozone layer, which protects us from the worst effects of ultra-violet rays. Deplete the ozone and we get into trouble. The usage of these types of propellant, which are usually chloro-fluoro-methane gases known as freons, in aerosol sprays has doubled just about every six years since 1950, hence the recent note of caution. Oregon, as in other areas, is a leader in the matter of environmental protection, as we know from its legislation on beverage containers.

Now we are at the stage when control is being looked at on a global basis. This makes sense, because it is of course a global problem. The 24-nation Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development is now engaged on a major study of patterns of fluorocarbon use and production. It is hoped that, if firm control or regulation becomes necessary, action can be arranged on a world-wide basis. Not only Oregon is concerned about this matter. New York State will have a similar ban in force starting January next, if its Environmental Conservation Commissioner confirms it is a threat to public health. That State has issued labelling requirements for aerosol products containing the chemicals, effective from, I think, Friday of last week. Several other American States are considering doing the same. I can assure the honourable member that we will be watching closely developments in other parts of the world, and will be quick to take advantage of any research that has been done in this matter.

HOUSE KITS

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Has the Attorney-General seen recent reports about an individual's offering for sale a kit that contains advice to people who are selling their own house and, if he has, can he assess the effectiveness of that kit? People at present are finding that, because of the effect of inflation on property values,

to sell their house and buy another costs a large sum in general fees and especially in relation to commission. I expect that many people might be interested in buying this kit on the basis that it could save them considerable money. If it did, it would be a splendid idea; however, my experience has shown me that often information of this nature leaves many questions unanswered and could cause people considerable difficulty.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I have seen reports about this kit, but I have not had an opportunity of viewing it personally to assess its worth or otherwise. What I can say to the honourable member is that my experience generally has been that such kits are aimed at assisting a person who is involved in what could be described, in this case, as an average property transaction in law. Of course, there is no such thing as an average case, or an ordinary simple case, because each property transaction has its own quirks and its own variations from what might be considered the norm. The problem with such kits that I have seen in the past has been that it is not possible for them to take account of variations from transaction to transaction. I believe that, with the land-broker system that operates in this State, we have the best conveyancing system operating in any legal system in the world. Recently, whilst I was overseas, the British Royal Commission into the legal profession was extremely enthusiastic in seeking details from South Australia about our land-broker system. Those details have now been supplied. The people of this State have been well served by the conveyancing arrangements that have been made through land brokers and solicitors. I would suggest that people generally would be best served by continuing to use the existing methods of conveyancing. I will certainly look at the kit to which the honourable member has referred, and I will let him know my views about the benefits that this kit could have for people. Generally, people should be fairly wary of using such kits because, as I have said, they may not provide for the hidden pitfalls in conveyancing. To sum up, I suggest that people continue to use existing methods of conveyancing.

WOMEN'S SHELTERS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: What guidelines has the Minister of Community Welfare formulated to ensure that taxpayers' funds are not misappropriated in the conduct of women's shelters in South Australia? The Minister recently announced that \$50 000 was to be provided for new women's shelters this financial year. Serious allegations have been made regarding the conduct of the Naomi Women's Shelter at Prospect. It has been alleged that the manager of the shelter, Mrs. Annette Willcox, misappropriated Government funds and generally managed the shelter in an unsatisfactory way. She has been accused of having a constitution drawn up by a lawyer, Mr. Mark Harrison, without reference to the Chairman of the association; of hiring staff without approval; of not paying into the organisation's official account all moneys paid into the centre, but of opening an illegal bank account; of using money for food in a dishonest way, by applying an additional 5 per cent loading on food costs; of misappropriating Government grant money by purchasing a vehicle, supposedly for the transport of children and mothers at the shelter, and using the vehicle for her own purposes; and of using the office of the shelter for preselection work, using telephone, letters and staff time in her attempt to be selected by the Labor

Party for a seat in Parliament. I understand that the Minister investigated at least some of the circumstances surrounding these allegations, and, can he say what was the result of his investigations and what will be done in future to assure the satisfactory running of women's shelters in South Australia?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The last part of the Deputy Leader's remarks really gives the story. I think he suggested that I had had an opportunity to investigate some of the allegations made. That is the position: some of the allegations made. It was brought to my notice recently that a number of incidents had occurred at the Naomi shelter, involving people on the management group, those who were attempting to get on to the management group, or those alleged to have been put off the management group. The matter involved is one which I understand, because the shelter concerned is an incorporated body, is for the Registrar of Companies. After getting some advice, I gave that information to the persons who came to me with the allegations. I have since confirmed that, to the best of my ability, I gave them the correct advice. The kind of thing brought to me was exactly as outlined by the Deputy Leader, involving allegations about persons.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Are they true?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: If I were in a position to say whether they were true, I would hardly be referring to them as allegations. As I understand it, an allegation is a claim that is not, at the time it is made, necessarily substantiated by fact. I do not know whether that is the legal definition, but that is the way I understand "allegation".

Mr. Goldsworthy: You're satisfied they're not true?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader has asked a question, and the Minister must answer it without interjections.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: He will get an answer. The Deputy Leader asked what were the guidelines that I was formulating for the conduct of women's shelters in South Australia. I am glad to be able to answer that part of the question. The guidelines that I believe should apply in the running of women's shelters are those guidelines set up, devised, and evolved by women, because they are shelters for women. I have endeavoured, over some time, to get into operation a women's shelter committee, and I have succeeded in doing so. A women's shelter committee has now been set up, chaired by an officer of the Community Welfare Department, and representatives of every women's shelter in South Australia, together with representatives of one or two that are pending, have attended the meetings held. Among the tasks I have asked them to assume (because that is all I have the statutory authority to do) is the very matter raised by the Deputy Leader of setting down guidelines for the good government and operation of women's shelters. My understanding is that this task has been accepted by those persons presently constituting that advisory shelter committee. In addition, with the concurrence of Cabinet I have appointed a lady within the department to function as the women's shelter liaison officer, and she will also assist in that task. I trust that what I have been able to put to the Deputy Leader will show him that I have been earnest in this matter, as has the Government. I could have gone on to ask whether it was any wonder that someone should look after women's shelters, because it is by no means clear what will happen to their funding under the present Commonwealth arrangements. I could have raised many other

matters, but I shall desist and leave the matter there. I suggest to the Deputy Leader that I have answered his question fairly.

Mr. BECKER: Was the Minister aware of the allegations made by the Deputy Leader of misconduct and misappropriation of funds at the shelter, and does he believe that the allegations are unfounded?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The answer to the honourable member's first question is "No". How could I have known what was in the Deputy Leader's head? To know that would be a job for a lot more people to work out. I did not know what was in his head. Regarding whether the allegations are unfounded, the only answer I can give is that the only contact, to my knowledge, which my departmental officers have had with the shelter with respect to financial matters was in regard to a submission being made to the Federal Government for funding. Some assistance was provided by, I think, one of my departmental officers on a request basis. That is the total knowledge I have of the financial set-up at the shelter, and that is as it should be, because, until recently, the matter did not involve my department. I can really only answer on whether the allegations are unfounded after I have had the opportunity to investigate whatever is contained in the allegations.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the member for Hanson have been directing their questions to the wrong Minister, because the matter was not within the hands of the Minister of Community Welfare. The complaint the Deputy Leader outlined was made not to the Minister but to me. I had the matter investigated by my Women's Adviser, who was then in touch with officers of the Minister's department and the officer to whom the Minister has referred. After a full investigation, a full reply was sent to the complainant. There were some reasons to complain about the constitution of the shelter and the way in which it operated, and those have all been dealt with. However, there is certainly no basis for proceeding on the charge and counter-charge made as to the internal administration of the shelter. A full report on the matter was signed by me and sent to the complainant to show what the investigation had, in effect, established and what the position now was as regards the future control of and funding for the shelter.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You didn't tell the Minister?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was not the Minister's obligation in this matter. The normal thing had gone through his department. My Women's Adviser was given material to check out with the Minister's departmental officers, and a full reply, as a result of her investigation, was sent to the complainant.

Mr. COUMBE: Referring specifically to the Naomi Women's Shelter, which is in my district, I ask the Minister whether he has anything further to report or whether he is satisfied with the discussions that have occurred following numerous representations made to him and his department regarding problems of conduct, especially in the conduct of a senior person at that institution, regarding damage done to the local church, which is next door to the shelter, resulting in numerous broken windows, allegedly caused by stones thrown by children at the home.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I thank the honourable member for his forbearance in this matter generally, because it was a somewhat protracted series of incidents. The last

that I recall on the matter was that a conference was held. I am not sure whether the honourable member was there.

Mr. Coumbe: One of the persons didn't turn up.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: A conference was held regarding the problem that existed there, because children sometimes want to play with missiles. I think that sums up what has been happening. My last information was that a satisfactory agreement had been reached regarding a mixture of protection for the windows concerned and some action to be taken regarding the fencing, with an undertaking from the staff of the shelter that some supervision would be applied. That is the latest information I have. If there is a suggestion that there has been a further development, I shall check the matter and try to bring down further information for the honourable member.

NAME SUPPRESSION

Mr. ABBOTT: Can the Attorney-General say what procedure is adopted in relation to the suppression of names of people appearing before the courts in South Australia? It has been drawn to my attention by a constituent that, in a recent case of a cheque fraud that involved a student doctor and a salesman, the student doctor's name was suppressed but not that of the salesman. Both defendants pleaded guilty and I am at a loss to understand why one can be named and not the other.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I have not seen in the press the case referred to by the honourable member but it may have occurred before I returned from overseas. I will certainly look into the matter. In light of what the honourable member has said, I wonder just what were the circumstances in that case that differentiated one defendant from the other to such a marked degree, because the courts generally exercise the power of suppression of names only in the most extreme circumstances where they believe they are acting on firm grounds. I will certainly look into this matter. I am as interested as is the honourable member to see what were the reasons for suppression in this case.

ROAD FUNDS

Mr. BLACKER: In view of the increased funds proposed by the Federal Government for rural arterial roads for the 1977-78 year, can the Minister of Transport say what alterations to planning will take place and whether it is possible that the sealing of the Bratton Way and the Cleve to Kimba road could be included in next year's allocation? Following an inquiry at the office of the Federal Minister for Transport, I received advice that there is to be an increase of 112 per cent in the proposed allocation for rural arterial roads in South Australia, a 26 per cent increase for rural local roads and a 35 per cent increase for the National Highway maintenance allocation. As these increases are of major significance to country people, I ask the Minister what alterations will be made to the planned programme.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I rather suspect this is a loaded question from a Country Party Minister to a Country Party member because the member concerned has gone to some trouble simply to refer to those areas where there will be an increase in the allocation on a category basis but to ignore completely the fact that South Australia this coming year will suffer in real money terms a reduction of over 10 per cent on funds received this year.

I know the Commonwealth Minister for Transport (Mr. Nixon) is troubled by the criticisms that have been levelled at him, not by Labor Ministers but by his own colleagues. Only last night at a function I attended I quoted from a press statement that had been made by the Victorian Liberal Minister (Mr. Rafferty), who said that he believed that Australian Transport Advisory Council meetings were now a waste of time, and that consultations on road matters with the Federal Minister were a complete farce. The honourable member's political colleague Mr. Hinze, the Country Party Minister for Local Government and Main Roads in Queensland, said at the conclusion of the last A.T.A.C. meeting in Sydney that he would have to consider his position carefully, because he believed that all he had done in going to the last two A.T.A.C. meetings was waste the money of his State. The plain fact is that we have been told by the Federal Minister for Transport that, if we do not like the allocation in categories that he has forced on the States, we have the opportunity to alter that position by allocating our own funds.

Dr. Tonkin: Who decided on those categories?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The categories were brought in during the last Labor Government and were opposed by every State Minister. The Leader can get that cynical grin off his face, because the present Minister and the present Prime Minister said that all these things were going with the new Federalism policy, but what has been said in A.T.A.C. meetings, and what was said by Mr. Rafferty in the press report, is that we are getting a worse deal from Nixon than we ever got from the Labor Government. That is the unpalatable thing that unfortunately has prompted this question. It is the very fact that prompts the Leader, every time he gets an opportunity, to run South Australia down.

I will challenge the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Country Party in South Australia (if that is his title), and any member to use their offices to get out and fight for South Australia instead of running us down on every opportunity. When the announcements were made of the allocation of funds the Premier of Victoria and the Minister of Transport in Western Australia complained bitterly, but the Deputy Leader in South Australia applauded South Australia's being cut down in its funds. I ask the Leader, the Deputy Leader and the member for Flinders to start to support South Australia for a change.

BOARD OF ADVANCED EDUCATION

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Education say when legislation amending the South Australian Board of Advanced Education Act will be introduced?

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much private conversation that is audible in the Chamber. The honourable member for Unley has the floor.

Mr. LANGLEY: I understand that the Minister intends to broaden the membership of the board. Will the amending Act be introduced during this session?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: There is an intention to broaden the membership of the Board of Advanced Education. I have been having discussions with various people associated with staff associations in the area for some considerable time. However, it will not be possible for me to introduce the legislation during this session.

URANIUM

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether it is a fact that a report entitled "The Hazard of the Nuclear Fuel Cycle and other Sources of Energy" was prepared and issued by officers of the Policy Division of the Premier's Department and was circulated to members of the Labor Party? If so, is the Government prepared to make the document available for perusal by all members of the House? It was apparent to members on this side last Tuesday evening that the Government Whip was circulating a document of some importance to members of his Party. From the interest shown, and in some cases surprised looks on some faces opposite, it was a document of considerable moment. What followed in the debate highlighted the Government's attitude to uranium mining, and from events of last weekend it follows that the document is, indeed, one of some detailed study and research. Members on this side would be grateful to have the benefit of studying the contents of such a report. Will the Minister make that report available to the Opposition?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Certain materials can be made available: there are summaries of reports of the Fox Commission and the Flowers Commission, but so far as any other reports are concerned, I will investigate to see whether they are at an appropriate stage, discuss the matter with my colleagues, and bring down a reply at an appropriate stage.

Mr. VANDEPEER: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say what recommendations have been made by officers of the Mines Department relating to the mining and use of uranium and when these reports will be tabled for public consideration? I assume that officers of the Mines Department have considerable knowledge and expertise concerning the mining and use of uranium. I believe that this knowledge should be available to the public in order to enable a full discussion to take place on the uranium issue.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not know quite what will satisfy the honourable member in this regard. I believe that the information that should be made available by the Government to the public, if it can be produced effectively, is information that helps the public to make up their minds on the issue. It should not be information that is directed one way or the other in its balance to produce a certain point of view. Whether or not it is possible for the Government to produce material which has the necessary balance in its overall make-up and which the Government can therefore justify the cost of distributing and making available to the public is a matter yet to be determined.

TEROWIE WATER SUPPLY

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Premier give the House a progress report on the upgrading of the Terowie water supply? He will recall that, prior to his visit to Peterborough on February 16, I wrote to him asking whether he would call at Terowie, meet the local people, and discuss with them the problems of water reticulation. The local people had approached me previously and asked about the possibility of getting a Government grant to finance the cleaning out of the reservoir and the drains leading to the dam. The Premier acceded to my request, and carried out an inspection on that occasion. At the conclusion of his visit to Peterborough, he said that the Terowie water supply should be improved. As I understand that investigations are now being carried out, can the Premier report on any progress in this matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Following my visit to Terowie and my meeting with the residents, I took up the matter with the Minister of Works, and an officer of the Engineering and Water Supply Department visited the town, inspected the water installations relating to the town, and discussed the problems with several local residents. The report of the officer then was that to meet the residents' requests would require a large expenditure, which could not possibly be supported: the debt could not be serviced as to annual payments out, let alone any repayments on capital. Frankly, I was not satisfied with that report, and I have requested that immediate work be undertaken to remove the silt from the Gumbowie dam and clean out the area into which water is put on the railways when it is carted to Terowie. These are two immediate things to be done, and I have requested that they be done urgently. We will then assess the piping from the Gumbowie dam when it has been cleaned out and we can see what is the result in reticulation to the town. The suggestion is that it is likely that the pipe from the Gumbowie dam is so bad that it will need to be replaced and that the expenditure will be very large. It was also suggested that we would have to put in a new water tower and pump higher in Terowie. It is not possible for us to undertake the whole of that expenditure immediately, but I believe that the first two steps can immediately improve the existing situation in Terowie, and we will be able to assess what further action should be taken when the first two steps have been taken.

REGIONAL BOUNDARIES REPORT

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Premier any details of the present situation concerning consideration of the report of the Committee on Urban and Regional Boundaries, and when is it likely, if a complete statement cannot be made, that some information will be made available to the people of this State?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know to what specific aspect of that report the honourable member is referring. The report is being studied by the Government. There have been several recommendations of that report which have needed further investigation and study and with which we are not completely satisfied. Those investigations and studies are still continuing. At this stage I am unable to put a date on when all the studies and investigations will be completed. We can certainly accept some of the recommendations and proceed to plan to implement them.

Dr. Eastick: Are they publicly identifiable?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We will certainly announce when we take any steps following the CURB report, precisely what we are proceeding to do. Whether we can simply publish the whole report with the Government's final view at some time soon, I cannot say. I will inquire for the honourable member to see what information I can bring down for him.

TRAIN DERAILMENT

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Transport say whether an investigation was called for into the cause and circumstances of a derailment on February 7 last at the Adelaide railway station and, if it was, whether and when the findings will be made public? A report in the *Advertiser* of February 8, 1977, states:

Several peak hour metropolitan train services were delayed yesterday after a derailed carriage crashed into a platform at the Adelaide railway station.

It is fortunate that no-one was hurt. The report continues:

The empty train, three carriages long, was heading from the railway depot to the station to be connected to the 4.58 p.m. Christie Downs train when the accident happened about 4.50 p.m. . . . Mr. Hazeal said the cause of the derailment was not known and services would be back to normal this morning.

I understand that the Christie Downs service is possibly the best patronised metropolitan service by commuting passengers. I should therefore like the Minister's assurance, in the interests of safety and the confidence that would be instilled in the travelling public by such an assurance, that the investigation will be reported publicly regarding the cause of the derailment and the circumstances surrounding it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Whenever an accident occurs, whether it is a derailment or any other kind of accident, a departmental investigation is always carried out. The normal departmental investigation took place on this occasion. I will discuss with the General Manager of the Rail Division whether or not there would be any value in making the findings of that investigation public, but I doubt whether there would be. I do not believe that the confidence of the travelling public is in jeopardy.

Mr. Russack: Some people are asking about it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The only people who would be asking about the accident are those who have had fears put into their minds—

Mr. Russack: That's not so.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: —and, as a result, are now a little scared. The plain facts are that accidents do occur from time to time, but the record of the Rail Division is probably as good a record as that of any public transit system could be, and we plan to keep it that way.

PLANNING REPORT

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister for Planning make available a copy of the report commissioned by his department from Hassell and Partners about the planning and future development of the area east of Reynella and Morphett Vale? At a meeting in that area a Dr. Whiting produced a report which he claimed was from Hassell and Partners and which was commissioned by the Government to inform it about what that company believed should be the planning for that area in future and what development should occur there. I believe the report contains information that is important for local government, for members of the Opposition, and for the public at large, and that it should be made public. I am told that some people other than Dr. Whiting, in particular people in the local government area, have copies of the report. For that reason, I ask the Minister whether copies can be made available to the Opposition and to the public by tabling the report in the House.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The short answer to the honourable member's question is "No". I understand that Hassell and Partners prepared this as a preliminary report which they used in order to get comments and input from local government. I presume that that organisation must have made copies of its report available to local government in the area for that purpose. Presumably, that is the way in which Dr. Whiting obtained a copy of the document. It is a preliminary document only. The procedure must be for Hassell and Partners to prepare a final document and submit that to the Land Commission. That will contain, no doubt, the kind of input local government wants to make, and then the Land Commission

will make up its mind as to what it recommends to the Government for the development of that area. Subsequent to that meeting, I announced that any owner of viticultural land who wanted to have his land declared as open space under section 61 of the Planning and Development Act could have that land so declared so far as that area was concerned. We have had, I think, four applications already to have land declared as open space under section 61.

Those facts have not been taken into account by Hassell and Partners, and consequently there will undoubtedly be substantial changes in the final report as recommended by the Land Commission to the Government. When we have something final on it, I shall see whether or not that can be tabled and made available, in particular to the honourable member. At this stage, however, it would not be proper to make public a report that was not a report which was going to lead necessarily to the kind of action designated in it. We would be disturbing people quite unnecessarily. As I have said, subsequent to that statements have been made regarding the use of section 61, and applications have been made for the declaration of open space to be placed on certain viticultural land in the area. It is all very much in the preliminary stage and, until we are closer to finalisation of the overall problem, I am really not able to contribute something that would be productive to the public or to the honourable member.

MURRAY RIVER BRIDGES

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Minister of Transport inform the House of the Government's programme regarding the building of bridges across the Murray River? I do not want my question to make it sound as though it is a simple and short business of constructing a bridge over the Murray River. I believe that the Government will have some programme following the completion of the new bridge at Swanport in just under two years time. What I have in mind from that point on is whether the Government is planning the renewal of the old road bridge at Murray Bridge following completion of the Swanport bridge, if it continues to go on building bridges, whether the proposed bridge at Berri has any great priority after or before the replacement of the road bridge at Murray Bridge, or whether even a bridge at Mannum has some sort of priority in comparison with the proposed bridge at Berri.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Berri bridge has been regarded always as having top priority after the Swanport bridge is completed. The member for Chaffey is away at the moment, so what I have said will not upset him, but in case he gets too excited and thinks we are going to start it next week, let me say that we were told at the Australian Transport Advisory Council meeting in Hobart on February 3 of the availability of funds for 1977-78, but we were not given an indication of the level of funding for the following two years in the new triennium. Until we have that information, I regret that it is quite impossible, with any degree of certainty at all, to forecast what we will be doing. Generally speaking, the Berri bridge certainly commands a very high priority.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1) 1977

Second reading.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): 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 for amendments to Part VIII of the principal Act, the Crown Lands Act, 1929-1975, relating to the Lyrup Village Settlement. The amendments are intended to clarify the powers and responsibilities of the Minister of Lands and the Lyrup Village Association with respect to the settlement, to enable the association to manage the settlement without recourse to the Minister and to empower the Minister to make new rules governing the management of the settlement.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 amends section 82 of the principal Act which sets out definitions for Part VIII. The clause strikes out the definition of "inspector" as, in fact, there is not an inspector of village settlements, nor will there be any need for one in the future. It also amends the definition of "irrigation works" to make it clear that drainage and domestic water supply are part of the irrigation works of the association. Clause 4 is consequential to clause 5 which removes the limitation imposed by subsection (7) of section 94 on the size of holdings. The limitation is a vestige of the communal origins of the settlement and is no longer appropriate. Clause 6 amends section 101 of the principal Act to clarify the requirement that any lessee of lands forming part of the settlement must be a member of the association.

Clause 7 amends section 102 of the principal Act and is declaratory of the fact that the irrigation works have for many years been vested in the association. Clause 8 substitutes a new section for section 104 of the principal Act empowering the association to manage the irrigation works without Ministerial control and impose charges for the provision of services connected with the irrigation works. Clause 9 substitutes a new section 105 for sections 105 and 106 of the principal Act. Again this clause removes Ministerial control over the management of the association. Clause 10 repeals sections 108 and 109 of the principal Act, which are obsolete.

Clause 11 amends section 110 of the principal Act by removing Ministerial control over the management of commonage lands and striking out subsection (2), which is obsolete.

Clause 12 substitutes new sections for sections 111 and 112 of the principal Act. The new sections require that proper accounts be kept by the board of trustees of the association and audited annually and that an annual report and the audited statement of accounts be submitted to members of the association at its annual general meeting and to the Minister. The settlement of disputes between members of the association, which is regulated by the present section 112, is to be regulated by the rules of the association. Clause 13 repeals section 115 of the principal Act which is obsolete and substitutes new sections for that section and section 116 of the principal Act. New section 115 provides for public inspection of the annual report and audited statement of accounts of the association, not all the accounts, as is the present requirement. New section 116 empowers the Minister to make rules for the purposes of Part VIII.

Mr. NANKIVELL secured the adjournment of the debate.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 31. Page 3085.)

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): As all honourable members know, and as the Treasurer showed by his surprise when I commented that he had finished his own speech so quickly, this is a routine measure. It is a Bill which it is traditional to support. Its intention is to cover the several months that will elapse between the beginning of the early part of the next financial year and the bringing in of the Budget, the main Appropriation Bill, for 1977-78.

Mr. Becker: That will be interesting.

Dr. TONKIN: It certainly will be an interesting document, and I look forward to seeing it. It appears from the amount of \$190 000 000 that the introduction of the Budget can be expected in about August of this year. I understand that the increased amount is partly to provide for the high level of costs faced by the Government and partly because of an additional pay period falling due in July.

This is a very interesting prospect, which does not happen very often, but I suppose it is one that, with the size of our Public Service now, must be taken into account. It is reassuring to find that the increase on this occasion is smaller than has been the case in some other years, especially in the year 1975, when the two Supply Bills of the year represented a 45 per cent increase over the amount provided for a similar period in the preceding year. To the extent that this is an indication that wage indexation and other economic measures have been successful to a degree in helping to control spiralling costs and inflation, we can be reassured. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for consideration of the Bill.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): Once again, as is the traditional right of every member of this House, it is possible on the moving of this motion to bring up matters of grievance and concern. I wish to deal with one subject briefly. In view of the misrepresentations made by Government members in this House, I wish to refer briefly to the events that took place on Wednesday last relating to the mining and use of uranium. The motion introduced by the Premier, under suspension of Standing Orders, was as follows:

That this House believes that it has not yet been demonstrated to its satisfaction that it is safe to provide uranium to a customer country and, unless and until it is so resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for consideration of the Bill.

The Liberal Party, agreeing with this proposition, supported the motion, but it does not believe that the necessary safeguards will virtually never be found at any time in the future. It became obvious, however, particularly during a later television interview with the Premier, that he and the Government had closed their minds to any suggestion that evidence to support the safe supply of uranium to a customer country would be forthcoming either in the immediate future or at any time. In fact, he made clear that the Government, much to the embarrassment of the Minister of Mines and Energy and his department, had adopted the line promoted by the left wing of his party, that is, leave it in ground. The Liberal Party believes

that evidence may well be forthcoming in future to demonstrate that it is safe to provide uranium to a customer country.

Although we agree that it has not yet been demonstrated that it is safe to do so, we realise that the Federal Government, the International Atomic Energy Agency, and several other Governments are conferring to set down adequate safeguards. There is every possibility that such safeguards will be found, and the Liberal Party will not close its mind to this possibility. The position thus is that, although we have supported the motion as moved and amended, we also support the principle inherent in the motion that, when adequate safeguards are found and become available, we will support the mining and treatment of uranium in South Australia. Obviously this will not be done without the most stringent local safeguards, controls, precautions and investigations.

I repeat what I said in debate in this House and outside: that the Government's decision based on its long-term interpretation of the motion has pre-empted any action that may be taken when findings which indicate adequate safeguards are released in future. Its inflexible leave-it-in-the-ground policy will result in a significant inhibition in the planning for future development of South Australia and certainly will have deterred anyone from establishing a uranium industry in South Australia at any time, even if and when adequate safeguards are found. No-one will suggest that uranium should be mined, treated or exported until it has been proved safe to do so, but to put a virtual all-time ban on uranium has effectively cut off South Australia's chances of participating in research and development in uranium technology, regardless of what future safety decisions may be made. The Government has seen fit to twist and turn on this issue and to try to involve the Liberal Party in its about-face. We will continue to uphold the principle outlined in the motion until we are satisfied that adequate safeguards have been found.

Another matter that has apparently been causing the Government some concern is the matter of shopping hours, which has received considerable attention following the release of the Liberal Party's policy on the subject. I think it is also a credit to the actions of the Hon. J. A. Carnie in another place that the matter has been ventilated. The Liberal Party's policy is quite clear on the issue, as follows:

A Liberal Government would lift all restrictions on retail trading hours except between the hours of 1 p.m. on Saturday until midnight on Sunday. This decision followed a two-day joint meeting of the Liberal Parliamentary Party to consider policy statements. With the lifting of restrictions, other than those applying at the weekend, retail traders would be able to make their own arrangements for rationalised trading on at least one night each week until 9 p.m. This could be achieved through agreements between their own organisations and employee representatives, which is what happened in Victoria following the lifting of all restrictions in that State.

A Liberal Government will, at first opportunity after an election, legislate to allow retail trading until 9 p.m. on one night a week as a first step towards implementation of this policy. It is emphasised that the matter will be entirely a voluntary one; no-one will be compelled to open or to close and the decision will be entirely between traders and employees, bearing in mind the needs of the community. This is a Liberal approach because it will remove unnecessary restrictions and give a wider freedom of choice both to traders and consumers. This freedom of choice may ultimately involve opening on different evenings in different areas to allow for local conditions.

One of the worst things that ever happened to South Australia was the high-handed and arbitrary decision made by a Labor Government to ban late night shopping in outer metropolitan areas although the people in those areas

had indicated quite clearly they were very much in favour of it. We are determined that Parliament should remedy this situation as soon as possible.

That is a clear statement of Liberal Party policy on the matter. Apparently for some reason it has met with no approbation at all from Government members. The Government has found itself in complete confusion over the issue and is frantically seeking ways to keep the public out of any decision-making on shopping hours. I understand that the Minister of Labour and Industry has gone to Queensland and other States to find what alternatives he can. Apparently, he is presently considering two ways of getting his Party off the hook. The first is the possibility of giving the responsibility for determining shopping hours to the Industrial Court or the Arbitration Commission, as it was suggested to me. Failing that, he will endeavour to set up a committee of inquiry into the matter, and that is an old ploy that has been used by the Government with increasing regularity recently.

Mr. Gunn: It's not acceptable any longer.

Dr. TONKIN: I think we are getting sick of the story that another inquiry has been set up into this, that or the other. We have even had an inquiry set up a few days ago involving the inquiring officer inquiring into his own activities and those of his department, and we may hear more about that in this House.

Mr. Gunn: I think we ought to.

Dr. TONKIN: I think I can promise members that they will hear more about it. The Government has set up many committees of inquiry on the basis that it hopes, as far as it can, to stall long enough, hoping that the next election will be over and done with before any of the committees can come up with a report to embarrass it, and that is what the score is.

Mr. Becker: How can they replace all the people who are on committees?

Dr. TONKIN: There will be many retired Labor members of Parliament after the next election, and perhaps they will be looking for a guernsey. Neither of those Government alternatives—the setting of shopping hours by the Industrial Court or a protracted committee of inquiry to try to dodge the issue for the next few months—is acceptable to this Party. I do not believe either is acceptable to the people of South Australia. Members of the public are obviously strongly in favour of extending shopping hours, and they should have a direct say in what those shopping hours should be. Obviously, for some reason or another known best to themselves (and we can have a few guesses as to the real reasons), this is a very hot issue for members of the Labor Party and the whole history of the question bears this out.

Mr. Keneally: How did your people vote last time?

Dr. TONKIN: They voted as they should have done and as their electorates directed them to do by the results of the referendum vote. That is something that I will canvass at some depth in a minute or two. I am glad the honourable member raised the subject; I certainly did not forget it. One of the first pieces of legislation introduced into this House by a Labor Government when it came to office in 1970 was the Referendum (Metropolitan Area Shop Trading Hours) Bill. The member for Henley Beach was sitting in the Minister's chair at that time, and made a very good speech.

Mr. Mathwin: He was in the hot seat.

Dr. TONKIN: It was a hot seat indeed. He said, among other things:

The Government intends to introduce legislation into Parliament during the current session to make a complete revision of the present laws which restrict shopping hours.

There has been no major review of the Early Closing Act since 1950, and the hours at which shops within shopping districts must close are those determined during the early part of the Second World War under the emergency conditions that operated at that time.

One could be forgiven for believing at that time (as many of us did) that the Minister of the time intended to open up the shopping hours situation; it looked like it. His speech quite clearly indicated that the Government intended to relax the restrictions on shopping hours, but there was a disappointment in store. He went on as follows:

The Government recognises that the metropolitan shopping district, which was defined in 1926, is hopelessly out of date and it has decided that whatever new laws are to apply will be uniform in the metropolitan planning area, as defined in the Planning and Development Act, together with the municipality of Gawler. This will mean that the metropolitan area for the purpose of shop trading laws will extend from Gawler in the north to Willunga in the south and include Tea Tree Gully and Bridgewater.

Once again, there might have been some avenue for hope in that. All the Minister had said was that there would be a uniform approach over that entire area instead of the situation as it was, where on the fringes of the metropolitan area people were enjoying late night shopping and treating it as a part (and a valued part) of what they termed their quality of life.

Mr. Langley: When you were in Government did you do anything about lotteries and T.A.B. laws? Not a thing!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Mathwin: He's hiding behind the leg stump again.

Dr. TONKIN: I am terribly pleased and honoured that the honourable member for Unley has joined us, one way or another.

Mr. Langley: No chance of that.

Dr. TONKIN: As well as considerably widening the list of exempted goods, the Minister then said:

The Government intends that there should be uniform shopping hours within the enlarged metropolitan area. It is recognised that this will affect many people, both shoppers and shopkeepers, and that there are differing views also whether all shops should be permitted, should they desire to do so, to open on Friday nights.

There was not very much of a differing view when it came to those people in the fringe areas who were already enjoying late night shopping. They were totally and absolutely in support of it. The Minister continued:

Many people seem to regard the opening of shops on Friday night as the opportunity for an outing as well as for shopping. On the other hand, organisations of shopkeepers have strongly claimed that the general opening of all shops on Friday nights would not result in more goods being sold but would increase prices.

The Government does not consider that it should take the responsibility for making a decision which can significantly affect the lives of the people in the metropolitan planning area and Gawler and upon which they have not been able to directly express their opinion.

There was a laugh, Mr. Speaker, the biggest laugh of all time. There was the Government of the day saying it would consult the people, that it did not think it was fair to take the responsibility for such a momentous decision, and then, when the result of the referendum became known, the Government took not the slightest notice of it and went along in its own sweet way, totally regardless of what the people in various districts had said. How hypocritical!

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Don't you believe there should be some degree of uniformity?

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, we believe that there should be uniformity. We believe that the restrictions should be removed and people should be left to sort out the issues

for themselves. That is the whole object of the exercise, and if the Minister of Mines and Energy, who represents a district in close proximity to Christies Beach and the southern areas, does not see this, he has had his head in the sand, his own uranium-bearing sand perhaps, for far too long. The Minister continued:

The Government has, therefore, decided to introduce this Bill to provide for a referendum to be held of the House of Assembly electors in the metropolitan planning area and the municipality of Gawler. As can be seen from clause 4 the referendum will be to enable electors to vote on whether shops in the metropolitan planning area and in the municipality of Gawler should be permitted to remain open until 9 p.m. on Fridays.

It was a specific issue of "Yes" or "No". A referendum was called. There was considerable debate on the subject. There was no question at all that the people on the fringes of the metropolitan area, at Elizabeth, Tea Tree Gully and Christies Beach, who had been enjoying late night shopping for a number of years, were strongly in favour of retaining it. The Deputy Premier made the rather rash public statement that he was sure that the referendum would pass with the support of 70 per cent of the voters. The Premier, on the other hand, had obviously had a change of mind.

Mr. Mathwin: He did a bit of neat footwork.

Dr. TONKIN: Indeed, he is a very good foot worker. He did some very fancy footwork on that occasion. On November 25, 1969, *Hansard* reports that the Premier, who was then Leader of the Opposition, said:

I do not suggest that there is any easy solution to this problem.

He went on to say what he believed ought to be done. It was significant that he said this as the alternative Leader of the Government. He also said:

Therefore, I believe that we should try to hold the position generally, as it stands: that is, we should not interfere with existing vested interests but allow the situation to go no further;

He was saying that things should be left as they were; that where people were enjoying late night shopping they should be left to enjoy it and that, where people had had no demand for it and were not used to it, the situation should be left as it was. He changed his mind on that subject. He continued:

that we should provide that throughout the State there should normally be a five-and-a-half day week apart from those specially proclaimed shopping nights agreed on by traders in the area for special purposes;

That is out, too, as far as he was concerned. He continued:

and that we should leave Friday night shopping where it stands in areas in which this is already the practice.

This was said in November, 1969. Then, a little later, he changed his mind completely. When the referendum Bill came in, he said:

I believe that we now need to amend the Act to hold the general retail trade situation where it stands and that, in relation to butchering, we should provide five-and-a-half-day butchering throughout the State. If we do not do that, the anomalies will increase.

The Premier supported the referendum Bill and supported the case for one question only to be considered. It was a question of either whether everyone was in favour of late night shopping on Friday or whether everyone was against; no question was asked at any stage about whether or not the situation should remain static, that is, as it was before. It was a notable occasion, for many reasons. Honourable members will remember that there were many people who did not vote and who were sent notices threatening prosecution, and that the prosecutions were never put in train. That was an admission of some degree of embarrassment

on the Government's part. Many people in the metropolitan area did not realise that the matter concerned them at all and that they had to vote, in any case.

Mr. Gunn: Who framed the questions?

Dr. TONKIN: I do not know, but they were framed at the instigation of the then newly elected Labor Government, and they were inadequate. I have already outlined the two options, but there was no question of "Do you want things left as they are?" The voting was predictable. There was no great demand where late night shopping did not already exist, but there was an overwhelming demand where late night shopping was already being enjoyed. When the Bill to bring this matter to legislative form was introduced, we had the deplorable and frightening situation of the then members for Elizabeth, Playford, Salisbury, Tea Tree Gully, and Mawson faced with an agonising decision. They were faced with the prospect of having to toe the Party line and vote as directed by Caucus (the Labor Party machine) and by the trade unions, or of voting as their electors had obviously directed that they should do.

Mr. Mathwin: They have all signed the pledge.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes. I even now recall the photographs, taken with a telephoto lens, that appeared of secret meetings of those fringe members tiptoeing through the long grass to secret consultations where the pressure was applied.

Mr. Mathwin: In the Florey District?

Dr. TONKIN: Yes.

Mr. Langley: You're wrong again.

Dr. TONKIN: Obviously there was more than one secret meeting, and I am grateful to Government members for putting me straight on this matter. The strength of the Labor Party would not have to tiptoe even through the long grass and the tulips. The Party pressure applied resulted in these members voting directly against the expressed wishes of their electors. People in those electorates, as a result, who had so strongly supported late night shopping were sold out by their direct representatives voting, under the direction of their Party and the unions, against their clearly expressed interests. Obviously it must be a hot issue.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It doesn't worry me.

Dr. TONKIN: I shall be interested to hear what the honourable member has to say later. I cannot understand what all the fuss is about and why the Labor Party does not take the issue, face it fairly and squarely, and do something about it. The Minister of Labour and Industry, I understand, had two meetings yesterday; perhaps that is not quite correct, but he had two meetings scheduled for yesterday, the first being with Mr. Goldsworthy of the union. At that stage, it seemed that the Minister expected to move on to a second meeting, with the Retail Traders Association, later in the day, having told Mr. Goldsworthy exactly what he was going to do.

Mr. Abbott: That's not true.

Dr. TONKIN: That is what seems to the general public to have happened. Perhaps Mr. Goldsworthy told the Minister what he and the Government should do. The Minister did not keep his appointments with the association. I think that, for some reason or other, he ran into more trouble than he expected to run into. I do not know why the Minister and the Government generally do not face up to reality. They must face up to the unions sooner or later, so why not now? Why do they not tell them what is happening?

Mr. Abbott: There's no need to.

Dr. TONKIN: Perhaps they have already changed their minds. I shall be interested to hear, and I look forward with great interest to seeing, what has happened. The only satisfactory way out of this situation is not to give the determination to someone else (to the Industrial Court, or anyone else) or set up a delaying committee of inquiry but to go ahead and remove the restrictions that now apply (except between Saturday at 1 p.m. and midnight on Sunday), and let the traders, in consultation with the unions (and particularly in consultation with members of the shopping public), make up their own minds when they will choose to open. In our view, there is no place for government in such a determination. Legislation and restrictions imposed by the Government are totally unwarranted in this regard. We live in a civilised community in which people are able to discuss matters rationally and arrive at rational conclusions. That is something which this Government will never accept. The Government has no role in interfering in the determination of shopping hours. Late night shopping is enjoyed by residents of many cities in many countries, and it is an integral part of what they believe is their quality of life. We have heard so much said by Government members over the past few years about the quality of life in South Australia. The fact that the quality of life is rapidly being priced out of the average South Australian's reach is not the point. The Government has been so anxious to promote quality of life, yet when one of the things that can enhance it for every South Australian, that is, an opportunity to make up his own mind, in consultation with traders and employees, about when he would like to be able to shop (in other words, to enjoy at least one late shopping night a week) is proposed, the Government says, "No you may not." When asked for a reason, all the Government can say is, "Because we say so." That is the only reason we have heard from the Government. The Liberal Party believes there is no reason why South Australians should not enjoy the rights and privileges of late shopping. We will do nothing to inhibit the introduction of late night shopping, and we will act as soon as we possibly can (which means as soon as we come to Government) to ensure that South Australians are able to exercise those rights and privileges.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I will refer, first, to replies to questions given earlier this afternoon, because this matter seems to me to be in accord with the theme I will develop later, namely, the question of the Government's covering-up and not taking the public into its confidence, and suppressing reports of vital concern to the people. I am prompted to make these remarks because of the question I asked today and a later question asked by the member for Hanson. I would have thought that the Minister of Community Welfare would be well aware of the allegations made in the House earlier today. It seems to me incredible that the Premier would have the matter investigated, commission a report, send a reply to the complainant, but would not tell his Minister the subject of the complaint or, indeed, the result.

It is incredible that the Minister responsible for women's shelters was alleged to have been unaware of what was going on and, indeed, that the Premier would investigate the matter and send a reply, but not inform his Minister. Whatever the rights or wrongs of the case, that is an appalling situation when we are dealing with public funds. I believe that the Government is intent on a cover-up operation and that, whenever there is a hint of criticism of the Government, this is the way in which it operates,

I turn now to a related subject, that of access of information for the public. The Whitlam Labor Government prided itself on being an open Government, and the Labor Government in South Australia adopted this theme for a brief period, but I believe it is now a master of the cover-up. I was approached by the Chairman of the Truro school council last week, who was concerned that the school was to be placed in a new region based on the Murray River. The council had picked up this information on the grape vine, and it was my job to contact the appropriate authority and try to have the decision reversed. In relation to two Government reports, I asked the following questions in the House on November 30.:

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 replied as follows:

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.

That report is of considerable importance to many people in my district, but it has not yet seen the light of day. My next question and the reply were as follows:

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.

Many months have passed since I received replies to those questions, but those reports have not yet seen the light of day. There seems to be ample evidence that the Government is acting on the reports, so the public will be confronted with a *fait accompli*, because the Government's decisions have been based on the reports, to which the public has not had access. The following letter was sent to me in connection with this matter by the Barossa and Light Community Council for Social Development:

Dear Mr. Goldsworthy, I am directed to write to you and the other Parliamentary representatives of districts within our region on a matter which is causing us some considerable concern. Last year it came to our attention that Cabinet had received a report of a proposed reorganisation of functional boundaries throughout the State which was known as the Committee on Urban and Regional Boundaries Report (CURB). A number of rumours concerning the new boundaries, which seemed incomprehensible to us, came to our attention. Accordingly, I was directed to write to the Minister of Community Welfare (being our statutory Cabinet contact) seeking a copy of the CURB report. His reply of December 13, stated that Cabinet had not yet reached a final decision and that, therefore, a copy of the report was unavailable at the present time.

Dr. Eastick: What date was that?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That was in December.

Dr. Eastick: Did you notice this afternoon that they have not finished yet?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. I was told in November last year that within weeks the reports would be released when Cabinet had considered them. Decisions are being made on the basis of the reports, but yet they are not available to the public. So much for open Government. I believe it makes a complete lie of the Government's claim, because I believe it is involved in a classic cover-up operation. Anything embarrassing to the Government on which it wishes to make decisions without public controversy is the subject of a cover-up. The letter continues:

Whilst we recognise that rationalisation of regional boundaries is a necessary activity we feel strongly that to carry out such an activity in the secrecy of Cabinet, to be released upon the public as a *fait accompli*, entirely

negates the philosophy of the Community Welfare Act, which set up community councils for social development with the function, *inter alia*, of "giving advice and guidance in the rationalisation and co-ordination of services designed to promote the welfare of the local community so as to achieve the most effective utilisation of those services". Subsequent to this our Chairman, Mr. Brian Marr of Eudunda, had come into his possession a document relating to reorganisation of Community Welfare Department regions and districts which made mention that July 1, 1977, was the anticipated date for the new CURB boundaries to come into effect.

That is on the basis of a report not made public. It is obvious that the Government stealthily wants to implement any recommendations. The letter continues:

These boundaries, it must be remembered, have been drawn up without consultation with local communities, particularly community councils, whose brief it is to advise on just such matters. This particular document also made statements concerning the reorganisation of this community council which would greatly change its character—again with no consultation and, in our opinion, to the detriment of its effectiveness. A copy of our letter to the Minister on this matter and his immediate reply are enclosed. This council deplores the lack of consultation and lack of communication, and requests that you look into the matter at the earliest opportunity.

This is about the earliest opportunity we have had to air the matter in this House, and it is a matter of grave concern. If the Government is to make decisions that affect sections of the community and then confront the community with the decisions as a *fait accompli* without any discussion of reports that have been made to the Government, it is a disgraceful state of affairs. The Minister's reply to the writer of that letter is as follows:

The Minister has asked me to acknowledge your letter of January 6, regarding boundaries of community councils. The matters you have raised are receiving consideration and, when the Minister has further information, he will contact you again.

Yet, it is believed that they will be operating by July 1. The gentleman concerned told me last evening that he had received a further reply from the Minister but it stated nothing and there is no further information of any value and no indication—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Whose judgment is that?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The man to whom I was speaking.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Or yours!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: No, it was the judgment of the man to whom I was speaking.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you reporting him accurately?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister becomes excited and loud in his interjections when we touch on a sore spot.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What evidence have you?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That was a first-hand conversation last evening with the gentleman concerned.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What evidence have we that anything you say is reliable?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister should have a look at the Government's reply to the letter from the gentleman concerned.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What are you covering up?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We are covering up nothing. There have been inquiries from the Clerk of the District Council of Barossa of the member for Light and of me last year in relation to two reports to which I referred in my questions of November 30 last year. This is the most secretive Government that has been inflicted on the people of South Australia: it works by devious means to achieve its socialistic ends, and it is high time that information

available to the Government is also made available to the public of South Australia in the interests of democracy.

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

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I will grieve on three matters: gift duty, North Malaysia Week, and the future of Monarto. There is an urgent need for the Government to abolish, or at least review, gift duty, which is a burden on many groups in our community, one such group being young married couples who wish to own property in joint names. Gift duty is a penalty for people who decide to save and pass on their assets, rather than spend. There is no logical reason to tax these people indiscriminately. Gift duty also has a crippling effect on operators of small businesses who attempt to pass on their businesses to their children. These small concerns are already generally undercapitalised and struggling to remain financially viable. Primary producers constitute another group suffering under the existing gift duty provisions in this State. No amendments have been made to that Act since 1968. During that time rapid inflation has occurred, resulting in a significantly higher rate of gift duty being charged in each dollar. As a progressive tax, the amount of duty paid for each dollar increases with the size of the gift and therefore with inflation.

Gifts below \$4 000 are exempt from duty in South Australia. To bring this tax into line with Commonwealth duty, the maximum sum before tax payable should be \$10 000 and, accordingly, the rate in the dollar needs to be reduced. Since 1968, the amount of gift duty collected has increased from \$8 100 000 to \$19 000 000, an increase of 119 per cent. During the same period the consumer price index has risen by only 80 per cent. Victoria is the only other State in Australia that charges gift duty. With inflation running at such a high level, far less emphasis should be placed on capital taxation. South Australians should not be at a disadvantage, compared with other Australians, by having to pay such a disproportionate tax.

The attempts of the South Australian Government to develop industrial and trade links with North Malaysia have been of no real benefit to South Australians. The Premier is encouraging the export of job opportunities from South Australia to the North Malaysian region, where salaries are much lower than they are here in South Australia. An unskilled worker in Malaysia receives, at the Australian currency equivalent, \$1.50 a day compared with about \$20 a day for an Australian worker. Even a skilled worker in Malaysia receives only \$13 a week. The whole emphasis of North Malaysia Week's industrial display was to promote the advantage of establishing manufacturing plants in North Malaysia. Promotional material available at the displays outlined what Government assistance would be given to industries considering such a move. Even the displays promoted goods that would be in direct competition with goods made by local manufacturers. These goods included chemical, rubber, footwear and food products.

I am amazed that, during a period of high unemployment in South Australia, our State Government should encourage the promotion of industrial development in another country that can offer cheap labour. It is ironical that the Dunstan Government does not give the same financial assistance to promote locally made goods. It is significant that the South Australian Government has spent \$200 000 in promoting North Malaysia Week. The main emphasis on spending that money was to promote South Australian companies to establish industrial plants in North Malaysia. One could relate a policy like that to the policy enunciated by Australia in the 1800's when we imported

cheap labour from the Pacific Islands. In this case, we are taking South Australian companies to cheap labour rather than bringing cheap labour to the companies. It is a disgrace on this State Government that it should promote, by spending \$200 000, such activities to encourage our companies to establish manufacturing plants in North Malaysia.

I took the trouble to watch video tapes that were on display at Elder Park; I also took the trouble to obtain all the promotional material available at the displays. All that material was directed towards encouraging South Australian companies to establish plants in North Malaysia. The material referred to the advantages the North Malaysian Government would give to companies establishing there. I understand that one company has since decided to establish a manufacturing plant in North Malaysia. The Premier was not willing or able to reply to the question that I placed on notice last week about North Malaysia Week.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It was one question among 112 others.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Nevertheless, one would have expected that, on such an important issue, the Government could easily have supplied the relevant information. All I asked is what specific trade contracts or agreements have been made between South Australian and Malaysian interests. I simply asked the Premier to justify publicly, if he could, what benefits South Australia had obtained from North Malaysia Week. The Premier, after taking a week, has still had insufficient time to think up a suitable reply or to concoct a reply.

The third issue I raise relates to Monarto. A reply to a Question on Notice today indicated clearly that as from March 8, 1977, the Premier had suggested to the Chairman of the Public Service Board that the special conditions relating to the transfer to Monarto of personnel be laid aside from job advertisements until the date of recommendation of the Monarto plan had been clarified. The reply further pointed out that it was further suggested that at that time a decision concerning the departments required to relocate to Monarto should be reviewed. The reply states that that action seems necessary because of marked changes in the organisational structure of the Lands Department, the Agriculture and Fisheries Department, and the Environment Department, stemming from amalgamations of various departments and functions. That the Government has now dropped any such conditions from its advertisements is a clear indication and an admission from it that the Monarto project has now been deferred indefinitely, and the 18-month period that the Minister announced for its deferral has now obviously been thrown aside. It is clear, despite our not getting a clear statement from the Government, that it does not intend to proceed with Monarto for 18 months or in the long term.

It is obvious that, because the Monarto Development Commission has now been dismantled and its staff moved elsewhere rather than keeping it autonomous, the Government has abandoned completely Monarto. I might add that it has not been abandoned before time. We advocated that course of action in 1973, 1974 and 1975. It is now 1977 and the Government has eventually adopted that policy, even though it is too scared to do so publicly. It is scared to announce this publicly because it has wasted over \$20 000 000 of our taxpayers' money on a decentralisation policy that will not move one person out of Adelaide or create one employment opportunity out of Adelaide. This decentralisation policy has been a

disaster, as the Minister knows. Monarto has been laid to rest. As I said in a speech in this House in 1973, Monarto is the town that never was.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): A matter that has caused me and several other people considerable concern relates to the formation of the Dog Racing Control Board and the take-over of the facilities of the National Coursing Association. Members will appreciate that I and other members on this side, endorse thoroughly the idea of a control board for dog-racing. Such a board was overdue and, in the form in which it finally went through this House, it was in the best interests of that part of the racing industry. Today I received several details about the board in reply to a Question on Notice that I asked. The reply indicates that the board was to take effect as from February 1, 1977. Indeed, it has taken charge of the industry since that date, and it has been functioning in the best interests of dog-racing since then. The problem that causes me great concern is the 1984-type circumstances surrounding the take-over of the staff, the offices, the equipment, and the records of the National Coursing Association. Without any reference to the National Coursing Association, the Chairman of the board advised the Secretary of the National Coursing Association that, as from February 1, he and other members of the staff were employed by the Dog Racing Control Board, that the accounts covering the operation of the National Coursing Association would be ruled off, that the lease applicable to the National Coursing Association at 17 Leigh Street, Adelaide, would be taken over by the board, and that in due course the National Coursing Association would be informed that it would have its property taken over in this way.

It was not until about nine days or 10 days later that a letter was forwarded to the National Coursing Association informing it of what had happened to its own property, to the office which it had on lease, and to the Secretary, who had ceased to be only the Secretary of the National Coursing Association and who, from February 1, 1977, was the Secretary of the Dog Racing Control Board. I believe that it was in the longer-term best interest of the organisation that this latter action was followed. I believe that Mr. McCarron, who is and was the Secretary of the National Coursing Association, was the person best suited to the requirements of the Dog Racing Control Board. I believe that the equipment, the staff, and the records which had been used successfully to conduct dog-racing in this State before February 1, 1977, had to be taken over for the conduct of dog-racing in the immediate future from February 1, but it is the manner in which it was done that concerns me. Members of the National Coursing Association had a legal responsibility to their member clubs and a responsibility in law to the lessee of the property and to the staff they had employed over a period of time, and they had a right to expect that negotiations would have been undertaken man to man or by an exchange of letters before February 1, when this action was taken, and not some days later.

We cannot, whether in the case of the Dog Racing Control Board or any other body that will come into being in the future, accept a situation where the worth of the body is so lightly regarded in the minds of some; nor should the Minister responsible for setting up the board allow an organisation of this nature to ride roughshod over the existing body. The answer I received in reply to my Question on Notice today indicates that the board has established a liaison with the National Coursing Association and that it is at present pursuing discussions with the association, with the object of ensuring that the

association is able to continue with its functions in relation to the conduct of open coursing. I would point out to the person who prepared that answer that the association has the authority now to undertake coursing without any further discussion with the Dog Racing Control Board, because the activities of coursing were completely outside the ambit of the Racing Bill passed through this House. The action taken by the Government and Government officers in walking in and taking over the staff, property and facilities of an existing organisation is more in keeping with what we have been warned of for 1984 than it is with sane Government action in the year 1977. The Government stands totally condemned for its part in this abhorrent activity.

The member for Kavel referred to the difficulties of the Barossa and Light Community Council for Social Development and a letter which had been received. That document was the reason behind my question to the Premier this afternoon. I must say that the Premier looked completely stunned, as though he did not know what the CURB report was. He had to take assistance from along the line before he was able to stand and give his answer.

Mr. Allison: Not a word in his answer indicated that he knew what it was.

Dr. EASTICK: Exactly. Obviously, even though it is claimed that this matter is actively before Cabinet, there is a grave lack of information and knowledge on the part of the Premier on what is taking place in respect of regionalisation of the State of South Australia. Following the letter that the Secretary of that organisation forwarded to me, I approached the Minister of Community Welfare. After the acknowledgment of the letter, I subsequently received a reply dated March 2, 1977, in which the Minister states:

I refer to your letter of February 15, in which you referred to the CURB report. I am at present unable to give you any details of likely dates of implementation, as the report has not yet been approved in Cabinet.

It is not yet approved in Cabinet, and yet officers in the various Government departments are having pressed on them actions relating to the findings of the report and they are completely up in the air as to their future, and the direction and purpose of the Government. It is, as the member for Kavel said, another case of the Government's barnstorming through, not worrying about the effect it is having on the lives of people generally and, more particularly in this instance, on people employed by the State who should have, from a Government which gives any consideration at all to its employees, an opportunity to know where they are going and when they may expect to be considered.

It has been represented to me by members of the Newsagents Association that its members are having difficulties, when delivering newspapers by motor vehicle (as many of them do), in effectively undertaking delivery without personal injury or disadvantage from wearing a seat belt. I believe that a request has been made on their part that they be permitted not to wear a seat belt while delivering newspapers, and I believe that should be agreed to.

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

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): One may be forgiven for being a little confused at times as to the state of the finances of South Australia. Checking on last year's statements made by the Premier, I notice statements on two close dates. On July 5, 1976, the Premier pointed out

that, with a financial revenue surplus of slightly more than \$2 000 000, the State would be relatively hard pressed to maintain a balanced Budget during that last year. He said, "South Australia will be hard pressed to maintain the services to the community which the people in this State rightly expect." On July 17, 1976, this time in Western Australia before a packed Press Club luncheon, the Premier said that he had been advising Mr. Wran, the new New South Wales Premier, to beware of certain problems which might arise from Federal funding. He was also absolutely set against the federalism policy and therefore had a closed mind on the subject, which he still has. At the same time he also said:

"Look at me—the Liberals said I would run the State into bankruptcy by invoking new social programmes. But after I accepted special grants for the State's rail services and for hospital finance from the Whitlam Government, I finished up with a surplus last year of \$56 000 000."

He referred to \$2 000 000 in the House on July 5 and \$56 000 000, as quoted in the *Australian*, on July 17, 1976—a difference of \$54 000 000. What really happened in the House of Assembly? When the Premier discovered he had over \$50 000 000 surplus last year he checked through to see which areas had been neglected and one of them springs to mind immediately: an allocation of \$20 000 000 was made in great haste towards South Australian State housing.

In a grievance debate just after the announcement was made, I pointed out that between 1950 and 1968 Liberal Governments and, incidentally the Walsh Government, had averaged 3 200 South Australian Housing Trust houses each year. Between 1970 and 1974 the average had dropped to less than half—1 515 houses a year. Those statistics are documented in papers which are placed regularly before this House. The surplus of \$50 000 000 had been accrued not through superb management but through neglect. We had in fact not built nearly as many houses as the previous Governments had completed before 1970. We can probably place some of the blame on the fact that the building industry has an inflation rate of about 28 per cent a year. Therefore, a similar sum spent each year would mean a reduced number of houses capable of being built. However, one sees no evidence in any of the Premier's statements that he is anxious to accept at least some of the restrictions that are being asked for at Federal level.

There is no indication that he is prepared to attack and reduce inflation, yet it is in the interests of this Government, as well as of other State Governments, to reduce inflation. The fact that inflation has been reduced, apart from the Medibank contract, to about 10 per cent automatically benefits this State's salaries bill, in spite of the inflation rate.

If we allocate 16 per cent of our salaries allowance and inflation is only 10 per cent (and indexation contributes to this), we benefit. It ill behoves any Premier to stress that we should be ignoring indexation, or to say that indexation is finished, because the reduction in salaries has in fact contributed substantially towards the State's coffers. Let us not ignore the fact that yesterday the annual report of the National Bank showed a graph specially devoted to the great discrepancy between the cost price index (rising at an angle of 45 per cent) and the salaries paid over the same 10-year period. The salaries had gained considerably over the cost price index. It is no good saying that indexation is a failure, because indexation over the past 10 years has carried the salaries of all Australian workers well above the rise in the cost price index for that period.

At the request of school councils I visited many schools last week. I suppose every member of Parliament receives

similar invitations. I accepted invitations to visit under-privileged schools. Two diametrically opposed points of view have been put forward in relation to the continued existence of under-privileged schools. One view is that the entire blame must be put at the door of the Federal Government. The other point of view is a counter argument. To blame the Federal Government for everything is ridiculous. The Federal Government increase, which is a small one over and above inflation for the current year, is 2 per cent for primary and secondary schools, 4 per cent for universities, and 8 per cent or 9 per cent for further education.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: It's 7 per cent.

Mr. ALLISON: Okay, we have had additional funding recently to increase that but apparently the Minister has not taken that into consideration. Irrespective of that, laying the blame at the door of the Federal Government seems to be a little alarming, since it was the Whitlam Government in the previous years that pruned \$105 000 000 from the gross education budget. It pegged the tertiary allowance for students not at the 1975 level of \$32 but at the 1974 level of \$32, and it was left to the Fraser Government to increase the tertiary allowance to \$42, an increase of about 30 per cent, in an attempt to redress the fact that the Whitlam Government had ignored students for two years.

The Federal Government reintroduced triennial funding, which is obviously a good thing because our own Premier, in September last year, drew attention to the fact that triennial funding was a preferred alternative to annual funding. The Federal Government has generally asked not just education and nursing people, but people involved with the whole range of facilities across Australia, to pull in their belts for one year. I would disagree intensely with Don Chipp, although he would obviously have an axe to grind; whether he is grinding it or blunting it remains to be seen.

There are two sides to the argument, and one has to look at these under-privileged schools with sympathy. Migrant and ethnic groups are very much under-privileged, and many of them have asked for help. I had to point out to them that for 10 of the past 12 years the Labor Government has been able to allocate priorities in this State and, if these priorities have not been acknowledged, one can hardly lay the blame for the discrepancies at the door of the Fraser Government because priorities in relation to under-privileged schools are set in South Australia and not in Canberra.

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen): A matter that greatly concerns me and most people in this State is the desperate need in South Australia at present for law and order.

Mr. Millhouse: The desperate need?

Mr. WOTTON: Yes. If the member for Mitcham does not agree, I hope I can change his mind. The moral cost to South Australia, particularly among young people, is extremely frightening and it is something that the Labor Government in this State seems to encourage.

Looked at overall, Government legislation, whatever subject it may concern, seems bent on many laws but no order whatever. When a State can function on the fewest possible laws, that State is functioning extremely well, but when a Government has to legislate for many laws there is something very wrong. As long as each new piece of legislation introduced by the Labor Government upsets the maximum number of people, immorally encourages the maximum number of people or the most impressionable people (and that is the young), financially

breaks the maximum number of people, or deprives the maximum number of people of their privately owned homes or land, it is considered successful socialist legislation.

I would like to know why, in this State, nothing is any good unless it is either new or different, when there are standards of living that have been proven over hundreds of years? Why, when they work so well and keep a community sane, clean, healthy, happy and fit, do these standards have to be torn down? Freedom has always involved voluntary restraint, and some restraint by law. When restraint is removed we have chaos, and chaos is what we are getting in this State at present and what can be expected in the future.

Let us look at law and order. The matter of child pornography has been discussed recently in this House. In that debate, the Attorney-General had the gall to say that we were discussing this matter because we were trying to beat our own political drum. I wanted to speak in that debate, but because time ran out I was unable to do so. I did not want to speak to bang any political drum; I wanted to speak because I am a concerned parent of three children. I am concerned about their future. The honourable member for Stuart may grin (he might not have any children, I do not know), but I am particularly concerned about my children. If he is not concerned about the young people of this State, that is his dog fight. I am concerned about the young people, and that is why I am concerned about the subject of child pornography. I believe it was important that that subject was debated when it was and I still believe, despite what has been said by either the Premier or the Attorney-General, that much needs to be done about that matter before South Australians can rest in relation to the safety of their children.

Let us look at community welfare. I strongly believe that certain sections of community welfare today are too lenient. In fact, they seem to be encouraging irresponsible behaviour and, in many cases, deliberately turning children against their parents. I believe that we have far too much rehabilitation in this State. The punishment does not fit the crime, and this is a matter that the community is concerned about. There is a desperate need in this State for discipline—in schools and in the community. Although "discipline" is a word this Government does not understand, it is a word we need to hear a lot more about. The penalties that exist at present are wrong in their priorities. We often read of cases that go before a court in which the defendant, on a rape charge for example, is perhaps patted on the head and told not to do it again.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Heysen has the floor. The honourable member for Stuart will have an opportunity to speak later.

Mr. WOTTON: It is evident in this State that juvenile delinquency is increasing. Some of the causes are believed to be related to the lack of discipline. If a child has not been taught a way to behave that is acceptable to the standards of everyday life in South Australia, we have the drop-out from school. This leads to petty crime including drug addiction and vandalism, creating a pattern that leads to criminal law breaking. We are all aware of the concern that the Government and the community in South Australia have expressed, particularly with regard to vandalism. When a child has not been taught how to behave and to conduct himself the odds are that he will not have been taught how to respect other people's

property. This, again, leads to vandalism, theft and destruction. A child who has misbehaved repeatedly, who has come up against authority and who has mixed with others of his kind, feels that the world is against him and he then loses his pride in himself or his work. If that child had been told about discipline, I believe that this would not be the case.

Another matter that concerns me, and concerns the public, is in relation to the Public Buildings Department in this State. I believe that we could see much more efficiency from that department. I believe that much more of the work involved could be done by private enterprise. I would like to know how tenders are accepted by the department and whether it accepts the lowest quote. I have an example in my district of a school that is being upgraded. When I visited that school the other day I was told that \$37 000 had been spent by the department on constructing a steel and concrete double block of toilets. I think that we all realise that a substantial home can be built today for \$37 000. When I inquired, I was told that this was one of four similar toilet blocks that were built for that sum of money.

I am glad that the Minister of Education is in the Chamber at present because I am concerned about the work carried out by the Public Buildings Department on schools. I am concerned about the way that the schools are able to obtain assistance. I believe there is a need for a genuine priority list in schools. I do not think that this is the case at present. I understand, from my inquiries, that the school council that cries the loudest gets the most work done. I have recently encountered examples of this. I believe that this is a matter that the Minister of Education should consider. I intend to deal with this matter further on another occasion. It is an evident problem in the schools that I have been associated with in my district.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I raise a matter that has been bandied around this House in the past two sitting days in relation to the road assistance funds made available to South Australia through the Commonwealth Government. I raise this matter because it follows a question I asked during Question Time when I sought information from the Minister about what planning was being undertaken to upgrade the priorities for allocations for rural arterial roads, rural local roads and the national highway maintenance programme.

Dr. Eastick: Do you think he protested too much?

Mr. BLACKER: The Minister did protest rather severely, to the extent of accusing me of presenting a loaded question. I do not take exception to that remark because the funding of the areas concerned affects my district. It is fair to say that the figures I quoted are concerned primarily with country areas. Mine being a country electorate, I think it only natural that I should look to those areas. From an analysis of those figures, I think there has been a shift of emphasis by the Commonwealth Government from the metropolitan road works programme to a country road works programme. That is of considerable significance, particularly to country members. I was concerned that the Minister should accuse me of asking a loaded question. Last Thursday, in reply to a question asked by the member for Stuart about the Stuart Highway, the Minister of Transport replied:

One of those categories is the national roads, and in 1977-78 South Australia will receive \$15 000 000 from the Commonwealth Government, a reduction of 13.2 per cent in money terms. This year South Australia is receiving \$17 300 000 but next year we will get only \$15 000 000

and, when that is considered in the light of inflation, one can realise just how badly we are treated by Mr. Nixon. I appreciate the Minister's comments, but it is fair to say that he has used the figures to his advantage in trying to demonstrate to South Australians what a bad guy the Federal Minister is; yet, by the same token, he has overlooked considerable increases in funding, particularly for roads. There is a dire need for additional funds to be channelled into roads in country districts. I can honestly say that not much more than a few kilometres of road has been sealed over the past decade in the present Flinders District, except for three tourist roads. There has not been a major road works programme involving the sealing of roads, yet many people in the metropolitan area accept that they must have sealed roads. People in the outer metropolitan and near country areas have also grown to accept that they must have sealed roads, but that is not so in the country. With the exception of the highway around and up the centre of the peninsula, that is the full extent of our sealed highway programme. Last week, I presented a petition signed by residents and visitors who use the road between White Flat and Koppio, which is a short drive from Port Lincoln and which is a centre of attraction because of its historic museum. The petition was placed at the museum for two months, but it was incorrectly worded and, consequently, had to be withdrawn and could not be presented, but I hope to present a similar one to the Minister soon. I had another petition drawn up, and it began attracting signatures two months ago. Since then, 1 198 signatures have been placed on it. That gives some indication of the volume of traffic that traverses that road, which is a dirt road, unsafe in summer because of the dust, and unsafe in the wet weather because it is slippery and boggy. Two school buses use the road to carry students to schools at Cummins, Poonindie and Port Lincoln. Generally speaking, it is an access road to that part of the peninsula, yet it is in poor condition and cannot be considered to be a pride and joy of the State.

I now raise another matter that concerns me, and no doubt the member for Mitcham will show some interest in it. This matter goes back to an application made by Mr. J. R. Kroezen for a permit for a relief abalone diver. Mr. Kroezen wanted to take a fortnight off to attend an Army reserve camp; that was a commendable action on his part. On March 3, he wrote to the Director of Agriculture and Fisheries seeking a permit for a relief diver to act on his behalf whilst in camp, on the basis that less than a year ago another diver had the misfortune (or whatever we like to call it) to be put in gaol.

Mr. Millhouse: It's usually regarded as a misfortune, deserved or otherwise.

Mr. BLACKER: The inconsistency in the application is that the diver who had spent some time in gaol was granted a permit to allow a relief diver to do down, whereas Mr. Kroezen was not granted a relief permit. They are the anomalies that crop up in the why's and wherefore's in the granting of a permit in this case. The Director declined the application, and this, incidentally, was notified to Mr. Kroezen at 3.50 p.m. on the day before he was about to board the truck to go to El Alamein. The Director's letter states:

Our policy is to allow relief divers only in cases of illness or accident, and not for periods when the licence holder is unable to dive for reasons within his own control. I consider that while your personal commitment to the Army reserve is commendable, it is not really any different to possible commitment to worthy organisations such as charity groups or community service club projects. No doubt you appreciate the difficulties which could arise if we were asked to make judgments in this area. A line unfortunately has to be drawn.

I believe that, when the Director compares service in the Army reserve with service to worthy organisations and charitable groups, the matter needs questioning by the House and by the people of the State. Surely the Army reserve gets some consideration in this matter. For Mr. Kroezen to be treated in this way is, I think, disgraceful, first, to the department concerned and, particularly, to the Government.

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

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): I support the remarks made by the member for Flinders concerning road grants and funding and the recent misleading statements made by the Minister. Although I will not comment further on that matter, I could not resist the opportunity of supporting the honourable member.

I will briefly comment on a matter vital to those who travel on metropolitan railways and concentrate on that aspect of public transport. Much could be said about the inadequacies of other modes of public transport, and many views have been aired recently regarding the lack of attractiveness of many spheres of public transport in the metropolitan area. I quote from an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* on March 17 under the heading "Railway crisis looms—union", as follows:

South Australia's railway system faced an acute shortage of passenger carriages and diesels, a union leader said yesterday. The Australian Railways Union State Secretary (Mr. W. W. Marshall) said the situation was reaching crisis point. More passengers on peak-hour metropolitan services were forced to stand for most of the journey because of the rolling stock shortages. The passenger car shortage had arisen when the railways had been forced to pull 13 railcar trailers out of service.

Tenders had been called for 13 new railcar trailers, but it would be about 18 months before they were on the tracks. The union believed that 12 diesels more than 25 years old also had to be withdrawn from service recently. "It is obvious if they have that many out of service they are going to have to start knocking back freight and that would be a tragedy," Mr. Marshall said. "At this moment the railways can't try to promote peak-period traffic simply because we can't cater for it."

Mr. Marshall said the South Australian railways had been starved of the money needed for proper forward planning to replace old carriages and diesels. "We haven't the money to do even the most elementary things private enterprise would do," he said. The acting secretary of the rail division of the State Transport Authority (Mr. J. L. Hazeal) confirmed that 13 trailer cars had been withdrawn from traffic. He said he realised that people were having to stand on some journeys, but could not comment on the reasons for delays in replacing the carriages. No freight services had been cancelled because of locomotive shortages.

I can suggest at least two reasons why the situation has almost reached crisis point: one is the bad management on the part of the Minister of Transport. When 13 railcar trailers have to be withdrawn at the same time, it is obvious that consideration should have been given to maintenance in the past. The Labor Government was in power from 1965 to 1968, and has now been in power from 1970 to 1977. Mr. Marshall has said that there has been a lack of finance coming from the Government for this aspect of transport. I bring to the notice of the House the following comment by Mr. Marshall: "We haven't the money to do even the most elementary things private enterprise would do." That is an admission that private enterprise would have done a better job; if that is the case, a Government that stands for private enterprise should replace the present Government, and the railways will go ahead and people will not have to stand in railway carriages at peak periods. The situation has been caused by neglect on the part of the Minister of Transport and by poor management. Let us follow the sequence of events that have taken place in this situation.

That report appeared in the newspaper on the morning of March 17. That afternoon the Minister of Transport came out with a hurried statement through the afternoon press. Headed "Big Revamp for rail fleet", the press report stated:

The State Government has begun a multi-million dollar scheme to upgrade the metropolitan passenger rail fleet. The transport Minister, Mr. Virgo, said today tenders would be called shortly for 13 non-motorised "redhen" carriages. These would replace old carriages taken out of service for safety reasons. The non-motorised carriages are placed between diesel-driven railcars.

Motorised "redhen" units operating are now being examined in a plan to replace or renovate all motorised units in the fleet. Mr. Virgo could not say how long the replacement programme would take or what the likely cost would be.

What planning! The Minister could not say how long it would take or how much it would cost. When 13 carriages and 12 diesels were withdrawn, the Minister should have been able to give details, but he did not know how long it would take and what the cost would be to replace them. He said they were withdrawn for safety reasons, and his statement continued:

He expected the 13 new carriages would come into service next year, improving passenger comfort and service efficiency on suburban runs. The new carriages would become part of a three-car set, sandwiched between two motorised units. Because 13 units had been taken out of service there was a shortage of carriages and this had forced the railways to reduce the size of some trains to two motorised units.

"It is cramping our usual means of meeting passenger comfort demands," Mr. Virgo said. "But we had to withdraw the carriages in the interests of safety to the travelling public. We simply did not want to take any risks."

As 13 carriages and 12 locomotives had to be withdrawn, it seems that care, surveillance, and maintenance had not been considered over the years. This time the Minister could not blame the Federal Government because money had not been available. He has often claimed that money was made available freely by the Whitlam Government. If that had been the case, these carriages and locomotives should not have been in the condition in which they had to be withdrawn, and the travelling public inconvenienced. A 1975 report on Transport Policy and Planning in South Australia, referring to public transport, states:

2. Improving and promoting public transport.

2.1 The purpose of this chapter is to describe the action being taken by the Director-General of Transport and other transport agencies to achieve the two primary policy objectives contained in paragraph 1.20 above:

By improving public transport services—making them more accessible, faster, more convenient and more comfortable—to attract people to use public transport for many journeys now made by motor car.

By lowering the relative price of public transport and making use of motor cars less easy where congestion is most serious and where a high standard of public transport service is available, to discourage many people from using their cars for some journeys—especially journeys to work in the city of Adelaide.

By actively marketing transport to inform potential users of the services available to them.

2.2 The first element in this strategy has received most attention to date.

I emphasise that the Minister has not achieved what has been claimed in that report, namely, that people have been attracted to public transport, especially when they have to stand in crowded carriages at peak periods on commuter services. People will not be attracted to public transport

until this Government uses proper management and progresses in upgrading these vehicles.

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): This has been a pretty dull debate, and I would not be taking part in it if it were not for my anger at some replies to Questions on Notice that I received today. I take the first opportunity to canvass one set of those replies that concerned a recent amendment to the Licensing Act and the appointment since then of Mr. W. C. (Bill) Langcake as a licensing magistrate. During February I wrote a letter to the Premier that I made public, accusing him and the Government of misleading Parliament. I repeat that statement in the House today, because there is no doubt, following the replies I received this afternoon, that the Government has misled Parliament, the legal profession, and the public of this State. In my letter of February 7, in part I stated:

I greatly regret that neither I nor apparently any other member in Opposition realised what the Government was giving itself power to do and how it meant to use that power.

That is under section 5 (8) of the Licensing Act, which provides that the Governor may, subject to the Public Service Act, appoint any suitable person to be a Licensing Court magistrate. None of us saw that provision last year. It means that a lay person can be appointed a magistrate; not a lawyer, as has been the practice in South Australia for a long time. That is what I was referring to. My letter continues:

Neither was there the slightest hint in the second reading speeches in either House, nor during the debate in Committee, that this was your intention. You will agree now, I am sure, that the absence of any suggestion of appointing a lay magistrate or magistrates, when it must already have been the intention of the Government, was tantamount to misleading Parliament. The Government must have been well aware of the protests which such an indication would have brought from members of Parliament, members of the legal profession and probably others as well. Moreover, from what I now know, I believe that this omission to warn members of the public of what was intended, was deliberate.

I wrote that letter on February 7. I did not receive a reply, so I wrote (as is my wont when these things happen) a hastener to the Premier on February 22, asking him for a reply. He had already made a public comment, but he had not bothered to reply to my letter.

Mr. Keneally: Why are you continually reflecting on the appointee?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will come to that in a moment. On February 22, I wrote to the Premier asking for a reply. On February 25 I received from the Premier a reply dated February 21. It is perfectly obvious what happened—he received my hastener and members of his staff back-dated the reply.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It does not take four days even for a letter from the Premier's Department to get to Mitcham, not even with Australia Post in its present condition. I cannot be kidded on that. In his reply, the Premier stated:

Dear Mr. Millhouse, I have your letter of February 7. The tone is distinctly frosty. He signed the letter "Yours faithfully", too, thank goodness. Usually letters from Ministers are signed "Yours sincerely". The letter continues:

The question of the appointment of a lay magistrate is not new, and in fact was raised in the Legislative Council during the passing of the Licensing Act Amendment Bill.

That is untrue. I have looked right through the debates in another place, as I have looked through the debates for this House, and this matter was not raised, as far as *Hansard* is concerned. The clause to which I refer and which contains this provision was passed without any debate. Members can have a look at that if they wish. It is simply untrue what the Premier states. His letter continues:

The work of the Licensing Court has changed since the early rush of applications with the new Licensing Act and, as you know, Mr. Langcake's experience in the administration of work coming through the Licensing Branch is of long standing.

Of course his experience is long standing; he has been there for many years and, as I said in my earlier letter, I have a great affection for Mr. Langcake and respect for his ability as Secretary to the Attorney-General, but that is the closest he has come to the administration of the Licensing Branch. The Premier then continues (and this is the sentence to which I take particular objection):

It is not inappropriate that non-lawyers should sit on administrative tribunals.

This is not an administrative tribunal, as the reply that I received to my Question on Notice today will show. The Premier's letter continues:

Commissioners sit on the Planning Appeals Board. A lay industrial magistrate sits in that jurisdiction. There is no reason why Mr. Langcake should not, with his experience, sit in the licensing jurisdiction.

The Premier may believe that, being led by the nose in this matter by the Attorney-General, but a hell of a lot of other people outside do not agree with him. His letter continues:

In many of the common law countries, the history of licensing magistrates who are not lawyers has been a long one.

The Premier in the next paragraph deals with Mr. Peter O'Brien, and I will come back to that matter if I get time. In view of what the Premier has implied, that this was an administrative tribunal, today I asked, in part, the following Question on Notice:

Have any Licensing Court magistrates been appointed . . . and, if so:
 (a) who have been appointed;
 (b) what are the qualifications . . .
 (c) what are duties of such appointees—
 and that was the nub of the whole matter—
 (d) to whom are they responsible . . .
 (e) has there been any appeal . . .

The replies were as follows:

1. Yes.

- (a) Mr. W. C. Langcake, J.P.
 (b) extensive administrative experience in Public Service over a period of 40 years including 16 years as Permanent Head of Attorney-General's Department, which department administered the Licensing Act; a member of several commercial tribunals for many years—

but, of course, a man without any legal qualifications. What about his duties, which is the point in question? The reply continues:

- (c) hear applications in court and in chambers and in particular will deal with applications for permits, changes of manager, directorship, etc.; sit as member of Full Bench as required.

The Full Bench of the Licensing Court is a court of appeal from a single member of the court and on matters of the law. To say, as the Premier has done in his letter to me, that this is an administrative tribunal is a lie. It is not true, and his reply to me today shows that it is not true. The Premier had to admit that when I asked the question straight out, and, my word, many members of

the legal profession wished me to ask what Mr. Langcake's duties would be, because the Law Society is rightly up in arms about his appointment. This reply gives the lie direct to what the Premier said about its being an administrative tribunal. The Attorney-General in a passing reference to a matter made perfectly clear (and honourable members can look it up in *Hansard*) that the Licensing Court is not simply to be an administrative tribunal, far less the Full Bench of which Mr. Langcake will from time to time be a member.

I protest vigorously about this matter, which I have raised to give the Premier and the Attorney-General (who is now back from his trip abroad) an opportunity, if they wish to take it and have the courage to take it, to answer me in this place and allow us to have a debate about it. The other point that I raised in my original letter to the Premier was that it had been put to me (and I certainly accept it) that the reason for appointing Mr. Langcake was to get rid of him from the Attorney-General's Division so that Mr. Peter O'Brien could be promoted to a position to take Mr. Langcake's place, which the Premier denied indignantly and about which I thought he protested too much. If Mr. O'Brien is such a good bloke, why should he get in such a pet? The answer is that Mr. O'Brien is suspect in many quarters, no less in the Labor Party than elsewhere. I have no doubt that the real reason for Mr. Langcake's appointment was so that he would be out of the Attorney-General's Division and Mr. O'Brien would be in a position of more influence, whatever formally his position may be. It is a disgrace and a scandal, and it is something that I am sure the Public Service Association resents, as I know many individual public servants resent. This whole exercise has been shabby: it reflects badly on the Government. I wish that it had not occurred, and I challenge any member—

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

Mr. BOUNDY (Goyder): I wish to refer to the situation that exists on Kangaroo Island, mainly because I did not get an opportunity to speak last week in the urgency motion that was before the House. I wish, too, to tie up what I have to say with other concerns I have about the Lands Department. In beginning to speak about the Kangaroo Island situation, I wish to refer to an editorial which appeared in the *Advertiser* of January 24 and which states rather better than I could the background to the situation. It states, in part:

Back in 1945 former Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, proclaimed the sacred obligation we have to see men settled satisfactorily on the land. Federal and State Governments then co-operated in a plan to place 174 ex-servicemen and their families around Parndarna. Others were settled elsewhere. Those selected to pioneer these schemes had no doubt that, in return for a lifetime of hard work, they were being given an irrevocable opportunity to achieve full equity in their properties by the end of their lives.

In the nature of things, men and women are different, with different capacities. Land varies in quality and productivity. Markets and circumstances change. Of the original Parndarna settlers, only 94 remain. Some have died, some already failed, some sold out. Now, 21 others who for one reason or another have got seriously into debt are about to learn their fate . . .

It has been a cruel business, even though at least a dozen may now be given a last chance to carry on. In the free market place, farmers not making a success of their properties would doubtless have faced their moment of truth long ago. Banks and stock firms would have withdrawn support and the settlers would have had the chance to build new lives elsewhere while still young

enough. Now, however, most Kangaroo Island soldier settlers are in late middle age. They are too old to start again. So if anything were going to be done at all, it should have happened 10 or 15 years ago.

Later, the editorial continues:

It is an unhappy story all round, and the community will expect the authorities to be generous and humane in their provisions for those who have to go.

A report appearing in the *Advertiser* on February 26 stated that the Gosse Land Committee was seeking a 12-month reprieve for the eight soldier settlers under threat of eviction. It is on this point that I wish to agree with that committee. I think that a stay of execution could be amply demonstrated as the action the Government should take. I can give an example to illustrate why these people should be given a 12-month stay of execution so that the improved situation in the livestock industry could be allowed to help them out of their financial dilemma.

Mr. Max Brown: What about the three who want to get out with dignity?

Mr. BOUNDY: They can go. No-one is stopping those who want to go from going. The opportunity should be there for those who wish to stay to be allowed to stay.

I refer now to an unrelated case. A letter has come to my notice. The Rural Industries Assistance Committee wrote to a settler in the South-East and, on March 1, 1976, told him that his position was completely unviable and that there was no way in which he could continue, even though his wife was working. A list of conditions was set out as follows:

(a) That all payment of principal and/or interest to the Savings Bank of South Australia, Commonwealth Trading Bank and Commonwealth Development Bank of Australia be suspended.

(b) All receipts be applied to current account and the authority's debts.

(c) The question of contract reaping lupins and sunflowers be deferred for consideration in the light of circumstances in December next.

Obviously, the Lands Department would not even consider alternative projects to help improve the viability. Further conditions were as follows:

No advances be made from the authority in respect of living allowance, education expenses, medical benefit subscriptions, electricity, telephone.

All these had to be paid from his wife's earnings outside the farm; perhaps that is fair enough. Item (f) is as follows:

That arrangements with you be reviewed quarterly with a view of termination of assistance in the absence of disposal of your property during the current budget period. It is noted that you are endeavouring to dispose of property.

Subsequently, the farm was sold, right in the depths of the rural crisis last year, when drought exacerbated the poor livestock prices pertaining, and when wool was at an even lower price than prevails now. The farm was put on the market at a lower price than it would bring today, and the farmer sold the livestock and the farm plant, built a new two-storey house with an inground swimming pool and landscaped gardens, all paid for, and had money left to put aside. The letter stated that his position was hopelessly unviable and that there was no way in which he could get out of his financial dilemma and continue in the business of farming, no way in which the department would consider alternative enterprises for him.

It is too late for that person concerned to stay in business on the farm, but he has proved that he can repay about 200c in the dollar on his debt overall. The position of the farmers on Kangaroo Island was itemised in August last, at the worst possible time, when there was no market at

all on the mainland for their livestock, and without considering the high cost of transporting their stock to the mainland markets. I urge the Government to consider allowing those Kangaroo Island settlers who wish to do so to continue for another 12 months, so that they may have the opportunity denied to the person I referred to who lived elsewhere in the State.

Those remarks lead me to another and related problem in relation to the Lands Department. I refer to a matter concerning a constituent of mine who owns perpetual leasehold land west of Warooka, on which reassessment is on a 14-year basis, as that is the type of perpetual lease that he holds. He has noticed that on October 2, 1978, his rental will be increased from \$41 a year, as it has been in the past 14 years, to \$755 a year, an increase of 1 800 per cent. His council rates are only about \$400 a year, and the district council does something for him. What has the Lands Department done on that property that would involve an annual rental of \$755? The market value of the land which the Lands Department and the Crown residually own would probably earn a greater value than that, but surely, in the name of all that is just, the rental levied on land such as this must bear some relationship to the productive capacity.

Any fair-minded man or Minister would agree that it would be completely inappropriate to levy, by way of Crown rental, nearly twice as much as the local council is levying in council rates. What has the Lands Department done? This was virgin scrub when the man took it over. He has developed it, and everything that is on it is the result of his work. Surely a nominal amount is all that the Lands Department can claim justly. If this situation is to continue, and rentals increase, as they obviously will, great hardship will fall on all people who own leasehold lands, who have laboured under the delusion for the past 100 years that leasehold ownership is as good as freehold ownership, and that its value in the market place is the same. We will see the viability of people suffer because of these high rentals.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I should like to comment on an attitude I have noticed, particularly from the Minister of Transport, to questions addressed to him of late. I am delighted that the Minister has just come into the Chamber. It has been quite evident that, apart from the actions of all other Ministers on the front bench, the Minister of Transport especially takes great delight in denigrating the efforts of the present Federal Government, and in particular the Commonwealth Minister for Transport. It is almost a fetish with the Minister that he cannot answer a question without having this happen. The member for Flinders today asked a question, and he got a bucket tipped over him; what is more, the question was not answered. The Minister had no intention of answering it. He just took the opportunity to denigrate the Minister in the Federal House.

This is interesting to those who have a retentive memory and who have watched the Minister in Opposition and in office. Some of us will remember vividly the row that the State Minister had with the Hon. Mr. Jones at the famous Darwin meeting. I was not there but it was recounted to me, and the Minister has never denied it. Furthermore, many of us remember vividly one night in a public room of this House the Minister's speaking to Mr. Jones, who at that time was the Federal Minister for Transport, in rather strong and colourful language. He told Mr. Jones just what he thought of him because of what he believed Mr. Jones was doing in South Australia.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Were you earwigging, too?

Mr. COUMBE: I said this was in a public room.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Were you earwigging, too, on a private conversation?

Mr. COUMBE: It was made in such circumstances that the Minister interrupted what other members were doing at that time.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It's not a public room, either.

Mr. COUMBE: It is a public room to members of this House.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Members of the public are not entitled to go into that room.

Mr. COUMBE: It is a common room for members of this House. The Minister was hopping mad. It was all about the question of funding for South Australian roads because the Minister had been getting a hurry-up from Opposition members who were asking him about the allocations to local government, allocations in addition to those provided for roads in various categories. I remember in July, 1974, asking several questions, as did the members for Gouger and Eyre, about the famous \$31 000 000 deal. Following a question I asked, it was made plain by the Minister that the Commonwealth-State roads agreement was about to run out and would be replaced with a new agreement. One change was that the four categories included were to be replaced by the eight categories we have now. The Minister was apologetic when he was faced with several questions about that situation, and that is different from his present attitude. On July 31, 1974, in reply to my question the Minister said:

Concerning the sum granted to South Australia in the current financial year, \$31 000 000 will be made available. That sum is identical to the sum allocated under the old Commonwealth Aid Roads Act for 1973-74. In other words, under the proposed legislation we have been allocated the same sum for this financial year.

I then interjected, "No increase for inflation?", and the Minister replied:

No, nor has any allowance been made for the normal increases caused by expansion of activities.

That is what the Minister said when one of his Federal colleagues was in power and the allocation was the same as it had been the previous year, with no allowance for inflation, and now he has the hide to criticise on every possible occasion the present Federal Minister, who happens to belong to a Party opposed to his socialistic ideas. The Minister has recently said that South Australia will not come up with any more money from its own resources, as has been proposed in Canberra. When Labor was in power in Canberra he took a different attitude. He said:

We believe that it may be necessary to raise additional funds, but the decisions have not yet been taken. Until all these decisions have been taken, obviously decisions cannot be taken on distribution. However, we have said to local government, wherever the opportunity has been provided, that it should not automatically expect to receive continuing financial support at the level we have previously been able to give.

At that time the member for Eyre raised a similar question regarding the fact that councils were finding that their debit order work was being cut back by the Highways Department and the administration of the Transport Department. The Minister said then that the Government had told councils that they needed to plan their programmes to sustain themselves from their own resources; in other words, they should not expect assistance merely because they had received it in previous years. Thank goodness those difficult times are not with us at present, because we have the advantage of a special Local Government Grants Commission, and in some areas local government is getting additional funds. I mention this in passing

to highlight the tactics adopted by our Minister of Transport in relation to these matters, tactics that are at variance with his previous approach.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Weren't councils getting anything from the Grants Commission in the year you're talking about?

Mr. COUMBE: They were getting it from the Commonwealth Grants Commission. The Minister is most churlish about the additional assistance they are getting now, which is much more than they were getting at that time.

I wish to speak about North Malaysia Week. I have been involved in this matter three times. Dr. Lim is a distinguished Parliamentarian and I have met him many times. I also had the privilege of visiting Penang during Adelaide Week.

Mr. Gunn: You paid for it yourself.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes. I do not want to comment on the ethics or the value of the show but I must say that I was disappointed at the display put on for the public at Elder Park. I went somewhat eagerly to look at the industrial exhibits and I was horribly disappointed. Some of the craft work could have been done in a better way, particularly the batik display. I know many women and others were interested in seeing the batik display, which I believe was of poor quality: one can see a better display on sale in the city. If they wish to repeat the show I suggest to the organisers of North Malaysia Week that they upgrade the type of exhibition that was put on here for the interest, education and edification of the people of South Australia. If it is to be a success it must be better organised. I was disappointed, as were many other people. In 1975, our display in Penang was first rate. I think the organisers of the North Malaysia Week let down the people of South Australia.

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

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): The Monarto project was doubtful from when it was first announced, yet to date \$18 200 000 has been spent on the project by the State Government and \$2 800 000 is still to be spent. I do not know on what aspects of the Monarto concept that has yet to be spent, but I believe the people of South Australia would have received far better value for this money if it had been spent on outlying country areas which have been crying out for some time for funds. One project that immediately comes to mind is the airstrip at Coober Pedy. The Minister of Transport and the Government are fully aware that Coober Pedy has often been isolated because of flooding of the Stuart Highway. Once or twice the airstrip has been out of use because of rain. It is essential that the airstrip be sealed and have lights fitted so that aircraft can land during the night, or at any time.

The Government of South Australia can spend \$18 000 000 on the Monarto project and not build one house or transfer one person there, but it has not got \$200 000 to spend on this project. I believe \$200 000 of the \$2 800 000 the Government was holding at March 31 in relation to Monarto should be spent immediately to upgrade this airstrip. It is verging on a scandal that nearly \$18 000 000 of the people's money should be spent on a project of this nature when it has achieved absolutely nothing. I believe this Government should hang its head in shame because it has persisted with a scheme that was not workable from the start. It had not done its homework, on this pipedream of the Premier;

it was not properly researched and was not required at that time. Decentralisation would have been achieved if the Government had thought about what it was doing and had spent this \$18 000 000 in country centres where there is existing industry and where it could have built more homes and upgraded existing facilities. The project I have mentioned at Coober Pedy is long overdue, and the Government should immediately provide funds for it. The Premier has already spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on unemployment relief schemes. I hope some of the \$2 800 000 to which I have referred can be used for the work at Coober Pedy. We have listened to the nonsense from the Premier, the member for Henley Beach, when he was Minister and the current Minister of Mines and Energy. Up to now nothing has been achieved; the Director of the department resigned, he was paid out, a few glossy reports were made and a few trees planted.

Since the Fraser Government was elected to power we have seen, in this State in particular, every Minister in this Government, no matter what the project they are opening or what matter they are discussing, always say that the Commonwealth Government should be providing more funds. The people of South Australia should understand that what they are doing is asking the Prime Minister whether he will increase income tax so that this Government can take that money and spend it. The Government is not prepared to accept the responsibility of raising revenue itself. The Labor Party in South Australia and in the Commonwealth sphere is a Party of high taxation. It is saying, "Whack the taxes on the people so that the Government of South Australia can spend it as it thinks fit." It is saying not to worry about the people; just tax them until they are bankrupt; that does not matter. That is the policy of the South Australian Government. We in the Opposition have a responsibility to make sure the people of Australia and South Australia fully understand what the policy of this Government is.

I believe the people will reject the philosophy of the Dunstan Labor Government because they do not want taxes increased. If the South Australian Government does not believe in high taxation, where does it think the Commonwealth Government will get the extra money from? The only place money comes from is the pockets of the taxpayers. The Labor Party likes to get its greasy hands on the taxpayers' money because it believes that it can spend that money better than the people can spend it. I intend to explain clearly to the people wherever I go that this is what the Labor Party has in store for them—higher taxation. Where will the Commonwealth Government get not hundreds of millions but thousands of millions of dollars from?

Since the Fraser Government has been in power, several criticisms have been made about its economic policies. I ask the Premier and his colleagues to reflect on the policies of their predecessors. I will refresh their memories. We had a devaluation of the Australian dollar in December, 1972, of 7 per cent, followed by a further devaluation in 1973 of 5 per cent. Then there was a cut in the rate of tariffs of 25 per cent in 1973. In 1974, we had a severe credit squeeze, and a devaluation of 12 per cent. During that time we had a couple of Treasurers sacked (one Treasurer never even introduced a Budget). There was then a period when Ministers were being sacked and would not resign, and the Prime Minister had to go to his friend the Governor-General to get him to remove Mr. Cameron. I wonder whether Mr. Whitlam has replied to the flowing terms in which Mr. Cameron referred to him in a letter to the Secretary of Caucus the other day.

One can go through the economic mess the Whitlam Government left to the Fraser Government to sort out. In the 18 months the present Government has been in power it has set out to rectify the errors of the previous three years. Anyone who stands up to criticise the Fraser Government ought to put himself in that Government's position. That Government has done what is economically right, not what is popular, and it ill behoves members opposite to make their sneering comments.

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

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I raise a quite involved matter relating to the Local and District Criminal Courts Act Amendment Act (No. 2), 1974. The relevant parts of that amending Act are the definition sections, section 3 and section 11, incorporating the new Part VIIA relating to small claims under the parent Act. Part VIIA expressly prohibits representation of parties by legal practitioners unless all parties agree to such representation and the court is satisfied that no party who is not represented will be disadvantaged.

All that the defendant has to do is refuse agreement to legal representation. That Part also allows a party to be assisted in the presentation of his case by another person who cannot be a lawyer, etc., and if the court is satisfied that the party is unable to conduct the action without assistance, that the assistant appears without fee and that no disadvantage to any other party follows from such assistance. However, the party must be present in person before such assistance can be invoked. A party that is a body corporate can be represented by one of its officers, provided that such officer is not a lawyer, etc.

This is a problem that is facing business, property owners, and people who want to obtain satisfaction through the Local and District Criminal Courts. It seems that Parliament, in passing this legislation, created an anomaly. I will quote from a letter I have received on the matter, hoping that the Government and the Attorney-General will review the situation. It is as follows:

The rigid prohibition of representation worked such injustice in the case of motor vehicle damage claims under \$500 (the small claim limit) that special local court rules were introduced on March 24, 1975 (that is, less than 3 months after the small claims amendment itself) to allow insurance companies to conduct motor vehicle damages claims rather than to insist on the vehicle owner to be present or personally in court to conduct such a claim. This was a special case where the insurance company could exercise so-called "rights of subrogation", which arose out of the contract of insurance between the vehicle owner and the insurance company. However, there are other instances than motor vehicles claims where this rigid prohibition operates harshly, for often the party personally will find it extremely difficult to be in court on the date of trial and that party's personal presence would be unnecessary, anyway, because all of the relevant facts are known and can be testified to by someone else.

It is important to bring to the attention of the House the following case, namely, *Irena Rahim v. Scott, Mr. A. B.*, Adelaide Local Court Action No. 45257 of 1974, as follows:

In this case, the claim was for arrears of rent, and the owner of the property lived in Malaysia and it was managed for her by local letting agents, who knew all the facts of the matter and the details of the case and who would have to give evidence. However, because of the small claims prohibition on representation and insistence on parties appearing personally, the letting agents could not themselves conduct the case but the plaintiff personally had to be present. We were the solicitors who had issued

the summons on behalf of the plaintiff under instructions from the letting agents, and as soon as we knew the date of trial, namely, May 28, 1975, we wrote to the plaintiff in Malaysia and received a letter back, of which a copy is enclosed. The plaintiff had written a letter to the Adelaide Local Court requesting an adjournment for six months to November, 1975, because she was then making a trip to Adelaide and would be able to appear then. We forwarded that letter to the Clerk Local Court of Adelaide, but we were unable to appear in court on behalf of the plaintiff on May 28, 1975, because of the small claims legislation and we learned after the date of trial that the action had been struck out because of non-attendance of the parties, the defendant also being absent. We can only surmise that the court felt obliged by the small claims legislation to strike out the action, notwithstanding the plaintiff's letter requesting adjournment or else such letter was never brought to the court's attention at the time of the hearing.

That is the problem facing people who want to seek justice. When the small claims legislation was introduced, it was to be a means of enabling people to obtain what was rightly theirs, without going through an expensive legal process. However, in introducing the legislation we have created an anomaly for those who would be taken to task in the small claims court and are aware of the existing loophole. The solicitors have informed me that the above is an extreme case, but they make the point that there are cases where it is most harsh and unjust to insist on the personal attendance of a plaintiff whose place of residence may be many miles from Adelaide when such plaintiff has no personal knowledge of the facts of the matter, but in the normal course of events would have been represented at trial by a solicitor who would have called those persons with personal knowledge of the facts and so prove the case for the plaintiff. The letter continues:

We submit that there should be some limited discretion given to the court to allow representation "for special reasons" or "in unusual circumstances" or "where the prohibition on representation by a solicitor would be unduly harsh in the circumstances". There are other defects in the legislation, namely:

- (1) Both parties resorting for advice to the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch and both receiving advice that they will be successful at trial.
- (2) Unequal contest developing out of the fact that the plaintiff or defendant has been frequently involved in litigation and has become something of a "bush lawyer", whereas the other party is a one-time-only litigant. This prejudices not only the conduct of the trial on behalf of the inexperienced party but also any order as to payment by instalments that may be made by the court immediately after trial.
- (3) Because no costs for preparing the case for trial can be ordered against the unsuccessful party, no party is likely to seek legal advice on the preparation of the case for trial and often arrives at court without essential witnesses or evidence, thus either losing the case or involving all parties and the court in expense and inconvenience of an adjournment.

However, the above are general defects, the cure of which would perhaps require the repeal of the small claims amendment or its drastic alteration, whereas we think a good case can be made out for giving some discretion to the court in unusual cases to allow representation, and this discretion would not have such a drastic effect.

If we are interested in maintaining a fair go and a fair representation in our courts, this is the area in which the Government and Parliament should create legislation to assist people. Unfortunately, however, we have erred. I call on the Attorney-General and the Government to review the small claims legislation and make the appropriate amendments, as suggested.

In the brief time left, I will raise the matter of the inconsistency of the Valuer-General in valuing certain properties. Having looked through my file and the many complaints I have received from my constituents about

revaluation, I notice a variation of between 6 per cent to 33½ per cent between his valuation and the market value, indicating a hit-and-miss affair. If the Valuer-General is to be spot on, he must either value at current market value or value at about 10 per cent under the current market value. In many cases, there is a variation from almost spot on to as much as 33½ per cent. This reminds me of the classic example of a valuation of an industrial property at Camden Park that was valued at \$368 000. An appeal being successful, it was dropped to about \$260 000. The land tax had gone from \$81 10 years ago to \$7 846, but it was later reduced to \$4 000. What a ridiculous situation for a small company to find that its land tax in 1975-76 has gone from \$2 600 to \$7 800 in one year, and in 10 years from \$81 to \$7 846. So much for the assistance the State Government is giving to small industry in my district.

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

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I will raise several matters, dealing mainly with my own district, although the first matter is somewhat broader. It relates to public transport, the State Transport Authority and the general concern in my district about the standard of service people have been getting and the mix-up that has taken place with the change to the Morphettville depot, and the authority's buses that serve the Mitcham Hills area. As a member of Parliament, I may contact someone in a key position in a Government department to obtain information on why a service cannot be improved or the standard of vehicle improved and, when given the answers, rightly or wrongly I believe it my duty to let the electorate know. I put it in the local paper and, from the published comments, an agent for a product contacted me (about my statement on 5KA) saying that he believed that I had been misinformed and that my statements were inaccurate. I tried to check that with the person to whom I had originally spoken. He said that he found it difficult to discuss the matter further. I am at a loss to know how far a politician should go in seeking information on this type of subject. I will explain the situation in which I became involved. I was told by a person in the State Transport Authority that the new buses being purchased were unsuitable for use in the Hills because of the type of transmission. I was also told that they were too long and too wide. I do not believe that the last two points will stand up to the test, because they are not too wide or too long, and they can operate in the Mitcham Hills area especially. Because I said what I did about the transmission system, I received a letter, a copy of which was sent to the Minister, from Mr. Enkelman, Technical Manager of Transpec Limited in Melbourne, in which he stated:

The Z.F. 2HP-45 transmission has been used in Australian urban transport since 1968, in Adelaide, Brisbane, Melbourne, Canberra, and Hobart. Approximately 800 such units are in use today in Australia, and they have proven themselves to be eminently suitable for urban and suburban passenger bus traffic in cities with varying topography.

Last Friday I met Mr. Enkelman in Melbourne and discussed these matters. He had pointed out in his letter that he appreciated my concern about the safety of public transport in my Hills district. He told me that there was no danger with the type of transmission, that it was suitable, and that, if the S.T.A. thought that the differential ratio in the two-speed differential was too high for Hills use, it was a simple change to lower the ratio and it would cost no more than \$1 500 for each bus for the modification. Also, the differential, pinion, and crown wheel would be suitable for replacing in any other vehicle

in future. He assured me on this point, because his company supplied the steering Z.F. mechanism fitted on the new buses and also the transmission that runs from the rear of the engine. He was concerned that I had been given this information. I telephoned the Minister asking him for an explanation from the department, but I have not received it. I hope it will be made available soon. Secondly, I emphasised to the Minister again what he had written to me on March 25, when he stated:

Coaches designed specifically for tourist and charter work are not considered to be suitable for regular use on urban bus services. In addition, all of the authority's coaches are being utilised on tours or charters and they cannot be made available for route services.

What is the S.T.A. supposed to supply? Our first priority must be for commuters, and charter work is out. If the Minister was a member on this side and the Liberal Party was in Government, he would be the strongest advocate for the point that buses should be brought back into metropolitan services in order to overcome the problem of a poor bus public transport system. I received a telephone call from people at Salisbury Primary School who stated that the bus to take the children home in the afternoon had not arrived on two occasions. The children were left waiting for the bus until 4 p.m., and then the teachers said that they could not take the children and that it would be better if the children started to walk towards their homes. It is not only in my district that buses fail to arrive. If charter buses are not to be used for the Hills (and they are suitable, because they go through the Blue Mountains and other hilly parts of the country), all we can expect in future are reject buses from the plains, and that is an unfair situation. People in the Hills are not second-class citizens, and they deserve the same public transport as is available to any other section of metropolitan Adelaide. I now refer to the millipede problem.

Mr. Becker: Keep them up your way.

Mr. EVANS: These insects are coming towards the city slowly but surely. If they hit a Labor Party district, the Government would make money available to have research undertaken. Mr. Baker is in Europe now ready to carry out an investigation on these insects in their original habitat, but the Government refuses to make money available. No transport cost is involved, because he is in Europe now and wants money to carry out the research. Millipedes are so prevalent in the Hills that they can be swept up by the shovelful. They are in Crafers at present, but they will be in Burnside, Mitcham, and Unley within four years at their present travel rate. They are not an insignificant specie of insect; they annoy people, because they get into houses and creep and crawl into beds. They are causing problems of mental health to people who have to put up with them.

I ask the Government to make money available so that Mr. Baker, while in Europe, can undertake an investigation. If they were in the district of a Labor member, the member would know what trouble they cause. I ask the Government seriously to consider the problem of millipedes, as some people have sold their houses because of them. Outside the Stirling District Council chamber many are lying dead on the footpath: some have died from old age, others from the weather, and some from being sprayed. They are a menace, and I hope that the Government has enough common sense and respect for the quality of life of people living in the Hills to make money available so that Mr. Baker can carry out research while he is in Europe. He will do the research, if he is granted money to do so.

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

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I do not know whether this is a grievance, but Government members have made abundantly clear that they have only one special concern. It is what all good business people should be doing, that is, staying in business. Obviously, that is the theme of the actions of the Government, as it seems to be hell bent on staying in business. When Parliament resumed last Tuesday we saw an unholy alliance between the Government and the member for Mitcham, who had the loyal support of members opposite to get an important but convenient message across. The Government did not wish to face up to a debate on child pornography, a matter which is uppermost in everyone's mind. The Premier's statement in Parliament was made to take the edge off what is a sore point with members opposite. It must have been very much against the grain for members opposite to support the member for Mitcham on that motion last week. Far worse than that, the distinguished member for Henley Beach dispensed to his members a document which was obviously to be the forerunner of a debate that occurred the following day and which spelt out the changed Government policy on uranium. I am sure that the Minister of Mines and Energy must have been sad that evening and the following day to see that change of policy. It shocked Australia; in fact, it was discussed in the Federal Parliament.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What was discussed was your supporting it.

Mr. RODDA: If the honourable member was to check his facts he would ascertain that I was not in this House when a vote on the motion was taken.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You abstained from voting?

Mr. RODDA: Yes. The ploy the Government is adopting was further highlighted last weekend with demonstrations in each capital city against the mining of uranium. In Perth, the Attorney-General said "We will leave uranium in the ground", or words to that effect. When fossil fuels run out, as most surely they will, I suppose the member for Stuart will ride his bicycle from Port Augusta or wherever he may be at that time. This Government is hell bent on staying in business. The Hon. John Cornwall is reported as saying in Mount Gambier:

Signs have emerged that the contest for the State seat of Mount Gambier will develop into a dirty tricks campaign . . . In a desperate bid to retain the seat the Liberal Party is already off and running with attempts to discredit the State Government through misrepresentation and distortion.

What a lot of hogwash. I attended the function in Mount Gambier for the opening of a college there. Where was the member for Mount Gambier? He should have been sitting on the platform in his rightful place, but he was stuck back in the audience and sitting along the wall. That sort of treatment is not going unnoticed. It ill behoves the Hon. John Cornwall to talk about a dirty campaign when the sort of thing that occurred to the member for Mount Gambier is happening and is emanating from Government sources. Announcement after announcement of this nature is being issued by the Australian Labor Party office in Mount Gambier. That office was opened by the Premier the same day as the college was opened, the same day that the elected member for Mount Gambier, whom the people of Mount Gambier elected at the last election by a 16 per cent swing—

Mr. Venning: He'll do it again, too.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You might even do it, Rocky.

Mr. RODDA: The Minister can talk about the member for Rocky River, who is coming in for some attention but over the weekend we heard that generous Government support was given to the people at Wallaroo. The Opposition will highlight more of this "staying in business at all costs" theme, as evidenced by the spending of money in certain areas. However, we do not hear great pronouncements in Millicent or Naracoorte anymore.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Tell us about the Privy Council hearing. Do you think you could finance another appeal to the Privy Council from Liberal funds?

Mr. RODDA: The Minister can talk about the Privy Council, but the Hon. Mr. Cornwall is further reported as saying:

The interests of country people and those in the city are closely inter-related in the fact that the two communities are interdependent and cannot afford to adopt an attitude of divisional confrontation.

The Minister talks about going to the Privy Council: the reason why Mr. Gilbertson is before the Privy Council is one vote one value, or staying in office at all costs. If a free citizen of this State has to spend a large sum of money to go to London, what sends him there is the freedom of the individual and not the hypocrisy as stated by the Hon. Mr. John Cornwall. Unionists are not enamoured at what has occurred in Government circles. It is time that everyone in this Parliament thought about something that is good for South Australia instead of indulging in nest-feathering. We should all be grateful to Mr. Gilbertson, who has gone to London to challenge this lopsided, iniquitous—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You've got your letter-set demand.

Mr. RODDA: The Minister is good at putting words in my mouth. What he has said is new, but it certainly fits in with the theme of staying in business at all costs. After all, that is part and parcel of this Government, which is going out on a high note of self-survival.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You—

Mr. RODDA: It will take more than the distinguished presence of the Government Whip, who is milling amongst his members and giving them orders in brown paper parcels, which they receive in stunned silence—

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

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I wish to bring the House back from anything that may be happening in London, however interesting that may be, to the subject of housing, which is much more appropriate, I am sure, for most South Australians. In conversation a moment ago with the member for Stuart I ascertained that in his district the housing situation is much worse than it is in mine.

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

Mr. WARDLE: At the adjournment, I was about to say that I was in no way reflecting on the Housing Trust or implying that it had not done its job quite well in my area. Before I become in any way critical, I want to express my gratitude to the trust for erecting about 730 trust units in my own town alone, irrespective of what has been erected in other townships within the district. In many ways I am grateful for the effort made but, after a period of almost 10 years as member, I believe that I am able to see and understand an area of housing which, to my mind, is deficient at present. I have no doubt that other members have the same problem. It arises from so many elderly people occupying houses, often large houses, within the town area.

Frequently, these houses are on such large blocks that it is difficult for elderly people to pay for the garden to be kept in the way they would like it kept. These people are on their own, and many of them are widows. With so many family applicants, where there are husband, wife and children, it is quite impossible for the trust to accept applications from single persons. I have had many single persons who have come to my office and who have pleaded to be able to apply for a trust house. They find it difficult to understand the policy of the trust in not accepting applications from single persons.

Mr. Vandeeper: Have they any family?

Mr. WARDLE: In these instances, they have no family. If a member of the family lived at home, they would be eligible to apply for a trust house. These are single men and women, largely women.

Mr. Vandeeper: You're not talking about single-parent families?

Mr. WARDLE: No. Let me assure my colleague that I have many applicants in that category, and I have found the trust most helpful. Wherever possible, it allots houses to single-parent families. In my district at present, the number of applications from single-person families is greater than is the number from normal families. The waiting list is longer for single-parent families. Not necessarily the longest waiting list in numbers, but the list it will take longest to satisfy is the list of pensioner couples. Almost 20 years ago, Sir Thomas Playford was able to secure Federal money without interest. With that he built 15 houses in Murray Bridge. They were very nice two-bedroom units, built of local limestone.

The trust will accept applications from pensioner couples for these units. If anything should happen to one of the two people, the trust does not require the remaining person to leave. Often then, one person is living in one of these two-bedroom cottages and may live there for a long time. Over the years I have carried out several surveys. I have taken the trouble to contact all the local doctors to see what are their views on housing aged single persons. They assure me that, in dealing with patients in this group, they have many people who need housing other than the large family houses they occupy. I believe there is a real need for the Housing Trust pensioner flats, whether single units or built in clusters. I think the member for Light has a group of pensioner flats in his town, but I do not know of many country towns outside the metropolitan area where such units have been provided.

The member for Gouger indicates that he has some. I have been trying for many years to persuade the trust of the need for this type of dwelling in Murray Bridge, which now has a population of about 7 500. Elderly people find it difficult to understand that the trust will not accept from them applications for Housing Trust units. I believe that many houses would be released for occupation by normal families if such accommodation could be provided. I am satisfied that many people are involved in heavy costs in having someone in to help clean a large house and also to help with the gardening. Many of these people are now on pensions. Although they may receive a small amount of superannuation as well, basically the bulk of their income is the pension. Therefore, they are not well endowed to maintain a family house. In every way that one might look at this subject, it would be a distinct advantage to have in our town a group of pensioner flats.

I appreciate the recent change in Housing Trust policy whereby increased rentals are being charged when more than one person in a house is working, or on the basis

of a family income. Many people in the community could well afford a deposit and would have the means to arrange a housing loan. They are in a position to launch out for themselves. To my mind, the Housing Trust has a specific function to perform in the community and that is especially to provide housing for those who have no opportunity whatever of providing their own. They are people who are not able to have that vital amount of deposit to get a loan and commence their own house. In many cases, the income in a family means that it is well within the reach of that family to borrow sufficient funds to purchase its own house. I believe such action would bring a number of houses on to the market to be occupied by applicants. Seldom in the past 10 years has the number of applicants in my town been below 100.

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

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): I wish to draw the attention of the House to the soldier settlement issue on Kangaroo Island. I could speak for some time on many matters affecting my own district, but I feel so strongly on this matter that I wish to spend my short time this evening dealing with it. I was a member of the Land Settlement Committee which investigated matters on Kangaroo Island. Having had 40 years of practical farming on my own account, I would be in a better position to speak on this subject than would any other member in this House. Further, as I am the father of the House, I hope that members will listen to fatherly advice. I spoke briefly on this matter in the urgency debate last Tuesday, but I had only three minutes in which to speak and I spent that time refuting the remarks that the Premier had made on the matter.

Members know that the Land Settlement Committee met in July last year and investigated this situation thoroughly, bringing down a report in October. Much has happened in primary producing since this time last year. When the investigation was first taken up, land values and wool prices were low and the valuations of land on the island were taken at these low rates. In the meantime, land values have escalated considerably and the drought on the mainland in the early part of the season last year had the effect of increasing land values on the island considerably.

Land values have increased astronomically on the mainland, and to compare a holding on Kangaroo Island with one on the mainland, I point out that a farm in the Mid North, in an assured rainfall area, comprising about 450 hectares, is bringing up to \$250 000, whereas a cleared block of land of the same size on Kangaroo Island at present is valued at about \$70 000 to \$80 000. There is much more viability in the industry at present than there was at this time last year. I warned the Land Settlement Committee several times that agriculture was a matter of peaks and troughs. When a person is at the bottom of the trough and things look desperate, they usually take a turn for the better and run back to a peak, and then revert to a trough. This has happened in agriculture since South Australia was first founded, and I feel that it will continue always.

I warned the committee that, if we did not examine the position thoroughly and if land values escalated and some settlers were forced off their properties, they could be forced off and yet pay off debts at 100 cents in the dollar, embarrassing the committee as well as the Government. I issue the same warning now. The same thing can happen regarding some of the seven settlers that I understand are to be given eviction notices. We are looking at equity, not at the amount of debt. Many farmers on the mainland who

are paying \$250 000 for land at present have huge overdrafts. The amount owed by these settlers on Kangaroo Island is only chicken feed in comparison.

Primary produce value has increased considerably in the past 12 months and, when we investigated the position on the island, most of these settlers had the natural increase in stock for the previous year on hand. Last year, they could not sell the stock. Prices were so low that they did not pay the freight to the mainland, so the settlers held on to their natural increase in both sheep and cattle and they have been able to dispose of surplus stock this year, cattle at reasonable prices and sheep at exceptionally good prices, and the price of wool increased in the 12 month from about \$200 to \$300 a bale. Some wool cheques alone this year will be about \$10 000 more than we estimated 12 months ago when we investigated the position.

One of the seven settlers had more than 2 000 sheep on hand when we were on the island last year. At the markets in the North last week, bare-shorn wethers were bringing \$16 a head, and this is the current rate throughout the North at present. Some sheep with six months wool are bringing \$21 or \$23. This settler on the island, with 2 000 sheep, has \$30 000 worth of sheep alone, putting the sheep value reasonably low at \$15 a head. He also has 170 head of cattle. As his debt is no more than \$60 000 or \$70 000, he could easily pay off more than half the debt in the current year.

We must be careful in making decisions of this kind, because, as I have said, some of these settlers could be forced off their land, yet pay debts at the rate of 100 cents in the dollar, and the Government would be embarrassed if that happened. The Premier said in the debate last week:

If the honourable member or any other member can come forward with a proposition on behalf of any of the remaining seven farmers that shows a means of their reasonably trading out of the position, or that their contention can be well based that they have been directed specifically into uneconomic activities that have resulted specifically in this debt structure, we will consider their case.

These settlers had been given until March 31 to reply, or else. That time has expired, and I understand that when the time expired there was no reply. I ask the Government to give extra time for these settlers to consider their cases. I asked the Premier last week whether the Government had taken another valuation of the assets of these particular seven settlers. It would not take long to do this and, with the current prices of wool, sheep and lambs, I am sure the overall situation of the settlers would be much better than it was at this time last year. I appeal to the Government to do this before it takes drastic action, because I am convinced from the visits that we had there and from talking to the settlers that some of them can trade their way out of their trouble.

So much for the future: let us look at the past. We must remember that the Kangaroo Island soldier settlement scheme was the last of the various schemes in South Australia and that the applicants were the last of those to be settled. The average time for which these settlers have been on Kangaroo Island is 14 years. Virgin scrub cannot be cleared and brought into top productivity in 14 years. The Yarloop clover matter has been debated here and we know that it takes about 10 or 12 years for natural grasses to take over from the clover, so it takes about 12 years before there are any signs of overcoming the Yarloop clover situation.

There is also the matter of rent. The rents being paid on Kangaroo Island are twice those being paid in the South-East, which is far more productive and which has cheaper marketing costs. Kangaroo Island settlers are paying double the rent for the area cleared, as well as paying high freights. I appeal to the Government to consider the matter again. If the settlers come out and pay off debts at 100c in the dollar, the Government should not say that I did not warn it.

Mr. VANDEPEER (Millicent): The first subject that I wish to raise in this grievance debate concerns some aspects of the North Malaysia Week celebrations held recently. The part of the celebrations to which I refer was held on the Monday evening, when the senior citizens of our State were invited. I consider that it was something of a fiasco, especially for the senior citizens. After waiting for about three hours with little to do, with few chairs provided and with the air getting cold, many people to whom I spoke went home rather disgruntled. However, I should like to mention one aspect of that evening's entertainment, when the Malaysian people raised two flags during the celebrations. One flag I took to be something to do with the Malaysian flag; I have not yet decided what the other flag was supposed to be, but it was a very large piece of cloth held aloft on a pole probably reaching to a point six metres from the ground, and the flag went out another six metres from the pole and then went straight to the apex, forming a triangle—a very nice piece of blue cloth.

Mr. Mathwin: Probably it was the Blue Peter.

Mr. VANDEPEER: No, it was not. At the top of the triangle of cloth, at the apex, was what I presumed to be the Union Jack. Below the Union Jack and to the right and in the position that the Southern Cross usually occupies on our own Australian flag there was what I presumed to be the Southern Cross with the stars in the correct position, approximately. Then there was a six-pointed star to the left of and beneath the Union Jack representing the six States, all on a large piece of blue cloth. The point that first caught my eye was that I do not believe the Union Jack (if that is what it was supposed to be) was the Union Jack, since the red and white stripes of the Jack were not the correct width and not in the correct place. To include that Union Jack on a large piece of cloth with the Southern Cross and a six-pointed star means to me that that piece of cloth was a desecration of our Australian flag; I was very upset to see this so-called flag or banner (call it what you will) raised alongside the other banner of the Malaysian group, and I presume it was meant to be our Australian flag. I was very concerned and would like to look at that piece of cloth or flag again, examine it closely, and see just what the intentions were of the people who designed and made it, because I consider from what I saw that that flag was nothing less than a complete and utter desecration of our Australian flag and this Government should be brought to book for this; it should have quietly told the Malaysian people, if they were the ones who produced that flag, that it should not be raised here in South Australia. To allow it to be raised is just another weak moment on the part of this Government in allowing law and order to break down in our community. I mean that. Our Australian flag is our pride; it is a symbol of our country and its heritage and of law and order in this country, and to break that down and desecrate our Australian flag is assisting in breaking down law and order in our community. This I deplore very much.

The matter of law and order has been brought up today by the member for Heysen. There has been so much concern about this matter in our community that I will have something to say about it. Without law and order properly administered, our society would soon degenerate into chaos. We must all respect the rule of law. The juvenile offender who has been apprehended must be taught to respect the society in which he lives and to obey its laws. We all agree on that. The difficulty we have is in deciding just how we should encourage or make the young offender obey our laws: do we do it by rehabilitation or by strict discipline, or by a combination of them both? Most of us would agree that a combination of them both is the correct method. At present, we are following the soft approach too much. Many people are appalled at the repeated flaunting of our laws by members of our society. Some blame is to be laid on the shoulders of the older generation, which should set the example but does not always do so. We are lax in our approach to many of the problems in our society, and many of us will not stand up and be counted. That is an important point, as many of the problems in our society could be solved or alleviated if only many more people would stand up and say what they think, but too many of them are too apathetic to do so. We in this Chamber, as elected members of this Parliament, should be of the highest integrity and honour, and so set the example for the remainder of the community.

Mr. Keneally: I'm not too sure about you mob, but we're all right.

Mr. VANDEPEER: If members opposite had the same integrity and honour as we on this side have, that would be very good and a great improvement.

I now refer to the rural assistance programme operated by our Lands Department, and the colossal time taken in processing applications for assistance. Assistance has been provided by the Federal Government on a \$1 for \$1 basis, with some contribution by the State Government, and it is there to help sections of the rural industries that are in deep trouble. The section it is mainly applied to in my electoral district is the dairying industry, and many of these applications take a tremendous time to process. In the meantime, these people are living below the bread line. As an instance of some of the decisions made, I had a constituent whose total assets amounted to over \$200 000. That sounds a lot of assets, and it is. His total liabilities were less than \$10 000, and he wished to purchase 300 acres of land at \$150 an acre. This would enable him to bring home his son, who is about to leave school and thus he has to find an occupation for him.

The farm was a little too big for him to work by himself but not big enough for two, and he wanted his son home. In all, he wanted to borrow \$45 000, but the committee said that the combined built-up property showed only a marginal surplus to service the costs of running the property and, therefore, the application was refused: a total borrowing programme of \$45 000, added to that of previous liabilities of under \$10 000, making a total of \$55 000 on a total asset value of over \$200 000, and he was considered not viable. That is an example of the problems that the rural industry faces at the moment with huge assets and not sufficient production. I think perhaps the production in this case was sufficient but the committee did not think so, and it shows the huge problem we have in the rural community where people have colossal assets which are no good unless they have production; one cannot eat assets; one can live only off production and, if the production is not great enough, one is in real trouble. A person in the dairying industry today requires \$200 000 or

more of assets before he can get a living; that is an example of the high costs involved in this industry and the great problems it is facing at the moment.

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

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I bring to the attention of the House a matter to which I have referred previously. It is a matter of great importance to me and especially to my constituents and those of a Government member. It relates especially to the young and the aged. When the Government decides to introduce clearways in the State, it must first cater for the needs of the young and the old, especially pedestrians who have to cross these clearways. Too much emphasis is placed now on the free flow of traffic, and it seems that motor cars are the gods of the future. The Government has at last decided to install traffic lights on Brighton Road adjacent to Jetty Road, Glenelg, after many years of representation by me. It has taken so long to install them that one would have thought that the Minister of Transport would have morning tea with frock coats and top hats provided.

The lights have now been installed, but there is a further problem: I refer to the Hove crossing, near which the Brighton Senior Citizens Club is situated. This club has more than 700 members, all of them aged 60 years, some are aged 70 years and others are 80 years of age. Many of these people have to cross Brighton Road. Adjacent to Brighton Road in this area is Mawson High School, which is attended by many students of both sexes. The present situation creates a further problem for the young people trying to cross Brighton Road from east to west, because there is no provision for them to do so. Several suggestions have been made, but no action has been taken.

Mr. Jennings: What's the local member been doing?

Mr. MATHWIN: Apparently, he has been scratching himself but is not taking any action. I want action taken to provide safety for his constituents as well as for mine. Many accidents have occurred in this area, and recently several involved young schoolchildren. The biggest problem is for old people to cross Brighton Road. The Government has provided a median strip in the centre of the road, and has publicised that this strip is a safety area. First, the person has to get there and, after a person who is almost 70 or 80 years of age has crossed the first stretch, he has to get up about 3 centimetre to stand on the median strip whilst traffic is passing on both sides of the road.

I defy anyone, especially old people, to obtain any comfort from standing in the middle of the road watching traffic hurtling in front of and behind them. For the Minister and the Government to say that this is a safety area in the middle of a clearway with dense traffic is a dense statement from a dense Government. It is not safe at all. Old people especially are upset and worried about facing the problem of crossing Brighton Road. The Brighton Senior Citizens Club is probably the busiest club of its type in the State: it has an excellent committee, looks after its own business, and operates effectively. The only fly in the ointment is that these people have to go through the nervous strain of crossing the road to reach the club and then, after the completion of the afternoon's entertainment, they have to return across the road.

I hope that the Government will place some priority on installing a pedestrian crossing. I know it has a problem because the railway crossing is so close, and that there has to be synchronisation with the train service, but it is not an impossible problem and could be and should have

been solved quickly. It is a disgrace that the Government for so long has failed to think about this problem. Some action should be taken now to provide a safe passage for these elderly citizens and for the young students from Mawson High School. Another matter to which I refer is the evening provided for senior citizens at Elder Park to see the Queen. The Queen arrived in *Popeye* but there was no flood-lighting to enable the senior citizens to see her in the dark, and when she sat down her seat was also in the dark.

Mr. Keneally: Were you there?

Mr. MATHWIN: I gave my tickets to some elderly citizens so that they could see the Queen.

Mr. Langley: I gave mine to pensioners, and they tell me they are a different race.

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable member has said that there is a difference between pensioners and senior citizens. In my opinion pensioners are senior citizens and senior citizens have done something for this State. They deserve some consideration from the Government in providing something better than the fiasco that was provided at Elder Park.

The other matter to which I refer concerns a senior staff training programme. I have a copy of a programme set out as a time table, and from 11.40 to 11.50 (chaired by Eva) all participants are to find an object they consider beautiful and return to the meeting with it. Each person in one minute or less then explains why he thinks the object is beautiful.

Later in the programme, from 12.15 to 12.25 (chaired by Eva), under the heading "My buttons", three members are to describe their personal buttons and how they control them. From 12.25 to 12.30 (also chaired by Eva) each member fills in the missing word on a piece of paper concealed from others in this sentence: "The reasons Charlie's hair is white is because he..... too much". Charlie then gives his suggestion, and gets one hug from the member of his choice for each matching answer. Each member in turn gives the answer he or she wrote down. This is a senior staff training agenda, and the persons who chaired the items is Miss Eva Thompson who, I believe, is second in command at McNally Training Centre. It is a training programme agenda for the senior staff at that centre.

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

Motion carried.

Bill taken through its remaining stages.

UNITING CHURCH IN AUSTRALIA BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The SPEAKER: The Legislative Council draws attention to clause 32, printed in erased type, which clause, being a money clause, cannot originate in the Legislative Council but which is deemed necessary to the Bill.

MENTAL HEALTH BILL

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

That the report be noted.

I pay a tribute to the Select Committee members, who applied themselves diligently over a considerable period to a consideration of this Bill and possible amendments. They worked wholeheartedly on behalf of this House and on behalf of the people affected by the Bill. Following its inquiries, the committee has recommended amendments to the Bill. In the interests of the people affected by the Bill, the committee held 21 meetings, took evidence from 32 witnesses, and received further submissions from 16 persons and organisations. That indicates the magnitude of the committee's task. Members of the Public Service and representatives of organisations associated with mental health and with mentally handicapped people provided valuable assistance.

I refer particularly to the committee's visit to Glenside Hospital and to the assistance rendered by Dr. Shea, by the Director-General of Mental Health (Dr. Dibden), and by the Superintendent of Glenside Hospital (Dr. Hoff), who on the day in question went to great lengths to ensure that the committee received all the information that it wanted to receive. Following a tour of the hospital during which information was provided wherever members wished to stop, there was a consolidation period in one of the hospital rooms where any last-minute information could be obtained. I place on record the committee's appreciation of the courtesies extended on that occasion by the officers I have named and by other staff members, all of whom went to great lengths to ensure that the committee received all the information that it wanted to receive.

At that time, the task loomed large in the minds of all the committee members, and we were therefore very grateful for the assistance rendered by the research staff of the Parliamentary Library who researched all Australian and British legislation in this field; they also made available the whole range of literature on the subject. It turned out to be a fairly large pile of material. Many of us on the committee considered that information, which dated from about 1954 until 1976-77. Therefore, much information was available to the committee. The committee, having considered all the research material available, reached two general conclusions, both of which I will outline briefly and which were summed up neatly in a paper on legislative needs in the field of mental retardation by Gunnar Dybwad. His paper is available in the Public Library. Two short excerpts from his paper took my fancy, and I brought them to the attention of the committee. I suspect that those excerpts had some effect on the committee in preparing its report. Whether they had the right effect is for the House to judge. In referring to legislation generally, Gunnar Dybwad said (when talking about how much one should go into a subject regarding legislation):

There is a real danger in having too much legislation specifically for mentally retarded people or for handicapped people in general . . . Problems are created when legislation is too specific in describing the person who should receive a service rather than describing the services and the needs they are supposed to meet. This is less likely to result in the exclusion of persons.

It was that kind of thinking that the committee tried to keep in mind in considering the Bill.

Mr. Coumbe: It could be applied to other Bills, too.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: True, but I must stick fairly strictly to the matter under consideration. If members have heard me correctly they would probably not expect a plethora of changes to the Bill, and they would be right, because not many changes are intended. That is not to say that changes that we considered necessary are not proposed. It was a pleasure to be Chairman of a Select Committee that is presenting a unanimous report to the

House. That it was a unanimous report will probably benefit members in deciding how they will treat it. One of the advantages of presenting a Select Committee report to the House is that it is not necessary to go over detail by detail all that is contained in the Bill, because that information, in general, is contained in the report anyway.

The report and its attendant amendments are such that they allow for the future proclamation of the main parts of this legislation but also provide for the continuation of two parts of the old Act. I refer to what has been headed "transitional provisions", which relates to certain powers of the Public Trustee (the administrator). Those powers are now contained in the old Mental Health Act. I also refer to certain provisions in the old Act relating to criminal mental defectives. Reference will be made in Committee to a fairly voluminous schedule containing many paragraphs. I take this opportunity to draw to the attention of the House (knowing that it is not a matter on which members generally dwell) and commend the efforts of the Secretary (Geof Mitchell), who was not only the Secretary of this committee but was also the Secretary of another fairly long and involved committee on noise control at the same time. All of us who have served on select committees know that the work is hard and arduous, and that one's interest and enthusiasm in the Bill is difficult to maintain. The task must be doubly difficult for the Secretary, and to work on two committees at the same time deserves some mention.

Much time was spent taking evidence, hearing submissions, and making decisions that will become apparent during the debate on clause 9, which relates to the objectives of the Bill. The committee has made certain recommendations and proposes certain amendments regarding that clause. That is not to say that the original Bill was necessarily deficient but, with the additional evidence that came forward, it seemed to the committee that a further broadening of the objectives would be in line with what was required and would also improve the Bill. It is in that spirit that the information has been put forward. Similarly, clause 14, dealing with the admission to detention of persons affected by the Act, created much concern. The matter begins with a decision by a qualified medical practitioner, and further periods of detention may follow. All members of the committee would agree that a loss of liberty is an important matter. Consequently, much time was spent dealing with it and much evidence was taken about it. I recommend to the House the decisions and recommendations of the committee in that regard, as they were made after much consideration. Finally, clause 19 refers to psychosurgery and electro-convulsive therapy, amongst other things. I have indicated the importance of that clause simply by citing those two areas of treatment.

Much evidence was taken on that topic, from medically qualified people, psychiatrists, persons who carry out operations on the head are generally, persons who have undergone the treatment, and persons who have been associated with this area for long periods in various group organisations outside the medical profession. The committee gave much consideration to this area and again unanimously arrived at the recommendations contained in the report. There is no need for me to dwell further on the report, and I merely ask honourable members to consider the recommendations in it and support the motion.

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen): I support the motion. I do not intend to canvass many points that have been raised by the Minister, but I appreciate the opportunity given to me to take part in the Select Committee's deliberations. Mental health is a subject not understood by the average

person, including me, and I appreciated the opportunity to examine further the problems associated with it, including problems associated with the existing Act. I have been interested in this matter since I attended a symposium about 12 months or 18 months ago with the Hon. Mr. Hill from another place. That symposium was called by the Director of Mental Health (Dr. Dibden) and involved people and organisations concerned about the need for a new mental health Bill. People attending that symposium would be satisfied with the results that have come forward in this report, which refers to the many topics raised at the symposium.

I was extremely impressed with the evidence submitted. Obviously, all witnesses called or who came voluntarily put much work into their submissions and understood the problems. They were able to express those problems clearly to the committee, and I was especially impressed by the submissions of Dr. Dibden and also Dr. Hoff (Superintendent, Glenside Hospital). As the Minister indicated, Dr. Hoff was generous enough to spend more than half a day showing the committee through Glenside Hospital, enabling us to see more closely some of the problems that exist. Dr. Shea (Director-General of Medical Services) also contributed much in his evidence.

One of the main features in the new legislation is that much of the stigma previously associated with mental health, which was evident in the previous legislation, will be removed. In fact, this Bill has been referred to by several witnesses as a "friendly" Bill.

That is a good thing, because many of the people who will be under the care associated with this Bill will find it much easier to cope with such stigma removed. Finally, I have appreciated the opportunity as a layman of becoming involved in this report and can only concur in the conclusion and the recommendations in the report, which state, especially the following:

Your committee believe that with the proposed amendments the Bill will enable a high standard of care, treatment and protection for persons suffering from mental illness or handicap, and accordingly recommends that it be passed with the amendments in the schedule attached hereto.

I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I support the motion. First the Select Committee's approach to this type of social measure has again proved to be a useful one, as was the case with the Health Commission Bill. One cannot help but believe that a more accurate and far better researched result obtained by using Select Committees in this area. It was obvious to committee members that the community as a whole agrees with the concept of mental health presented in this Bill, the basic concept being that patients should be seen as people with a right to dignity. I am pleased to say that the Bill reflects existing practice.

It was interesting to note that the huge advances in drug therapy have vastly reduced the number of long-term patients. I was interested to learn of the developments proposed for the future, especially the concept of the virtual removal of institutions and, in the long term, placing the mentally ill with the physically ill in general hospitals, that is, with a few exceptions remaining in cases of intractable mental illness. It was also important and satisfying to learn that, in the field of psychiatric illness in South Australia, there no longer appears to be the abuses of the kind alleged to exist in other countries and other States of Australia. I am referring to psychosurgery, electroconvulsive therapy and aversion therapy. There was no strong evidence at all before the committee which it could accept that any of these practices were in any way abused.

Dr. Tonkin: There were some suggestions.

Mr. McRAE: Suggestions were made, but they came from quarters and were put in such a way that not one committee member supported them. Nonetheless, I stress that this Bill certainly aims to ensure that this apparently happy position is maintained. I believe that clause 19 adequately handles that aspect. I should like briefly to refer to some of the major features of the Bill. First, the new objectives are noted in paragraph 10 of the report and, as the Minister has already referred to that, I will cut short my remarks, except to note new objective (b), which states:

provide for the integration and co-ordination of services and the encouragement of community involvement.

As in the case of the Health Commission, I was astounded to find the great variety of sincerely motivated and efficient organisations in this area; these organisations often overlap, but integration is important. Equally important, as we found out in relation to the Health Commission, is the encouragement of community involvement. That is now happening and I am sure we would like to see it fostered.

The provision of the guardianship board is of great significance and should be applauded. The board should reasonably be able to provide the protection and care of all patients that we would desire. The Minister has referred to the admission and detention procedures. The committee has attempted to clarify and greatly strengthen these procedures so as to prevent any potential abuse, and I use the words "potential abuse" advisedly, because there was no evidence before us that the existing position had been abused.

We have made sure that members of the Police Force, who in the past have had grave difficulties in dealing with mentally ill people at large, are now provided with adequate powers and protection. They may take a mentally ill person to a doctor and then to an approved hospital, or they may go to a doctor's surgery and escort the person to an approved hospital, or from an approved hospital to an approved hospital, at all times balancing the rights of the mentally ill person and of the Police Force.

It is clear that the prime objectives of removing the old Bill, replacing it with a new Bill related to modern concepts and establishing and maintaining the personal liberties and dignities of the patient have been achieved. Members will note two important things that have yet to be achieved. In the long schedule to which the Minister referred, there is a continuation of the criminal mental defective procedure. Paragraph 32 of the Select Committee's report, which I think is well worth quoting because it is an important area which actually we felt was outside the ambit of the committee, but concerning which something should be done, states:

Questions were raised about the present concepts of treatment and care of persons with psychopathic or sociopathic problems. In particular your committee considered the problem dealing with persons afflicted with these conditions in the law courts. These points are considered to be valid and urgent but outside the scope of the Bill. Your committee therefore recommends that the Government initiate a further inquiry into this question as to the method by which such persons can be best assisted during and after proceedings in the courts of criminal law.

Those observations were made in the light of submissions that we had before us from the Law Society of South Australia, and part of that submission referred to a judgment of Mr. Justice Jacobs, to which I should like to make brief reference; secondly, that observation stemmed from a communication from Mr. Justice Zelling along the same lines. What they were saying was two-fold: first, the

existing provisions relating to criminally mental defective persons are themselves simply not adequate to deal with the range of people before the courts. There is one specific example given by Mr. Justice Jacobs.

In a decision in 1976 he referred to the existing Mental Health Act. What we have had to do, unfortunately, because of what we took to be a restriction on our ambit, is maintain in another Act (that is to say, the Criminal Law Consolidation Act) the existing provisions of the Mental Health Act in relation to criminal mental defectives. We felt that it was wrong that, in an Act which had modernised the whole concept of approaching mental illness, we should have the fairly outdated and ineffective provisions relating to mental defectives who commit crimes, but by that we have not solved the problem. This is merely an interim measure to get these rather nasty provisions out of the Bill now before us, but something must be done about amending what we have now inserted into the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. In his decision, Mr. Justice Jacobs referred to the definition of a mentally defective person in the existing Mental Health Act, and at the end of his decision he went on to say that the person who was before the court might well have fallen within that definition, although there were some doubts. He concluded:

If indeed the State is so bereft of institutions capable of looking after this man as it appears to be, it is hoped that this case may help to stimulate those responsible to remedy that situation.

Those are fairly strong words, and they came from the diagnosis that the Community Welfare Department and the Mental Health Services had given to this unfortunate person. The magistrate, as a result of whose decision Mr. Justice Jacobs was hearing the matter, had been commenting on the factual situation. He said:

Unfortunately, your case is further complicated by the potential danger that you represent to yourself if you are released after a short or moderate term of imprisonment. He goes on to say:

Before leaving the matter I feel constrained to say that I strongly endorse the implied criticism (by the Director) at what appears to be a deficiency in the mental health legislation. It seems that our society fails to provide for persons in your (the appellant's) situation. It is a dreadful situation that you would appear to be inescapably set on the path, after your eventual release, to further attacks of mental disorder with further resultant brain damage until your level of brain activity is reduced to a stage at which you will fall into the existing legal definition of "mentally defective". At that stage you will no doubt be committed to a mental hospital with no hope of recovery.

In other words, the magistrate says (and the judge endorses the remarks) that the existing Act is so bad that a person can be clearly set on a course in which he is going to be hopelessly or incurably ill, but nothing can be done to assist in the existing situation. There can be no question that this problem of the person with psychopathic or sociopathic tendencies is one of the major problems facing our society. It is one we simply have to face up to.

On the whole, I feel confident that I can support the motion. I believe that every member of the committee worked very hard, as did the officers, in order to get back before the House a Bill which would be effective and which would achieve the object that we all have, to maintain the best treatment and the best care for patients and the maintenance, at the same time, of the rights and dignities of persons in our mental institutions.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): In supporting the motion, I endorse the remarks of previous speakers by saying that the work of this committee was probably the most interesting

and educational of the work of all the Select Committees on which I have served since I have been in this House. During the time I was on that committee, I thought it was a pity that its proceedings were not open to the public. It is a pity that our Select Committees are not open to the public, because I believe the public would have an opportunity, during our hearings, to become acquainted with exactly what we are doing. It may have taken a little more time, but I think it would serve its purpose in many ways. It was interesting, too, that we had two legal practitioners on the Select Committee. Although one would have been enough, we had two, and certainly they were a great help.

Members interjecting:

Mr. BECKER: One was very good, and the other was not there long enough to be of much use. When we have laymen trying to help the mentally ill and the mentally handicapped it is all very well to express what we want to do or what we want to achieve, but the difficulty is in putting it into legislation that is workable. I found that we must be precise and definite in what we wanted so that the courts would know what we were trying to achieve. I also found that the law was inhuman in dealing with mental health but I believe that the work of the Select Committee and the work of Dr. Dibden and the various other Government medical officers and people from all walks of life has resulted in an outstanding piece of legislation.

Of course, this will not be the end of the matter. The legislation will possibly have to be reviewed in about 12 months time, but I am confident that we have set the pace in recommending legislation that will give us what we want. The problem will be to get total acceptance from the community. In accepting the guidelines and objectives in the Bill, members should bear in mind that the whole crux is to ensure that patients receive the best possible treatment and care and to provide for the intergration and co-ordination of services and the encouragement of community involvement.

Community involvement will be quite wide. It will not mean that all mentally handicapped or mentally ill will be placed in Glenside or hospitals for the mentally deficient. The approved hospitals will be our known hospitals, including community hospitals, and treatment will not occur only at Glenside. I see the role of Glenside being run down somewhat but, unfortunately, there will always be the need for Glenside to treat short-term patients and geriatrics. That is the whole tragedy of mental health. We hope that money will be made available for further investigation and development and we hope that at least we will have legislation that will protect the rights of the mentally ill or the mentally handicapped.

A Guardianship Board is to be established. It will have wide open representation and it will be established to protect the rights of patients. The Public Trustee is being given good powers to act on behalf of the people concerned. Provision has been made for patients to be informed in writing of their rights, and this will be done in several languages. If necessary, voice tapes will be used to transmit the information to people who cannot read. That may seem to be a minor point, but it is worth noting.

Another point that I took seriously was the confidentiality of records, and the penalties in this area are the same as have been provided in regard to the Health Commission, namely, a fine of \$2 000 or imprisonment for 12 months for people who breach the Act. I support that wholeheartedly. Anyone who has knowledge of a certain illness suffered by a person must keep that confidential. However,

some people would use records for various purposes if they got hold of them and I am pleased we have stressed in the legislation that this is a serious offence.

We received interesting submissions, and one was from a group of social workers that had extremely futuristic ideas that I felt we could not incorporate at this stage. I believe that we are making certain strides, that the profession is recognising this, and that we could not go from one extreme to the other. On the other hand, the representatives of the Citizens Commission on Human Rights made some outlandish submissions. I was not prepared to accept those submissions and I got into trouble with the Chairman at one stage. He thought I was being rude but I did not think I was. They could not prove any of their statements, and did not have the qualifications or experience to make them.

Obviously, some people in that organisation have used certain privileges to visit patients, whether the patients were inmates of Glenside or other people with a mental health problem, and to make outlandish charges about the treatment of the mentally ill in this State. They hung their hat on that. In my opinion, they have done more harm than good. These people ought to be barred from hospitals and other institutions. I would not let them near a person who was being rehabilitated, because they would be doing more harm than good. They could not convince me that what they wanted incorporated or what they wanted done would be of any benefit.

That brings us back to the objects of the legislation, and I believe that the future of the measure will depend on community tolerance and acceptance of it. It will also depend on the organisations concerned upgrading their education programme and efforts in all areas. The voluntary organisations and the people responsible for administering certain institutions also must have another look at themselves, be prepared to change with the times, and be far more outgoing than they have been. It is no good hiding behind huge walls. The public must be fully informed at all times.

Probably the best part of the visual side of the committee's work was the visit to Glenside. I think we were shown over most of the blocks. Nothing was hidden from us. The staff gave us any answers we wanted and we could see what we wanted to see. Frankly, a person would not want to see some parts of Glenside. They were extremely depressing, and that is the unfortunate part of the geriatric side. On the other hand, we could see what was being achieved there and we could see the benefit of the redevelopment of part of Glenside and the obvious change of atmosphere. Some of the older buildings will be replaced in the next year or so, and it is encouraging that people will not have to live any longer in those conditions.

The older section has tiny cells and the standard is probably the most degrading and basic that one could see. The sooner that section is demolished the better. I hope that the National Trust does not put a plaque on it because we would not want to preserve that. At present, the National Trust has a few problems there. I do not think we should be proud of some of the earlier attitudes in this field. All in all, the Bill, because of the large number of amendments, is really a Bill that will be far more beneficially discussed during the Committee stage when we consider these amendments. I shall take the opportunity then to say a few more words. I wholeheartedly recommend to the House the adoption of this report.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I intend to be very brief. Most of what should have been said about this report has been said. I simply congratulate not only all those people who are concerned with the Select Committee and who appeared before it but also the enormous number of people associated particularly with the mental health field who came to the conclusion more than 10 years ago that, with the progress in the treatment of mental illness and the mentally handicapped, the Act needed rewriting to bring it into line with the standards of modern-day treatment. That task has now been completed. I am pleased that we shall have an Act that allows for the tremendous advances in particularly the use of drug therapy. The emphasis now is on returning mentally ill people to the community as soon as practicable, and this legislation will enable that to happen.

It is always difficult to deprive anyone of his or her liberty. Unfortunately, it becomes a necessity when dealing with people who do not recognise their own mental illness. That is the only reason why we need to take this step, but fortunately it is a step that does not need to be taken nearly as frequently as it did 10 years ago; but, if there is a loss of liberty, there must be adequate safeguards for the rights of the individual as well. Those safeguards exist in this Bill. If there are a few way-out individuals and groups in our society who see threats to themselves, to their own personalities, in any form of control helping to treat mental illness, I am pleased that the committee has found no evidence to uphold those rather outlandish claims; although I have not seen the details, I know exactly what they are. It is a great credit to everyone concerned, and particularly to all the members of the medical and mental health professions, and to the mental health nurses, that this report is now before us; I trust the legislation will shortly be proclaimed.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I regard this case as another triumph for Select Committees. I have said previously in this House that we have in this session of Parliament had the opportunity of seeing the advantage of a proper assessment of legislation placed before the House, and that proper assessment when considered by the public and given proper and due consideration by a Select Committee produces legislation that is more worthy of this State. Over the last weekend, I had my attention drawn to an extract from a comment by Thomas Lord Macaulay in 1830—"Men are never so likely to settle a question rightly as when they discuss it freely." I think that is a clear indication of the distinct advantage of a Select Committee. I want to contain my remarks to the deficiencies which will continue and which are highlighted in the report. It will not be competent to speak of them during the Committee stage and I want quickly to draw members' attention to paragraphs 7, 8, and 32 of the report we are noting. I do not bring this forward as criticism: I accept and acknowledge that the committee in its consideration has found that these deficiencies will continue and will have an effect on mentally defective persons. Paragraph 7 states:

The Public Trustee stated that the powers of an administrator will be contained in proposed amendment to the Administration and Probate Act. It is understood that these amendments will not be ready for some little time.

Paragraph 8 states:

Similarly, evidence was presented to the committee that the present provisions in the Mental Health Act relating to criminal mental defectives are not dealt with by this Bill.

That matter is further taken up in paragraph 32, which states:

Questions were raised about the present concepts of treatment and care of persons with psychopathic or sociopathic problems. In particular your committee considered the problem of dealing with persons afflicted with these conditions in the law courts. These points are considered to be valid and urgent but outside the scope of the Bill.

Quite rightly so. I should like from the Minister an assurance that he will make representations to the Government that these areas of difficulty will be considered as matters of urgency and that the necessary legislation to bring about amendments will be brought to the attention of this House as soon as possible. I say that because persons who are unfortunately mentally affected blow up minor incidents or problems to a magnitude that does not involve other persons in the community to the same degree, and it is that degree of "blow-up" that continues to cause them concern and, in many instances, creates further crises for them and militates against their improvement under treatment or with the normal passage of time. We would be doing these people a great service if the Government would accept the responsibility for early consideration of those alterations so that the problems facing these people will be minimal and, therefore, the direct result is likely to be of maximum benefit to them in allowing them partial or total recovery. The House should give unqualified support to those points; I give to the Minister and members opposite my unqualified support for an early consideration of those matters.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare) moved:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Members will find the amendments are attached to the Select Committee's report.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Arrangement of Act."

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare): I move:

Page 2, line 17—Leave out "PATIENTS IN APPEALS" and insert "APPELLANTS".

The proposed change more correctly describes the persons who will be making the appeal.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 4—"Repeal and transitional provisions."

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 2, line 21—Leave out subclause (1) and insert subclause as follows:

(1) The Mental Health Act, 1939-1974, is amended as shown in the schedule to this Act.

This is a necessary amendment to allow for the fact that there are continuance provisions contained in the schedule.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 2, line 23—Leave out "repealed" and insert "former".

The use of "former" is necessary because of the means adopted in the amendments to cater for the continuance provisions.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE moved:

Page 2, lines 27 to 30—Leave out subclause (3) and insert subclause as follows:

(3) Where immediately before the commencement of this Act, the Public Trustee, or some other person,

was the committee of the estate, or otherwise authorized to administer the estate, of any person pursuant to the provisions of the former Act, the Public Trustee or other person shall be deemed to have been appointed administrator of the estate under this Act.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 2, line 31—Leave out "repealed" and insert "former".

This is a consequential amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5—"Interpretation".

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 2, line 39—Leave out "for the care and treatment of persons who are mentally ill".

It was believed that the definition provided would otherwise be too constricting.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 3—After line 2 insert definition as follows: "the former Act" means the Mental Health Act, 1939-1974: This relates to the earlier amendments to remove "repealed" and insert "former"; the former Act means the Mental Health Act, 1939-1974.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 3, lines 23 and 24—Leave out definition of "the repealed Act".

This is no longer applicable.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 3, line 30—After "hospital" insert "or a person duly authorised to admit patients into the hospital".

Evidence was given that this delegation, as it were, would be necessary for the efficient administration of hospitals.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 6—"The office of Director of Mental Health Services."

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE moved:

Page 3, line 38—Leave out "repealed" and insert "former".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 7 and 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Objectives."

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 4, line 15—Leave out "afford patients" and insert "ensure that patients receive".

This is the first of several amendments that broaden the original objectives, and this ensures that patients receive the best possible treatment and care.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 4—After line 25 insert paragraph as follows:

(e1) to assist and encourage the development of services designed to reduce the incidence of mental illness in the community;

It was put to the committee that a desirable objective would be such prevention of mental illness as is possible.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 4—After line 27 insert paragraph as follows:

(f1) to promote a high standard of training for those responsible for the care of the mentally ill and the mentally handicapped;

It was also put to the committee that the objectives should promote a high standard of training for those responsible for the care of the mentally ill and mentally handicapped.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 4, line 29—After “knowledge” insert “and generally to promote public understanding of, and (wherever practicable) involvement in, measures for the prevention, treatment and cure of mental illness and the care and protection of the mentally handicapped.”

Amongst those who recommended this were the South Australian Council of Social Service and the Mentally Retarded Children's Society. The committee has accepted the worth of this proposal, and recommended the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 10 and 11 passed.

Clause 12—“Particulars relating to admission of patients to approved hospitals.”

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 5, lines 7 and 8—Leave out “upon payment of the prescribed fee”.

It was considered that, since the Director is allowed to make the decision, to impose a fee may prove to be a hardship, and this amendment is recommended by the committee, as it will remove the requirement for the payment of a fee.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 13 passed.

Clause 14—“Admission of patients pursuant to order by medical practitioner.”

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 6, lines 12 to 15—Leave out subclause (4) and insert subclause as follows:

- (4) When the psychiatrist has completed his examination—
- (a) he shall, if not satisfied that the continued detention of the patient is justified, discharge the order; or
 - (b) he may, if satisfied that the continued detention of the patient is justified, confirm the order.

The original subclause specified a procedure that would take place concerning a person who had been sent to an approved hospital under the order of a qualified medical practitioner. The committee received submissions and considered that, in order to make clear the intention that persons would not be detained except lawfully, the psychiatrist, having completed his examination and being not satisfied that the continued detention was justified could discharge the order. That puts the position more clearly than was indicated in the original wording.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 6—After line 36 insert subclause as follows:

- (9a) Where an order for further detention of a patient is made under subsection (5) or subsection (8) of this section, a report shall be made setting out the grounds upon which the order is made.

Quite apart from the requirement that a further order be made, some report substantiating the reasons for that further order ought to be made. This is a protection to which patients ought to be entitled.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 6—After line 47 insert subclause as follows:

- (12) A copy of the instrument by which a patient is permitted to be absent from an approved hospital under subsection (10) of this section shall be given to the patient to whom the instrument relates.

Subclause (10) provides that, where a person has been detained in an approved hospital pursuant to an order under this provision, the hospital superintendent may, by instrument in writing, permit that person to be absent on trial leave. The Select Committee thought that a person,

who ought to be lawfully out of hospital, might be apprehended and returned to an approved hospital. It seemed to the committee that in these circumstances a person on trial leave ought to have a pass entitling him to be out of hospital, thereby saving him from the possibility of the indignity of being returned to the hospital, only to be re-released.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 15—“Duty of superintendent of an approved hospital.”

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE moved:

Page 7, line 7—After “shall” insert “(unless the order for detention is discharged)”.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 16—“Patients to be given statements of their rights, etc.”

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 7, line 11—Leave out “as soon as practicable” and insert “upon admission to the hospital, or as soon as practicable thereafter”.

The committee recommends that a person's rights, in cases where he may be taken into detention, ought to be clearly explained to him. The purpose of the amendment is to ensure that his rights are explained to him as soon as practicable.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 7—After line 21 insert subclause as follows:

- (4) Where a patient is illiterate, or too disturbed to read and comprehend the statement referred to in this section, the superintendent shall take such steps (if any) as may be practicable in the circumstances to convey the information contained in the statement to the patient.

The amendment will ensure that methods other than straight-out reading may be employed to inform the patient of his rights.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 17 passed.

Clause 18—“Powers of apprehension of members of Police Force.”

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 7—

Line 31—After “mental illness” insert “or mental handicap”.

After line 41 insert subclause as follows:

(3) Where a member of the Police Force apprehends a person and brings him for examination by a medical practitioner in pursuance of this section—

- (a) he shall render such assistance to the medical practitioner as may be necessary for the purposes of the examination; and
- (b) where the medical practitioner makes an order for the admission and detention of the patient in an approved hospital, he shall, if the medical practitioner so requests, convey, or arrange for the conveyance of, the patient to an approved hospital in accordance with the order.

These amendments make clear the requirements, responsibilities and powers of the Police Force in matters involving the apprehension and conveyance of persons concerned under clause 18.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 19—“Restriction on psychiatric treatment.”

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 8, lines 7 to 9—Leave out all words in these lines after “by” in line 7 and insert—

- (a) the person who is to administer the treatment; and
- (b) two psychiatrists (at least one of whom is a senior psychiatrist), who have each made an independent examination of the patient;

This amendment is really a rearrangement of the words to make clear the respective responsibilities of the parties concerned in the action proposed.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 8, line 38—After "illness" insert "by the elimination or stimulation of apparently normal brain tissues".

This necessary amendment ensures that the normal operations of neurosurgeons are not caught up under the requirements of the Bill.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 20—"Establishment of Board."

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 9, line 14—After "medical practitioner" insert "who has had experience in psychiatry".

This amendment refers to the qualifications of persons eligible for appointment to the Guardianship Board.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 9, lines 16 to 18—Leave out paragraph (c) and insert paragraphs as follows:

(c) one shall be a registered psychologist who has had experience in the care of the mentally handicapped; and

(d) one shall be a person who has, in the opinion of the Governor, other appropriate qualifications for membership of the Board.

These paragraphs also apply to the qualifications of persons appointed to the board.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 21 to 24 passed.

Clause 25—"Power of the Board to require attendance."

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 10—Insert following subclause before the present subclause (1):

(1) Before the board makes an order, direction or requirement in relation to any person, it shall, wherever practicable, afford that person an opportunity to appear before, and make representations to, the Board.

This amendment inserts a subclause that the committee thought was very important. Originally, the Bill contained no direct proposal that a person who may be affected by an order by the board be given an opportunity to appear. This amendment makes clear that that is what should occur.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 26—"Reception of persons into the guardianship of the Board."

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 11, line 4—Leave out "is" where it occurs for the second time.

This is a grammatical correction.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 11, line 5—Leave out "incapable of managing his own affairs" and insert:

(i) incapable of looking after his own health and safety;

(ii) incapable of managing his own affairs.

This amendment more clearly describes the position of persons for whom applications may be made before the board.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 11, after line 17 insert paragraph as follows:

(b1) by the Public Trustee;

This amendment allows for the Public Trustee to be able to make applications before the board.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 27—"Power of board to exercise powers for the custody and welfare of protected persons."

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 11—

Line 29—Leave out "direct" and insert "require".

Line 36—Leave out "direct" and insert "require".

The committee believed, after taking evidence, that the word "direct" was too harsh and severe and that the word "require" was a better statement of the position that would apply.

Amendments carried.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 12, lines 4 and 5—Leave out all words in these lines after "protected person" in line 4 and insert:

(a) give due consideration to the expressed wishes (if any) of the protected person;

and

(b) treat the welfare of the protected person as the paramount consideration.

It was, in the opinion of the committee, an important addition to the previous requirement that proper consideration be given to the welfare of the protected person and that it was to be the paramount consideration. The committee is recommending a further important provision that due consideration should be given to the expressed wishes (if any) of the protected person.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 28 to 35 passed.

Clause 36—"Appeals in respect of patients detained in approved hospitals."

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 15—After line 40 insert subclause as follows:

(4) The tribunal shall proceed to hear and determine an appeal as soon as reasonably practicable after the institution thereof.

The committee believed that it should be stated clearly in the legislation that the tribunal shall not only hear appeals but shall also proceed to hear and determine them as soon as is reasonably practicable to avoid any possible delay.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 37 and 38 passed.

"DIVISION IV—REPRESENTATION OF PATIENTS IN APPEALS".

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 17, line—14—Leave out "PATIENTS IN APPEALS" and insert "APPELLANTS".

Reference was made in an earlier amendment to this change. It is simply a machinery method to ensure that the heading coincides with the earlier amendment.

Amendment carried.

Clauses 39 to 47 passed.

New clause 47a—"Duty to maintain confidentiality."

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 20—After line 35 insert new clause as follows:

47a. (1) Any person, acting in the administration of this Act, who divulges any personal information, relating to a patient, obtained in the course of his employment, otherwise than as he may be authorised or required to divulge that information by law, or by his employer, shall be guilty of an indictable offence.

(2) This section does not prevent a person from divulging statistical or other information that could not reasonably be expected to lead to the identification of patients to whom it relates.

It refers to the confidentiality requirements that should be specified.

New clause inserted.

Remaining clauses (48 to 51) passed.

The schedule.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE moved:

Page 22—Leave out the schedule and insert new schedule as follows:

THE SCHEDULE

AMENDMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH ACT, 1939-1974

The Mental Health Act, 1939-1974, is amended—

- (a) by striking out Parts I, II, IV, VI, VII, VIIA, VIII and IX thereof;
- (b) by striking out the heading to Part III thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following heading:

PART III

CRIMINAL MENTAL DEFECTIVES

- (c) by striking out Division I of Part III and inserting in lieu thereof the following Division:

Division I—Preliminary

42. In this Part, unless the contrary intention appears—

“the Director” means the person holding, or acting in, the office of Director of Mental Health Services under the Mental Health Act, 1976-1977;

“hospital for criminal mental defectives” means a place declared by proclamation to be a hospital for criminal mental defectives under this Act;

“mentally defective person” means—

- (a) a person who is mentally ill, that is to say, a person who, owing to his mental condition, requires oversight, care or control for his own good or in the public interest and who, owing to disorder of the mind or mental infirmity arising from age or the decay of his faculties, is incapable of managing himself or his affairs; or

- (b) an intellectually retarded person; and the expressions “mental defect”, “mental defective” and “mentally defective” shall be construed accordingly:

“receiving house” means any place that the Director declares, by instrument in writing, to be a receiving house for the purposes of this Part.

43. (1) The Governor may, from time to time, by proclamation, declare any hospital or any part thereof, or any part of any prison, or any other place which he deems suitable for the purpose, to be a hospital for criminal mental defectives.

(2) The Governor may, by proclamation, declare that any hospital for criminal mental defectives shall cease to be a hospital for criminal mental defectives.

44. (1) The Governor may for each hospital for criminal mental defectives appoint a superintendent and, if he deems it necessary, a deputy superintendent.

(2) No person shall be so appointed unless he is a medical practitioner.

45. (1) Except as provided by regulations made pursuant to this Act, where an institution is a part of a prison that has been declared to be a hospital for criminal mental defectives under section 43 of this Act—

- (a) the superintendent of the institution appointed under section 44 of this Act shall—

- (i) be responsible for, and have control of and over, the medical care, treatment and welfare of all patients of that institution; and

- (ii) perform such duties of a superintendent imposed by this Act as relate or are incidental to such care, treatment and welfare; and

- (b) the officer in charge of the prison shall—

- (i) subject to the directions of the Comptroller of Prisons, have the control, management and administration of the institution in all matters connected with its internal routine and discipline;

- (ii) be responsible for the custody and security of the patients therein; and

- (iii) be responsible for the carrying out of the other duties by this Act imposed upon the superintendent of the institution and for the due observance of the provisions of this Act in reference to all matters occurring within the institution other than those referred to in paragraph (a) of this subsection.

(2) Regulations made under this Act may, in relation to any institution that is a part of a prison declared to be a hospital for criminal mental defectives under section 43 of this Act—

- (a) impose or confer on or assign to the officer in charge of the prison any of the duties, responsibilities, powers or functions of the superintendent of an institution under this Act;

- (b) declare that any provision of this Act shall not apply.

(3) Any regulation so made shall have effect notwithstanding anything contained in this Act or in the Prisons Act, 1936-1976.

- (d) by striking out the heading immediately preceding section 46 of the principal Act and inserting in lieu thereof the following heading:

Division II—Manner in which criminal mental defectives are to be dealt with.

- (e) by striking out the heading to Part V thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following heading:

PART V

Administration of the Estates of the Mentally Ill and Mentally Handicapped

- (f) by striking out Division I of Part V and inserting in lieu thereof the following Division:

DIVISION I PRELIMINARY

109. In this Part, unless the contrary intention appears—

“the Act” means the Mental Health Act, 1976-1977;

“the Court” means the Supreme Court of South Australia;

- (g) by striking out from the heading to Division II of Part V the passage “COMMITTEE OR”,

- (h) by striking out from section 110 the passage “appointed under this Act as the committee of the estate of any person or becomes authorized by this Act to administer the estate of any person” and inserting in lieu thereof the passage “by virtue of the Act, the estate of any person”;

- (i) by striking out from section 111 the passage “appointed under this Act as the committee of the estate of any person, or being authorized by this Act to administer the estate of any person,” and inserting in lieu thereof the passage “by virtue of the Act the administrator of the estate of any person”;

- (j) by striking out from section 112 the passage “appointed under this Act as the committee of the estate of any person, or being authorized by this Act to administer the estate of any person” and inserting in lieu thereof the passage “by virtue of the Act the administrator of the estate of any person”;

- (k) by striking out from section 113 the passage “appointed under this Act as the committee of

- the estate of any person, or being authorized by this Act to administer the estate of any person" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "by virtue of the Act the administrator of the estate of any person";
- (l) by striking out from section 115 the passage "has been appointed under this Act as the committee of the estate of any person, or that he is authorized under this Act to administer the estate of any person, and stating the date at which he was so appointed or become so authorized and that the appointment or authority is still in force" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "is the administrator of the estate of any person, and has held that position since a date specified in the certificate";
- (m) by striking out from subsection (1) of section 117 the passage "committee or whose estate he is administering" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "the administrator";
- (n) by striking out sections 118 and 119;
- (o) by striking out from subsection (1) of section 120 the passage "this Act as the committee of an estate" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "the Act as administrator of an estate";
- (p) by striking out from subsection (2) of section 120 the passage "the committee" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "the administrator";
- (q) by striking out from subsection (1) of section 121 the passage "the committee" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "the administrator";
- (r) by striking out from subsection (3) of section 123 the passage "under section 108 of a committee" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "under the Act of an administrator";
- (s) by striking out from section 125 the passage "the committee of the estate of any person, or the Public Trustee being authorized by this Act to administer" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "the administrator of";
- (t) by striking out from section 125a the passage "a committee is appointed under this Act" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "an administrator is appointed under the Act";
- (u) by striking out from subsection (1) of section 125b the passage "patient and any person of whose estate a committee is appointed under this Act" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "person of whose estate an administrator is appointed under the Act";
- (v) by striking out from section 126 the passage "the committee (if any) of the estate of the said person, or the Public Trustee being authorized by this Act to administer the estate" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "the administrator of the estate of that person";
- (w) by striking out from section 127 the passage "the committee of an estate, or the Public Trustee being authorized by this Act to administer an estate" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "the administrator of an estate";
- (x) by striking out from subsection (1) of section 128 the passage "the committee of the estate of any person, or the Public Trustee being authorized by this Act to administer the estate of any person" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "the administrator of the estate of any person";
- (y) by striking out from section 129 the passage "the committee of the estate of any person, or the Public Trustee being authorized by this Act to administer the estate of any person" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "the administrator of the estate of any person";
- (z) by striking out from subsection (1) of section 130 the passage "the committee, or whose estate the Public Trustee is by this Act authorized to administer" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "the administrator";
- (aa) by striking out from subsection (1) of section 130 the passage "or other committee" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "or other administrator";
- (bb) by striking out from subsection (4) of section 130 the passage "a committee had been so appointed or that the Public Trustee was so authorized to administer the estate" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "an administrator had been so appointed";
- (cc) by striking out from subsection (1) of section 131 the passage "the committee of the estate of any person, or by the Public Trustee in a case where he is authorized by this Act to administer the estate of any person" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "administrator";
- (dd) by striking out from subsections (2) and (3) of section 131 the word "committee" wherever it occurs and inserting in lieu thereof, in each case, the word "administrator";
- (ee) by striking out from section 132 the word "a" where it occurs for the first time and inserting in lieu thereof the word "an";
- (ff) by striking out from section 132 the word "committee" wherever it occurs and inserting in lieu thereof, in each case, the word "administrator";
- (gg) by striking out section 136;
- (hh) by striking out all the schedules except the tenth schedule and the nineteenth schedule.

Amendment carried; schedule as amended passed.

Title passed.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The member for Light raised a question about paragraphs 7, 8 and 32 of the report which refer to people in society who may be described as psychopathic or sociopathic in behaviour, and asked for a certain undertaking. That undertaking already exists in the report, which will be perused closely by the responsible Minister in another place. However, I undertake to raise the matter with that Minister.

Bill read a third time and passed.

RURAL INDUSTRY ASSISTANCE BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 30. Page 3063.)

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): The Opposition supports this Bill, which ratifies an agreement with the Commonwealth which has been signed by the Premier of this State and by the Premiers of all the other States to give rise to a new agreement for financial assistance for people engaged in rural industry. The one thing people engaged in rural industry need is long-term finance at reasonable interest rates. This is an important adjunct in these trying times, because financial stress does confront the man on the land.

Hitherto, much disappointment has been experienced by rural producers who have applied unsuccessfully to the authority for assistance. They have been concerned to see their applications refused either because their properties are not sufficiently viable or because their position is sufficiently sound for them to have to make arrangements with other sources of commercial credit.

Mr. Wardle: Or their application is still in the pigeon hole.

Mr. RODDA: True. Much dissatisfaction has been expressed by the man on the land, members of Parliament and others who represent rural areas. The Bill has wide scope, clause 6(2) providing:

The Minister may do all things that he is authorised, empowered or required to do or as may be necessary, convenient or expedient for him to do for the purposes of carrying out and giving effect to the agreement and the scheme.

Hitherto, the committee that one never saw (although one knew of its existence) considered applications and made its judgments after the case in question had been processed by the Superintendent of Rural Industry or his staff, and it made recommendations to the Minister. It depended on the committee's recommendation whether or not assistance was given to the applicant. We have seen more assistance refused than has been approved.

Mr. Becker: Why?

Mr. RODDA: That is the \$64 question. I hope under this new set-up and under the operative clause that an improved position will apply. I have never understood why field officers are not constantly in the districts where the assessment is made. This aspect has been absent, decisions have been made in the office by officers of the Rural Industry Assistance Branch, and farmers have been left to their own devices. This has not been good enough. I need refer only to the war service land settlement scheme under which the district inspector played an important part in the rural scene. He had a regular district and clientele, his presence was appreciated and he was able to give advice and talk over problems with the settler concerned.

If this scheme is to work there must be adequate staff. The Rural Industry Assistance Branch has had a great load on it in periods of crisis, especially during the drought period when stress was placed on many people last year. The processing of drought relief applications requires much work and the branch was inadequately staffed, with applications being pigeon-holed, as the member for Murray has stated. If this scheme is to work, adequate staff must be provided. The provision I quoted is a most significant one as regards making this legislation work. The matter of protection certificates is important, this matter being included in the last agreement. On reading the Bill I find it to be mainly a print-out of the old Act, although the schedule makes some additions, including an increase in the term from 20 years to 30 years. One thing the man on the land requires is long-term assistance, and recognition of this will help many people.

If rural industry is to survive producers must receive a fair price for their products. Certainly, there is no need to worry about the majority of men on the land, who pull their weight to achieve their output. The South Australian farmer is well known for his expertise in production, resourcefulness and initiative. This new agreement appeals to me as being a blueprint to provide the necessary financial resources. One of the officers concerned pointed out to me that there was no definition of "the Minister", in this case the Minister of Lands being responsible. Concern was expressed that the Minister would have absolute power, but I am not so worried about that aspect. The Minister must have power and, from my experience with the Government departments with which I have dealt (for several years I was an officer of the Lands Department), if the applicant was doing the right thing, there was little to worry about. The Crown has always been a satisfactory landlord.

Certainly, I am hoping for improvement in the areas to which I have referred. We shall want to see co-operation and contact between applicants and the authority after agreements have been entered into. I am sure all honourable members have seen people being granted assistance whilst other more worthy applicants have been refused assistance. The consequences of that are bad for the industry, and the person to handle this is the field officer. I cannot stress too strongly the need for personal contact.

I think this is a good agreement, and we look forward to its working to the mutual benefit of the people engaged in primary industry and those in the cities in such a way that the whole State will benefit.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I support the Bill. We have no alternative but to support the legislation, because it is complementary legislation. We cannot amend it because, if we do, it would have to receive the concurrence of the Federal Parliament and of all the other Parliaments in Australia. The rural reconstruction scheme, as administered, was designed to assist people who found themselves in financial difficulties through no fault of their own, through changes in the economic situation in this country, or through fluctuations in oversea markets. The scheme has had its critics. One of the difficulties I have found is that it takes a considerable amount of time for a decision to be made. It is impossible, under the farm build-up scheme, for anyone to buy a property at auction. It takes a considerable time, if a person wishes to buy an adjoining property, to finalise the deal. In many cases, people have lost an opportunity to enlarge their properties to make them more economic because the person who wishes to sell is not prepared to wait or to be involved in the humbug that takes place.

I had brought to my attention some time ago a case where a very efficient farmer took the opportunity to buy an adjoining property. The only way in which he could finance the deal was to get money on a short-term arrangement at, I think, 14 per cent interest. He applied for rural reconstruction assistance and was knocked back, because it was claimed that he had finance available to him. The only reason why he obtained that finance was to clinch the deal. I examined the case at length, and the decision to buy the adjoining property was quite right. The farmer was experienced, he had the ability to farm both properties, and he had sons to assist him. He was an efficient operator, the type of person who should have been assisted.

Mr. Becker: Who lent him the bridging finance?

Mr. GUNN: It was an executor company.

Mr. Becker: They should have known better.

Mr. GUNN: The rural industry assistance scheme is far too narrow. It should be more flexible to deal with cases such as this. The farmer availed himself of the temporary finance only to clinch the deal, because the seller wanted to leave the industry; he wanted to invest his money into some other business arrangement, as was his right.

Nearby or adjoining properties do not come up every day of the week. The decision in the case I have mentioned was a good business decision, and everyone except the rural industry people thought it was the right decision. However, when I and others approached the authority, we could make no headway. It was quite adamant that he had existing finance and I was told that, if he was assisted, funds would not be available to assist others. I did not accept that argument, because I believed this to be a classic example of a most efficient farmer who, like all other efficient farmers, was an asset to the country, as is the rural industry. Unfortunately, many members opposite do not share that view.

Mr. Whitten: Stop your knocking and be a bit positive.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member is on record in this House knocking rural industry, but I will not be side-tracked. The other problem in relation to the administration of the scheme is that, when people apply for assistance, either for debt reconstruction or for farm build-up, they

are presented with a 23-page document, which is enough to frighten anyone. I have been told that it cost more than \$60 to get an accountant to fill out the form. It is time-consuming, and it frightens many people off. Some people have come to me, most perturbed that they do not know how to fill out the form. I started to assist people, but I found that it took nearly a day to do it. The department should be able to streamline the applications, and I believe decisions should be made on the basis of a personal interview. Then a competent officer who has a reasonable approach should go on to the person's property and discuss the matter with him. I think that is the best way to judge whether or not a person is efficient. Anyone who talks to a person on his own property can soon judge whether he is worthy of assistance.

The scheme has been slightly broadened. I believe its continuation is essential, and I hope its operation in future will be far more flexible than has been the case in the past. I am surprised that the South Australian Government has agreed to the scheme. Knowing the attitude of the Minister of Agriculture, who is on record as being a great supporter of group farming and who has taken a number of opportunities to attack me viciously for comments I have made in relation to group farming, I was surprised that the South Australian Government would support a scheme which was helping to maintain the family farming unit, the basis of any successful agricultural industry anywhere in the world. No-one with any knowledge of agriculture would condemn the family farming concept. It is the only concept that can successfully produce, efficiently and cheaply, agricultural goods.

The record of those involved in agriculture in Australia is second to none, but the problem we have faced is that agricultural industries have not been in a position to pass on costs. We have to buy on a market which allows people to pass on costs, but we sell on the open market and on the export market, where we cannot bargain, as can other sections of industry. Schemes such as this are essential to assist agriculture, creating employment as well as a tremendous export income.

It is interesting to note the increase in agricultural production over the past 75 years. In the year 1900, Australia had about 8 600 000 cattle, but in 1975 it had 31 000 000. I hope that action will be taken shortly to assist those involved in the cattle industry, who are going through a most difficult time. The number of sheep in Australia increased from 71 000 000 in 1900 to 145 000 000 in 1975, while the number of acres under crop increased from 8 800 000 in 1900 to 48 000 000 in 1975. One can see the tremendous development that has taken place in agriculture. I am pleased to say that, during the greater part of that time, we have had in power in this State and in the Commonwealth area Governments sympathetic to rural industry, prepared to give assistance where necessary, and to operate on the incentive basis necessary for any successful agricultural industry. To point out the need for this scheme, I shall quote some figures indicating clearly just what has taken place in agriculture. I have a comparative table regarding the increase in the consumer price index and the farmer price index from 1966 to 1976, and I ask leave to have the table incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The SPEAKER: Is this purely statistical?

Mr. GUNN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.
Leave granted.

YEAR BY YEAR PERCENTAGE INCREASE

	Consumer Price Index %	Farmer Price Index %
1966-67	2.7	3.4
1967-1968	3.3	3.4
1968-69	2.6	1.8
1969-70	3.2	0.9
1970-71	4.8	4.0
1971-72	6.8	5.6
1972-73	6.0	8.0
1973-74	12.9	15.5
1974-75	16.7	29.9
1975-76	13.0	17.0

Mr. GUNN: I have another set of figures, dealing with the average weekly income from 1966-1976 for adults in Australia and also dealing with the average return for a farmer. I seek leave to have that table incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

FARM INCOME AND AVERAGE ADULT MALE EARNINGS

Year	Net farm income as a return for capital invested, management and labour	Adult Male average earnings
1966-67	6 395 122.98	61.90
1967-68	3 835 73.75	65.50
1968-69	6 130 117.88	70.40
1969-70	5 345 102.79	76.30
1970-71	4 713 90.63	84.80
1971-72	5 982 115.04	93.00
1972-73	9 342 179.65	101.50
1973-74	15 902 305.81	118.00
1974-75	9 672 186.00	148.20
1975-76	8 441 162.33	169.50
1976-77 September		
Quarter Projected		184.70
1976-77:		
Sept. 1976	6 545 125.87	
Dec. 1976	8 813 169.48	

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the Bill because anything that can be done in this way needs the support of every member. The former committee has been ineffective for the primary producers of this State. When I went to confer with the Chairman of the committee on one occasion, I noticed that he had on the wall of his office a map of South Australia, and the State was marked all over with pins. When I asked whether this represented people who had received assistance from the committee, he said that it did not, that it represented people who had applied for assistance. I said to Mr. Joy, "Where is the map indicating the people you have assisted?" He said, "I am very sorry, but I cannot show you that one."

I was amazed by the replies that I have received today to questions that I had put on notice recently. I asked, first, how many primary producers had applied for assistance under the Rural Industries Assistance Act from December 1 last year to March 1 this year and, of these, how many had been assisted. The reply was that 56 applications had been received, four had been declined and there were 52 on hand. My second question was:

What moneys have so far been expended on the successful applicants?

Of course, there were no successful applicants, and the answer was "Nil". The third question was:

Have sufficient State moneys been expended to attract Commonwealth moneys for rural assistance in South Australia?

Again, the reply was "Nil". In that period, many people would have been seeking assistance through the committee. It was a difficult season for them, and I should have thought there would be an opportunity for the committee to give the service required. The Bill improves the previous measure, because it enables the committee to

assist the primary producer without his necessarily expanding his area of land. For instance, a fruitgrower on the river may have his trees affected by the salt content of the water used in irrigation. His property would be assisted if he installed equipment to do ground-watering instead of overhead watering. Further, a primary producer's farm may be run down in regard to soil quality, and the Bill will enable him to buy clovers, and so on, to build up soil fertility, without the need for the farmer to build up his farm in area.

I have been considering the work of this committee for some time, and my colleagues have dealt with some points. The member for Eyre has mentioned that the filling in of application forms cost more than \$50 a time in accountant's fees. Some people in my district have filled in forms three times. After the first occasion, they have been told that they cannot be helped then and it has been suggested that they apply a year later. When they have done that, they have been refused. It has cost these people about \$200 to have the forms filled in.

The position of many applicants for assistance has been mentioned in regard to the committee's stating that it will not help anyone who has purchased land under auction. When one realises that at present most properties are sold under auction, one asks how one gets assistance through the committee. I do not know what is going on at present. There has been a change of attitude in this regard, and I believe that there could be a further change soon regarding this aspect. I hope that common sense prevails, and that anyone who goes to auction, having previously spoken to the committee, will be able to go to auction to a certain level of valuation and be assisted. I am afraid that the committee has not brought much joy to the applicants, but I believe that the present Chairman is about to retire and, with this amendment to the legislation and probably new personnel, there is hope that assistance will be given to those who need it.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Definitions".

Mr. RODDA: I ask the Minister what is meant by the provision in the definition of "farmer" that it means a declared company.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): "Declared company" is defined.

Mr. Nankivell: The definition is that the shareholders in company have to be identified or recognised as *bona fide* farmers.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This provision is designed to enable the Minister to declare someone or some part of the company to be a farmer in appropriate circumstances. It is an administrative scheme that gets over a problem that would be difficult to define otherwise. Obviously some discretion is available to the Minister, as it is provided that the Minister shall determine the matter. Subclause (2) is also relevant: the Minister must be satisfied that each shareholder is a genuine farmer and, if he is satisfied of that, he makes a declaration, and his declaration is final. That means that the definition of a farmer gets around the problem of how to handle companies. It is a rather tortuous way but it is a method to create discretion and to avoid having to tie down every case of a company where one would give assistance by definition of all the cases, which obviously would be very difficult.

Mr. RODDA: I thank the Minister for that explanation. It is good to have the Minister's definition in *Hansard*. There may be arguments about it in future.

Clause passed.

Clause 5—"Ratification and approval of the agreement."

Mr. ALLISON: I refer to subclause (2), and this applies also to clause 6. One word there is impressive—"expedient". Is the Minister satisfied that Government departments are now structured so as to make things expedient? I ask that as I had communication with the Minister of Lands previously and the Minister of Agriculture about extensive delays lasting from six to eight months in processing applications for grants. The Minister assured me in writing some month or so ago that he had streamlined the operation of his department. I seek assurance that the expediency will be carried out. Will some regional authorities be established so that applications can be processed quickly on the spot without the sort of centralist delay that has occurred in previous years?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The administration of the Rural Industries Branch is under review at present. I certainly assure the honourable member that the things that are necessary and expedient to be done will be done, but he should understand that normally there is another side to the argument. Where there is a difference of opinion or doubt as to the way in which assistance is to be given or whether or not a certain person qualifies, there may be considerable difficulties that can impose delay. I think that generally, when people come to see us as members of Parliament, it always pays to be careful to find out whether there is another side to the story. Certainly, if the honourable member ever has any substantial evidence that something could have been processed earlier and that the department did not have genuine reasons for delay, I hope he would take those cases directly to the Minister and ask that they be dealt with.

Clause passed.

Clause 6—"Minister to be authority."

Mr. RODDA: I was interested to hear the Minister say that the Government is looking at the restructuring of the rural industries authority. Under this clause any restructuring must take place if this legislation is to do all these things expediently, as the member for Mount Gambier said. He was not digging in shallow ground when he made that statement. Much anxiety and disappointment has been emanating from this area. Can the Minister say what is envisaged? Generally, this is a bald clause but it is the gravamen of making this legislation work.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Briefly, the Government is concerned to make the legislation work. I indicated previously to the member for Mount Gambier that the most effective method of ensuring the administration of rural assistance was currently being investigated by the Government. Changes may well take place. It is impossible to say at this stage, but we are concerned to ensure effective administration, and I am sure the Minister is also concerned to see that that takes place. There are cases where delays occur for quite genuine reasons, but those reasons may not be accepted by the farmers making the application. So there are always marginal difficulties, which are hard to sort out.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (7 to 27) passed.

First schedule passed.

Second schedule.

Mr. RUSSACK: I refer to farm build-up, because in the past few months I have been contacted by people who have applied for assistance for it. As I understand it, applicants have met every requirement except that the property was sold by auction. Apparently, before October 12, 1976, specific conditions existed, as follows:

- (1) That the intending purchaser/applicant approach the auctioneers prior to sale and arrange to have his bids accepted, subject to the availability of finance.
- (2) That the property be offered at auction and passed in. The applicant then approach the vendor and negotiate private contract subject to the availability of finance, or
- (3) Arrange bridging finance. Attend the auction as a prudent bidder and if successful lodge application for Rural Industry Assistance finance. Intending applicants would be impressed that under no circumstances could any guarantee be given *re* the availability or otherwise of Rural Industry Assistance finance.

I understand that after October 12 the first and third of those conditions were deleted. Now, when a property is offered for auction, if it is passed in the applicant can approach the vendor and negotiate a private contract subject to the availability of finance. That is the only condition of the three applicable. I understand the committee considers that at auction there is an unfair advantage applying to accredited applicants. I cannot see the logic of this. If a dozen people were negotiating privately, immediately one of them signed a contract all the others would be excluded. As a result of this situation, I wrote to the Minister some time ago asking whether the Government would revert to the original conditions. Most farming properties today are offered at auction, and this minimises the opportunity for many people to obtain assistance. I have given the names of people who are in this position and who at auction bought land but, to pay the interest on normal finance arrangements with commercial finance institutions have found themselves in difficulties. I ask the Minister to consider this matter, and I hope that I will soon receive a reply that will be acceptable to those involved in these circumstances.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will refer this matter to the Minister, but I suspect that part of the difficulty is also a worry that the price of property may be unnecessarily bid up as a consequence of action taken at auction, and there would be concern that, unless they are careful, people may get themselves into unreasonable contracts and may be encouraged to bid at an auction but later discover that they are in difficulties. I am not sure of the complete reasons that the Minister has for imposing these conditions, but where farm build-up will take place as a consequence of an auction the extra bit of land to be acquired is subject to more than one interested buyer, one presumes. That situation would create some difficulties. It may be that, in the overall administration of this sort of scheme, there is an opinion that, if land is to be bought at an economical price anyway, in those circumstances it will be difficult to justify the use of funds for farm build-up: people who can afford to buy should buy. An auction would be a difficult situation to interpose in the overall situation where it is being considered whether or not a specific farmer should be assisted and the farmer has to make the decision. However, I will ask the Minister for details for the honourable member.

Mr. RUSSACK: I thank the Minister for his acknowledgement of the problem. I realise that the conditions set out refer to a situation of a person going

off the land because the property was not viable, although a neighbour by adding this land to his property could make it viable. However, many people sell their property by auction although they are not going off the land because of financial difficulties, but the next door neighbour or a person situated nearby wishing to purchase the land may find himself in difficulty and can do nothing but go to the auction and try to buy it. I look forward to further consideration by the Minister of Lands and to receiving an early reply.

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister explain the meaning of "reasonable terms" in 2(b) relating to farm build-up? What is the criteria: is it a matter of decision in each individual case, or is a percentage applied every time? As the Minister will appreciate, there is contention as to what is a reasonable term, be it from a bank or other institution.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It really comes down to a matter of judgment. It will be affected by the viability of a particular proposal and by the conditions applying at a particular time. The higher the rate of inflation the higher the rate of interest. If a person is attempting to finance farm build-up, he is interested in long-term finance. An interest rate of 15 per cent may be reasonable if a person knows that inflation will continue at between 14 per cent and 16 per cent for another 20 years but, if it continues at that rate for only two years and then falls to a low rate, a rate of 15 per cent is unreasonable. So, the term of the loan affects one's judgment. It must remain a matter of judgment.

Dr. Eastick: Does it boil down to the fact that you don't know?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I know that it is difficult to get this across to the honourable member. The question of what is reasonable terms is very much a matter of the length of the loan, the proposed interest rate—

Mr. Goldsworthy: And whether Whitlam is in power.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Deputy Leader, the boy genius—

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable Minister does not have to answer interjections. There is nothing in the Bill dealing with the Deputy Leader.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A loan for a long-term purpose that is only short term in nature and does not render the project viable in terms of long-term finance is a factor that must be taken into account. No clear-cut answer can be given. All cases have to be judged on their merits.

Dr. EASTICK: Is the Minister suggesting that normal bank interest is recognised as being reasonable and that any figure above normal bank interest, as might apply from an outside institution, would be considered unreasonable? It is an imprecise situation. For the benefit of those who constantly seek members' advice, is normal bank interest for long-term loans recognised as reasonable by the Government, as opposed to a rate of 1 per cent or 2 per cent above normal bank interest?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In many rural areas the price of land has been such for some time that the rate of return on the purchase of that land is very low. For someone who had only marginal financial resources behind him, normal bank interest might not be reasonable. If a person is intending to build up a farm and if he has to borrow \$20 000 and if the extra expected return is about \$1 200, which could easily be the case, it is obviously unreasonable to pay \$2 000 a year to a bank. On the other hand, for someone who has additional financial resources,

it may be reasonable for him to borrow at bank interest for a short period until other funds become available, but for a marginal farmer it may not be reasonable.

Dr. Eastick: It's an application by application procedure?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes. I do not think that can be avoided.

Schedule passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CROWN PROCEEDINGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 30. Page 3064.)

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill. There seems to be no objection to it, since obviously the State has a proper interest in any matter involving the legislative, executive or judicial powers of the State or involving the validity of a State or Commonwealth law. The only objection which has been raised is that it could be said that it is oppressive for citizens to face the possibility of the State's intervening in any sort of action between two private individuals. The only real tangible disadvantage to which citizens could be put is that they could incur additional costs. This is covered in the Bill, in that the court will have the power to award costs against the Crown in favour of private litigants. Clause 2 provides that the Crown is in the same position as is a private litigant in regard to costs. The second reading explanation says that it merely confirms the current practice for many years as far as the courts are concerned. I support the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I thought the Leader of the Opposition might have spoken rather longer than the time it took me to get from my room, but I just made it. I do not oppose the Bill, but I wonder whether it is necessary to have the damn thing at all. This was something that the Leader of the Opposition did not advert to. The fact is that a court now can allow the intervention of the Government as *amicus curiae*, the friend of the court, when that should be required. As far as I can see, this does not seem to carry the matter very much further at all, and I doubt whether it is needed. I understand (the Leader, again, did not mention this, and I am surprised he did not) that the genesis of this Bill lies in a remark of His Honour the Chief Justice of the High Court, Sir Garfield Barwick, to the then Solicitor-General (now the Attorney-General of the Commonwealth) when he sought leave successfully to intervene in some matter. The Chief Justice, having heard his argument, said either facetiously or bullyingly (I do not know which it was on that occasion), "If I had known the sort of argument you would put up, I would not have given you leave to intervene." Because certain authorities in Government have taken fright at that remark and the power that it may perhaps show, legislation of a somewhat similar nature has been introduced in the Commonwealth Parliament and now it has been introduced in South Australia. This legislation may or may not be useful. The problem of passing a Bill for the sake of passing it is that it simply creates another set of sections to be argued and construed. It may well be that problems are hidden in this legislation which we were blithely passing and which would have been passed in less than two minutes had I not

come to my feet (it takes me much less than two minutes to come down the stairs). We may be adding to problems of litigation rather than solving them. These things should be said, and that is why I came down to say them, because, if I did not say them, I do not suppose that anyone on this side would have done so. I do not oppose the Bill, but I have grave reservations whether it is necessary and fear that it may do more harm than good.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Interlocutory orders and costs."

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

Page 1, line 11—Leave out "In" and insert "Subject to the provisions of any other Act, in".

The amendment will ensure that provisions in the Justices Act and other Acts concerning costs are not in any way tampered with by this measure, which is intended to deal with other matters.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I did not know that this amendment was on file, but it is a perfect example of what I was saying. Here we are fiddling with the measure before it is passed. If we have picked up this slight error, I wonder how many other errors we have created.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (3 and 4) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LAND COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 30. Page 3062.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): At the outset I indicate that I oppose clause 3 of this Bill. I hope that all members on this side will oppose that clause. Clause 2 refers to section 4 of the principal Act regarding the fund. It is the Minister's intention, through this Bill, to replace the word "established" with the word "maintained" which, as the Minister explained, will allow the present practice to continue but, instead of the Land Commission establishing a fund within the Treasury, the commission will be allowed to maintain its own fund. I, and I believe other members on this side of the House, do not object to that provision. Clause 3 provides:

Section 12 of the principal Act is amended by inserting in paragraph (a) of subsection (6) after the passage "any dwellinghouse" the passage ", situated on a separate allotment or parcel of land of or less than one-fifth of a hectare,".

I object strongly to that provision. If ever an indication existed where we are moving into 1984, this is it. The Minister, in his second reading explanation, said that councils had requested a consolidation of titles or parcels of land (if one can define a parcel of land) for orderly development. With the Minister's co-operation, I spoke to a person from the Land Commission and, as the Minister made the point about local government, I asked that person which councils had asked the Land Commission to enter into negotiations to acquire land to be consolidated for such a purpose. I was given the names of the following councils: Meadows, Woodville, Salisbury, and Mount Gambier. I have not checked with all those councils, but, under the provisions of the Local Government Act, they have the power to acquire land through normal processes and can compulsorily acquire land.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: With their own funds.

Mr. EVANS: Yes.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They must have the funds to do it.

Mr. EVANS: Yes. If the Minister is saying that the Land Commission has the necessary funds, and that councils do not but that they should have the funds, his Government is in power and has sufficient money, including Loan funds, to make that available to the Land Commission if it wishes, as well as to councils under the next Budget, if the Government is still in office. The Government has an opportunity to make money available for whatever purpose it chooses under this State's budgetary system. Clause 3 is based on requests, according to the Minister, of councils. A letter published in yesterday's *News* from Mr. K. C. Taeuber, Chairman of the South Australian Land Commission, refers to a statement made by Mr. Jim Hullick, Secretary of the Local Government Association. I wish to refer to parts of Mr. Taeuber's letter. The point I am raising is that the Land Commission does not recognise other areas of local government. It does not recognise local government when it comes to meeting its responsibilities in paying council rates. It finds whatever opportunity it can to avoid paying rates by saying that it is exempt from having to pay council rates under the Local Government Act, because it is a Government body, unless the land is occupied. Mr. Taeuber stated:

However, the commission's policy is to ensure that all of its land is occupied and kept in productive use up to the time that urban development begins.

All the commission's land is not kept in production, and all its land does not have rates paid on it until the time of its development. That is not an accurate statement, and I believe that Mr. Taeuber would know that if he checked the facts. I am disappointed to see that sort of thing in print. Mr. Taeuber continues:

Many owners from whom land was acquired by the commission had no plans for subdividing their land, and therefore council rates would have been levied on the broad acre value.

Surely we are not advocating that all of these people in local government areas should think about subdividing their land, but that is the implication in that paragraph. The letter continues:

However, acquisition and development of this land by the commission has meant an increase in council's rate revenue due to earlier development.

It has also meant something else that should be recognised—local government has to pick up the tab for servicing those allotments and the area when it is developed. When land is in its broad acre form there is usually only one residence on it and not many costs are involved in servicing by local government. Once land is developed there are increased costs in servicing. Certainly, there is not a total benefit to local government through rate revenue.

True, there may be a credit on the rate revenue side, and I am not denying that. However, the suggestion here is that there is a total benefit to the local government authority, and that is not accurate at all. The last paragraph of the letter states:

Consequently councils are provided with substantial community assets at no cost to themselves by the commission's developments.

One aspect of the commission should be considered. Perhaps local councils do not pick up the tab, but the commission has a distinct advantage over private developers, and that advantage has been raised in this House, concerning a matter that the Government has refused to rectify, that is, the aggregation of land tax. The Land Commission does not pay land tax, yet private developers

have their properties aggregated and, when they go to sell individual allotments and they want to sell to an individual in the community, they are not allowed to claim back the aggregated rate of land tax: they can claim only the individual rate of land tax on the allotment in question. Therefore, a bigger cost burden is placed on private developers, and that is passed on to the purchasers of the land.

The Government has said in this House and elsewhere that the commission can supply cheaper land than can private developers. That is only because of the distinct in-built advantages to the commission, which does not pay land tax at all, let alone aggregated land tax, and it does not pay to councils the total of its council rates. They are two distinct advantages indeed and, on a proper investigation one finds that Government services, such as those provided by the Engineering and Water Supply Department or by semi-government authorities such as the Electricity Trust, are provided for the commission at a more favourable price than applies to private developers.

Furthermore, with applications to the State Planning Authority and other bodies the commission receives a much speedier service than private developers receive. As much as I have heard the Minister argue those points against this argument in the past, I say to him that it is true. Does the Minister know that in the case of the Meadows council the commission did not pay its council rates until after the due date? How can the commission say it is concerned about local government when it does not pay its rates until after the due date and then refuses to pay the fine imposed because it claims to be a Government body exempt from the Local Government Act?

How can we substantiate such action and then consider that changing the law will help local government? We must be honest about the real purposes of this clause, which is not to help local government; that is just the sham the Government and the Minister are using. The Meadows council is getting around its problem through its own action. It has to find the funds; that is its difficulty, but it will get there. Other councils can do the same with Government help, if the Government really wants to help them.

Under the present Act, the commission cannot acquire any land on which the principal house of the owner is situated. The Minister and the commission want to change that, as is stated in the Minister's second reading explanation, so that, if the area of land on which the principal house is situated is less than one-fifth of a hectare (about half an acre), the commission cannot acquire that land, but it can acquire any other area. Let us look at some of the properties which can be acquired and which doubtless will be acquired whether by present or future members of the commission. I refer to properties on which there are glasshouses, nurseries and market gardens. Such properties still remain in the metropolitan area, and I instance the Lockleys area and the property of the Hanks.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I suggest you examine clause 12 and see the other restrictions on Land Commission acquisition regarding an industry or commercial enterprise.

Mr. EVANS: What happens if the families decide that they do not wish to continue with an enterprise and just retire there? There is a gentleman of about 80 years of age at Golden Grove, and he owns more than 2 hectares of land. The commission has been trying to get him out for some time but he merely wishes to spend the remainder of his life on his piece of land, although he does not wish to go on working it. He has lived there all his life and wishes to see his years out there.

Under the present Act the commission cannot acquire that land but, if we accept this new provision, it can move in as soon as the Bill is signed by the Governor, and say, "Look, Sir, we are sorry, we are buying your property, but you can stay there for the rest of your life at a low rent." He does not want that—he wants to own the land and spend the rest of his life on it. I refer to other Adelaide metropolitan and fringe areas and properties of 2 ha, 4 ha or 8 ha on which no commercial enterprise is conducted at all.

Some Unley Park properties comprise 0.2 ha or more, and the commission could buy any of that land. I accept the Minister's argument about industry on a property. In Happy Valley, the commission recently attempted to buy out a poultry farmer. The owner may think of slowing down and discontinuing, because he has been in the game for years but, if he stops, under this new provision, the commission can buy this land. However, while he continues to live on the property and run his poultry farm, the commission cannot buy it even if this provision is passed. That is accepted.

The only way to save such land if this provision is passed is for everyone living in South Australia who owns more than one-fifth of a hectare to keep working it as a commercial enterprise. If not, the commission—big brother—can walk in and simply buy it. The Minister has made a recent statement (I will not say where) in relation to section 61 of the Planning and Development Act. He said that, if people wished to do so, they could declare it open space under section 61. I offer a word of warning to people who may do that. I cite the case of Mr. F. P. Smith, of Coromandel Valley, who in 1961 declared his land as open space under section 61 of the Planning and Development Act. The Minister, who was the Minister of Education in 1972, started negotiations to buy that property. Mr. Smith went overseas whilst the negotiations were proceeding. The value put on the property by the department was about \$60 000, but the Valuer-General placed on the property a value of more than \$100 000.

Mr. Smith did not appeal against it, because he was sure the Education Department would buy the land. The price was put up from \$60 000 to \$90 000, a fair sort of increase, and at \$90 000 Mr. Smith, through the person acting as his attorney, said, "No." He came back from his holiday and still refused the offer, and then the Minister of Education said the department did not want the land. Mr. Smith has been rated at subdivisional value on a piece of land declared open space and classed by the Valuer-General's Department as of subdivisional value. I offer a word of warning to people who declare their land open space. They cannot be sure that they will be rated at the lower rate.

In the case I have mentioned, both the Mitcham and the Meadows councils (the property transgressed the boundary between the two councils) recognised it as open space and rated it on that basis. The track record for land declared under section 61 in my district is not good. I warn property holders on that point. I ask the House to reject clause 3. It is not an essential move. No importance is placed on it by local government, and I believe the Minister wants it to give the commission more power. Clause 4 merely makes a point in relation to maintaining the fund. As there is no objection to that clause, it can be supported, but I ask the House to reject clause 3, which is unnecessary and not wanted. It will give too much power to an authority that already has sufficient power.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): My colleague mentioned that, on advice from a member of the Minister's staff, an invitation was given that areas in Mount Gambier, Salisbury, Woodville, and Meadows were examples of local government seeking this particular alteration. I undertook to contact the Salisbury council. I learnt from the officer who was in charge of planning at that council that in 1973, at the time when the Land Commission Bill was first being considered, the council raised with the Government a question whether this form of inclusion could be undertaken. The council had a problem. It referred to a parcel of land east of the Main North Road and north of Clayson Road, bounded on the eastern side by Bridge Road, a sizable piece of land into which, in an overall plan, a collector road would pass. The subdivision that had taken place to that time took the collector road to the fence line of the property and could proceed no further.

The council was interested not in the acquisition of the whole of the land but only in the acquisition of such parcel of land as would allow the collector road to complete its course and thus assist with the overall development of the area that was up for subdivision. The council saw in this piece of legislation a means of obtaining external funds for the purchase of the road. It was not interested in its own rights for a subdivision of the total property, but simply wanted that parcel of land for a collector road. When the council was told, as a result of discussions relating to the legislation, that it could not be accommodated, it said, "Thank you very much", and left it at that, knowing that at some later date, when further development took place in the area, it would be able to require that the land be used for a collector road and that it would be provided at the expense of the subdivider.

If the Government is saying that local government urgently requires this inclusion in the Act, on the evidence available to me that is not a fact. I have no doubt that the Salisbury council could come to some terms with the person who owns that land or could undertake compulsory acquisition of the piece of land for the purpose of that collector road by way of payment, and the Government with its funding should find no difficulty at all in making available to the council a specific grant for the acquisition of that parcel of land. The balance of the property will remain as one property for rating purposes, even though a road divides it. It is contiguous land; it will not be considered as two parcels. Granted, it will be necessary to provide two titles for it, but there are ways and means, and have been in the past, whereby those two titles adjacent to the one road could be combined and there could be a restriction on further subdivision without all of the other attendant requirements.

With the member for Fisher, I believe that the Government is attempting an intrusion into the rights of the people of this State by the measure contained in this clause. I agree with him, in respect of the amalgamation or aggregation of values for land tax, that it places a tremendous burden on people who are seeking to develop land. I ask members to refer to pages 1794 and 1795 of *Hansard* of November 2, 1976. There, in reply to a question regarding distribution of numbers of owners within certain bench marks of valuation, we find that in South Australia, in 1976-77, 554 people had properties aggregated or singly valued for amounts between \$200 001 and \$500 000, and that only 36 of those 554 were owners with declared rural land. Moving up the scale, from \$500 001 to \$1 000 000 there were 121 ownerships, only six of which were declared rural land. Looking at the parcels of land with aggregations of more than \$1 000 000, we

find 91 owners, with only two of the 91 classed as declared rural land. Let us take this one step further in the three categories I have mentioned. In the first, \$200 001 to \$500 000, they were estimated to return a total of \$3 271 000 by way of land tax. For the 121 in the group from \$500 001 to \$1 000 000, the estimated figure was \$2 024 000. In the group exceeding \$1 000 000, the total of 91 was expected to provide \$5 856 000 to the State. More than \$11 000 000 of the total of \$18 923 000 expected recovery for land tax would be provided by people with parcels of land of that kind.

In a subsequent reply to a Question on Notice, which can be found in *Hansard*, it was indicated that many people in those categories were companies or individuals who had development land. It is against the best interest of the people to support the Bill in total. I give the Minister fair warning that, if the offensive clause remains in the Bill, I will vote against the whole measure. Like my colleague, I find that the other alterations made are satisfactory, and they will advance the working of the Land Commission Act. In the interests of common decency and the best interest of the public, I cannot support clause 3.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill but oppose clause 3. Clauses 1 and 2 are normal and formal and I support clause 4, but I oppose clause 3 as strongly as possible. The trick in the Bill is that the Government has taken the opportunity to sneak in the amendment. There has been difficulty previously about the matter, and what the Government is doing will not be accepted by this side of the House, because it will allow Big Brother, the Land Commission, to be all powerful. Clause 3 alters the protection for a person who lives, as a owner, on a property.

The Minister in his second reading explanation referred to the provision that the commission shall not acquire, by compulsory process, any dwellinghouse that is occupied by the owner as his principal place of residence. Clause 3 inserts after "any dwellinghouse" the words "situated on a separate allotment or parcel of land of or less than one-fifth of a hectare". As the member for Fisher has said, one-fifth of a hectare is equal to about half an acre. What the Government is doing is entirely wrong, and the member for Fisher has explained the motives.

We on this side know how the Land Commission operates, and we know its history. We know what has happened in Adelaide and the surrounding areas regarding the disappearance of the vineyards that the Government has often proudly stated to be a tourist attraction. We have vineyards near the city and some in the city area, yet the Government is the worst offender in taking them over, bulldozing them out of existence, and providing housing. The record of the Land Commission is not a proud one. I said when the Bill for the principal Act was introduced that it was socialist legislation.

A similar thing was tried in the United Kingdom by the brothers of members of the socialist Government of this State, but the Government of the United Kingdom had to get rid of the Land Commission because of the problems that it caused. This State Government ought to take a leaf out of the book of that socialist Government and see how it changed its outlook. Pressure from the people made that Government think about the matter again. Clause 3 is bad, and the Government knows it is. It is typical of what this Government tries to sneak through in a sly way. I and my colleagues bitterly oppose the socialist method, the back-door way of taking control of many people who wish to

remain on their land. The Government is taking away the last protection that these people have against Big Brother, the monopoly Land Commission.

The commission has so many advantages over the private developer. It does not have to meet the costs that the private developer faces. It reneges on its commitments to local government as often as possible and it does not pay council rates or land tax commitments. The advantages that it has over the private sector are colossal and people who consider the matter will realise what a farce it is for the Minister to speak of the great record of the Land Commission in keeping down the price of land.

Mr. Langley: Does it keep down the price of land?

Mr. MATHWIN: It is operating at an advantage that the private sector does not have. If clause 3 is not defeated, I will oppose the Bill.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I am totally opposed to clause 3 and, if it passes, I will oppose the Bill. It is fundamentally and absolutely opposed to Liberal principle. The activities of the Land Commission have been referred to this evening, and I do not intend to add to the chapter of complaints laid. I want to deal only with the principle. Section 12 of the existing legislation provides that the commission shall not acquire by compulsory process any dwellinghouse that is occupied by the owner as his principal place of residence. That is entirely right. If we must have a Land Commission with powers of acquisition, the individual must be protected from its activities. The provision to which I have referred to in the Act is a fundamental part of that.

Now, that protection will be whittled away by bringing in the amendment to include the words "situated on a separate allotment or parcel of land of or less than one-fifth of a hectare". One-fifth of a hectare is the equivalent of half an acre. The whole thing stinks, and I will not have a bar of it. The whole question of acquisition is repugnant. Sometimes it is important and sometimes it is necessary. If a project affects the entire community, acquisition may be necessary, but it must be done having due regard for the rights of people who are displaced. The existing legislation is not nearly sufficient in that regard and this whole business is directly opposed to the rights of the individual. It has been said that the Englishman's home is his castle. That applies equally as well to the Australian's home and the South Australian's home.

It does not matter whether it is on one-fifth of a hectare or on a hectare—it is still his principal place of residence and it is his home. Here, we have the imposition of the absolute demands of the State overriding roughshod the rights of the individual. As I have said, there have been accounts of the Land Commission's acquisition activities or threatened acquisitions and of the effect they have had on land values, but this legislation removes one of the very few safeguards that already exist in the legislation to protect the rights of the individual. The present protection is to be cut back still further and whittled away. I repeat that it is fundamentally against not only Liberal principles and Liberal philosophy but also the fundamental rights of every human being. I oppose the proposed amendment.

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen): I rise briefly mainly to bring to the attention of the House some detail referred to earlier by the member for Light. When he spoke, he could not obtain information, but may I add to what has already been said and say that I oppose strongly clause 3. As has been pointed out clearly from members

on this side, we are totally against compulsory acquisition of any kind except in exceptional circumstances. The situation regarding compulsory acquisition has concerned people in my electoral district. It has caused much speculation, which is as great as any concern. I suggest that, if this clause and Bill are allowed to pass, many more people will be concerned as a result of that.

The member for Light could not immediately identify the detail of the number of developers in the various valuation scales, and he has given it to me. He has indicated that the additional detail is to be found on pages 1969 and 1970 of *Hansard* of November 9, 1976. It is pointed out there that there are nine property developers in 121 ownerships with valuations between \$500 001 and \$1 000 000. In fact, 21 of the 91 were cases where property values were in excess of \$1 000 000. As I said earlier, I rise only to quote those figures, but again I emphasise that I am very much against clause 3.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): In replying to the debate, which has concentrated mainly on one clause of the Bill, I make clear from the word "Go" that there are, as the Leader of the Opposition has indicated, provisions for compulsory acquisition by Government departments and local government for certain public purposes and, inevitably, whether or not we believe that compulsory acquisition is appropriate depends on the value that we place on those public purposes. The Leader of the Opposition, despite his very phoney indignation, knows full well that there are compulsory acquisition rights that he would not give up were he in Government—for departments like the Education, the Engineering and Water Supply and the Lands Departments for public purposes. The Leader seeks, as do other members opposite, to denigrate the activities of the Land Commission.

Dr. Tonkin: I denigrate this part of the Bill.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader may care to notice that I did not interject on him despite the very great provocation; he may care to extend the same courtesy to me.

Mr. Dean Brown: But you often interject in this House, don't you?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Dean Brown: You often interject—

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. If the honourable member for Davenport interjects again tonight and defies me while I am speaking, I promise that I shall certainly name him.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The purpose of the Land Commission is to ensure the orderly development of new suburbs and, by ensuring that orderly development, to avoid the excessive spread of the metropolitan area, to try to limit, by that orderly development, the metropolitan area to the 1991 boundaries, and in that way to ensure that there is not a metropolitan encroachment on to rural land that is not at present defined as future residential. Invariably, the land we are talking about is zoned rural A, and that zoning of rural A implies that it is future residential land and will be subject to residential development unless some means is found to declare, say under section 61 of the Planning and Development Act, it as an open space subject to some kind of special rates. Sooner or later, the effect of ancillary development in the neighbourhood will force the development of that land.

We have seen in Adelaide the effects of development taking place in a higgledy-piggledy fashion. It means that inadequate provision is made, in areas as they develop, for recreation or for various public facilities that are required—perhaps a bus depot. In proper planning, space for a bus depot should have been provided well ahead of development so that people would know what they were up for and what they could expect. If planning had been carried out properly, that would have been the case. The member for Glenelg has been associated with the Brighton council and he will be aware, for reasons I do not propose to canvass tonight, that in the development of that council area inadequate provision was made for recreation.

Mr. Mathwin: It was well before my time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not blaming the honourable member. In fact, he was one of those who had a relatively progressive attitude towards the activities of the council for the provision of recreational facilities. I am not sniping at him; I am merely saying that he would be aware that inadequate provision was made and that development has taken place in such a way that all the residential development that has occurred along Brighton Road is being subjected to increased traffic noise and traffic hazards, and obviously there is worse to come because of the further development taking place at Hallett Cove. Honourable members who know the Hallett Cove area will be aware that that area has developed over a 30-year period, and that has been at a cost to the rest of the community. Because there has not been orderly and consolidated development, rates for water and sewerage purposes are higher than they would otherwise be. Water and sewerage facilities have to be provided but the use that is made of them is much less than it could be, because the development gets spread over 20 years instead of being concentrated. The same applies to electricity facilities. Everyone in our community bears the consequences in terms of higher rates and taxes of the higgledy-piggledy and scattered development that has taken place in the past and bears the consequences of inadequate provision being made in new residential areas for various public purposes. There is no gainsaying those facts. Furthermore, the principles that the Leader would adhere to are designed to create millionaires out of some people (not all) who happen to be lucky enough to have large land holdings in areas that were rural but have become urban. Those increments in value are paid for by all of the new residents. The increment in value is unearned: it is purely the chance of fortune that means that some landholder who is on the fringe of an urban area gets the unearned increment while others who are not on the fringe do not.

The basic philosophy behind the Land Commission is that the increment in value should accrue to the public for the benefit of everyone. The implied philosophy of the member for Fisher, the Leader, and other Opposition members is that the individual landholder has the right to that full increment in value, no matter what, and the new residents of that area have to pay more in order to give that landholder that right. That is the basic difference in point of view: I am not going to hide it. It is no longer farm land, but what did the owner do to make it residential? He was lucky enough to own it, and lucky enough to become a millionaire in some cases and a multi-millionaire in other cases.

Mr. Becker: Good luck to him.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is what the honourable member and the Leader would say. They would say, "Let new people who have to buy land and the house

on it pay more as a consequence. Let us penalise the younger generation so that we can have good luck for the lucky landholders." That is not our opinion.

Mr. Becker: No, because you're a socialist: that's the crux of Socialism, isn't it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The crux of the position of the honourable member and other Opposition members is that the rest of the community can pay more for the privilege of certain people making huge capital gains that they happen to get by pure chance. It is not as though the owners of land that is rural A in Adelaide have not gained some increment in value and some effect from the urban change.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport has no need to speak so loudly to his colleague.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I am deaf.

The SPEAKER: I do not care: that does not give the honourable member the right to speak like that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is not the case that owners of rural A land acquired by the commission have not gained substantial increments in value. Most of that land, if valued for rural purposes (especially in the Tea Tree Gully and Modbury areas or in the area around Reynella, which are the two main areas of land acquisition by the commission), would be valued at, say, \$400 to \$500 an acre. Most of the land that has been purchased by the commission has attracted a price of \$2 500 to \$3 000 an acre. No landholder in those areas can say that he has been put to any disadvantage in terms of re-establishment compared to what would happen to landholders in the rest of the State involved in rural production if their land had to be purchased for some reason or if they had to sell. These landholders are getting a substantial advantage over and above what would apply elsewhere.

That is the basic difference between us. Opposition members say that what I am speaking about is Socialism: I say that what they are referring to leads to inadequate residential development, improper provision for public facilities, and increased costs for everyone. What the Opposition, especially the member for Fisher, is demonstrating is that, if it is a choice between speculative gain for landholders or increased costs for ratepayers or increased costs generally and increased costs for new house buyers, they would vote for increased costs generally and increased costs for new house buyers, because they want land tax to be paid on commission land, and want council rates to be paid on commission land during the process of development, and want extra costs to occur. That is what has been said. Who is to pay these costs? It will be the new generation who will buy a block of land on which to build a house.

Mr. Goldsworthy: We want fair competition: if it is good enough for the commission it should be good enough for private developers.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member wants fair competition, but the honourable member does not want low prices for the new house buyer, because if he could get it this way, he is saying you cannot have it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader had the opportunity to speak, but refused to take it. He must remain silent now, as he will have the opportunity in Committee to question the Minister.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He's talking rubbish.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Federal colleagues of Opposition members have to be given some credit, because,

as with the lands commissions and urban land councils in other States, the Federal Government is continuing to support financially this activity of these State authorities, and has continued to support financially the South Australian Government this year. The sum of \$6 000 000 was provided in Mr. Lynch's Budget last year for the purposes of the Land Commission, which has been subject to attack by Opposition members. We are coming to the clause in contention. The Land Commission has been involved in purchasing some property where there is a principal place of residence, not by compulsory acquisition procedures, but arrangements have always been reached to suit the owner of that land to excise the area of land around his house, or where a landowner has wished to buy the house there has been an arrangement for free rental for the house owner during his lifetime.

I have no doubt that similar arrangements will continue to be made wherever a principal place of residence is involved. The people associated with the Land Commission are very human in their approach. I have no doubt that, if Opposition members consider the matter, and desired to excise from a 20-acre block purchased by the Land Commission a half acre around the house, that could be done. I think the ultimate social purpose involved for the future development of Adelaide, in order to prevent its getting too large is to ensure that it does not spread excessively geographically, to ensure that the cost of new development is minimised, and to ensure that in the new development there is effective use of all public facilities provided, is in the general interest of the total community and will help in keeping down costs to the rest of the community.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Powers and functions of commission."

Mr. EVANS: I strongly oppose this clause. We have recently heard the Minister say that its intention is to make land cheaper for people who wish to acquire allotments. Also, the Minister says that the aim of the clause is to make better use of public resources. However, there are times when we must consider people's freedoms and their opportunities to stay on a piece of land. Let us consider the case of a family that has had a property for perhaps 100 years. Did the people who originally bought the property in, say, 1877 think that the suburban sprawl would reach it when their great grandchildren resided on the land? It is a poor argument to suggest that the people planned for that. Let us also consider another family which in 1877 struggled to clear land and subsequently educated two or three lawyers or doctors, who invested their money in shares, diamonds or gold and who could be equally as well off today as the family that remained on the property. The Minister's argument is false. His argument fails if he is saying that many people own much land on which the principal home is situated. I accept the Minister's argument if he is talking about developers who buy the land with the intention of developing it; they are caught up in the Income Tax Act, and they are taxed. Of course, there are loopholes in that Act that people use in connection with cash deals or false names. This evening we are talking about people who have their principal home on a piece of land. The people who own most of the old-established properties have lived on them for several generations, and we should not make the accusation that the Minister makes against them. Regarding the use of public money, I point out that it costs about \$70 000 to get a person to the point of being a lawyer. The rest

of society pays that burden. If a labourer employs a lawyer, that labourer may have to pay a fee of \$200 a day, yet the labourer has helped to pay for the lawyer's education. So, there are many faults in the system. Where there is a forced acquisition, a person should be paid something extra, because he is disadvantaged. If a person is forced off a property and if he argues that he is not getting enough compensation, by the time the final settlement is made and he buys another property, he is disadvantaged. Nowhere in the acquisition legislation are a person's rights protected. There is no such thing as fair compensation, except in the case of big poultry farmers who have enough legal power to fight a case.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is straying from the clause.

Mr. Dean Brown: Who pays—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Davenport has already been warned.

Mr. EVANS: This clause gives the Minister the opportunity to acquire land where the principal home is on the land and the property has an area of more than one-fifth of a hectare. I know that it can be argued that there are increased costs to the community. The Government is saying, "We will buy this area, and everyone who wants land must live there."

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: We are not saying that.

Mr. EVANS: That is happening now; that is orderly development! There is a choice of three or four areas. People are told that they must build on a block within two years of purchasing it. A person must wait until he has his partner in life and until his housing contract is arranged. The department says, "These areas are available." If we vote for this clause, we decrease the choices available. The Minister used the argument concerning the cost of providing services to areas where all the allotments are not built on in a short period. I know there is a slightly increased cost to the community, but the freedom of choice and the freedom of the individual to remain on a property are very important in our society. We do not want the doctrinaire, Big Brother dictatorship operation. The man in the street does not want it. If the man in the street was asked whether he objected to a Government department acquiring his home he, along with 95 per cent of the people, would say "Yes". I oppose the clause.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): My opposition is far more blunt and direct than that of my colleague the member for Fisher, although I do not in any way detract from the arguments he has advanced. The Minister for Planning has cut away all the bull from his earlier explanations about why this legislation was introduced.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: For your information—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Minister for Planning is out of order.

Dr. TONKIN: After the Minister pointed out to me that interjections were out of order I did him the courtesy of not interjecting. I should like him to do me the same courtesy. The Minister talked a lot of claptrap about public purposes but admitted finally that this legislation had been introduced for purely doctrinaire or philosophical reasons. Our opposition is based on philosophical grounds, because we believe in the freedom of the individual to live in peace undisturbed by the State. The State exists to serve the individual, not to dictate, oppress or harass him unnecessarily. That is what this clause is all about: it takes away the protection that the individual now enjoys. Lord knows that that protection is not very much! I totally and absolutely reject this clause.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister for Planning): I referred to the general arguments in reply to the points that were made previously by the member for Fisher. The arguments that existed in the second reading explanation still apply but, as these general points had been raised, I chose to reply to them, and I stand by that reply. One certainly wishes to protect the rights of the individual to the maximum possible extent. The effect of protecting those rights to an excessive extent could well produce a situation where the overall result of that protection is worse for individuals. If a new residential area is inadequately developed and if the road structure places improper consideration on where houses must be situated, because of that inadequate development, the future rights of individuals who must tolerate traffic noise and the problems associated with it are interfered with.

The consequence of the lack of orderly development can be seen in our existing suburbs, and arise from the kind of thing that has disturbed the member for Fisher in his area where, in order to cure problems created by the kind of development that has occurred in the past, certain road closures are proposed, and all sorts of arguments are developed as a consequence. It is important to try to obtain a rational and orderly development for the benefit of the rights of the individual who will ultimately live in the area. Individual rights have something to do, too, with the price that must be paid for land. These days, because of increased costs and the inflation of interest rates—

Mr. Gunn: You're going to evict people off their land.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Eyre is out of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: —young couples are finding it more and more difficult to finance the purchase of their own house, and that interferes with the rights of individuals. Unless attention is paid to costs, the rights of individuals are not as well looked after. It is wrong for members opposite to claim that they are the champions of the rights of individuals when it can be demonstrated that some of the consequences of the kinds of policy that they advocate are more damaging in the long run to the rights of individuals than would be the policies advocated by this Government.

Mr. EVANS: I cannot support those comments. Councils would have the right to be interested in orderly development in their areas. They are answerable directly to the people in their areas. Councils have the power to acquire land compulsorily regardless of the size of the house or property concerned. We are not objecting to that power, because the people of that area have the opportunity to vote and show their concern. On a State-wide basis people cannot express that point of view strongly enough to have any influence. If a Government wishes, because a problem has occurred in an area, to have orderly development, it can, through councils agreeing, make money available to local government to carry out the same functions that we are considering in this clause. Local residents have a say in what is happening because they can vote. That is why we believe that the Government does not need this power. I want the Minister to realise that in some instances costs of providing services have been the result of bad management and bad planning by a Government. Buses running on our roads are doing so with 12 tonnes on the rear axle, which is up to three tonnes—

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Fisher is out of order. We are dealing with clause 3. I can assure the honourable member that he is out of order talking about buses.

Mr. EVANS: Specifications laid down for roads and other services are going to the extreme for the reason that I gave earlier. That cost is added to the cost of an allotment, because the Government does not conform to the standards that it sets for the rest of society regarding the operation of the type of vehicle to which I referred. I know that interest rates are reasonably high, but I also know that the cost of providing services is high. The Government has never ascertained why the cost is so high. That is why allotments are so dear. Regarding the Chandler Hill subdivision, before the State Planning Authority issued a form A approval the commission allowed subcontractors to develop roads. If that is orderly planning, I am a Chinaman.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Connelly, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hoggood, Hudson (teller), Keneally, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Whitten.

Noes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Vandeeper, Wardle, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Corcoran, Jennings, and Wright.
Noes—Messrs. Arnold, Chapman, and Venning.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 4 passed.

Title passed.

[Midnight]

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): There is little to say about this Bill as it comes out of Committee except that clause 3, which was the subject of prolonged

discussion, is a clear indication that this Government, which is supposed to be so concerned about individuals, is nothing more than an openly confessed doctrinaire socialist Government whose only concern is to increase the power of the State over the individual. As the member for Light has said, tonight we have come close to 1984 in 1977.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): I merely wish to record the fact that the claims that the Leader of the Opposition has made about the purposes of the Government are totally and utterly false and without foundation.

Dr. Tonkin: You admitted it in the Committee stage.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader says that is what I did and that is always an entirely different thing, because the Leader is entirely incapable of understanding an argument that does not involve much claptrap.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hoggood, Hudson (teller), Keneally, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Whitten.

Noes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Vandeeper, Wardle, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Corcoran, Jennings, and Wright.
Noes—Messrs. Arnold, Chapman, and Venning.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

Bill passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.10 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, April 6, at 2 p.m.