

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, November 29, 1977

The **SPEAKER (Hon. G. R. Langley)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. **HARRISON** presented a petition signed by 23 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to amend the Succession Duties Act so that the position of blood relations sharing a family property enjoy at least the same benefits as those available to other recognised relationships.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

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

LINCOLN HIGHWAY

Mr. **WOTTON** (on notice):

1. Has the Government carried out any work to preserve roadside vegetation along the Lincoln Highway and, if so, what was the nature of the work, and when was this work carried out?

2. What plans does the Government have to preserve the Lincoln Highway vegetation strip, and when will this work be carried out?

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

1. No.

2. The Highways Department is currently reconstructing the Lincoln Gap to Whyalla section of the Lincoln Highway, and has taken into account preservation of existing vegetation in so far as is possible. Landscaping in the form of planting schemes is also being considered.

INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

Mr. **ALLISON** (on notice):

1. Is a member of the Premier's Industrial Democracy Unit currently carrying out an investigation into the suitability of various models for worker participation in Government schools?

2. Is this being done in collaboration with the South Australian Institute of Teachers?

3. Has the investigator been seconded from the Education Department?

4. Who is this officer, what are his terms of reference, and when will his report be completed and made public?

5. Does the Minister intend to impose, upon State schools, a specific model for worker participation?

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

1. Yes.

2. No.

3. Yes.

4. The officer is Mr. R. Quirk, and his terms of reference and report will be made public in the first half of next year.

5. No.

THEVENARD CROSSING

Mr. **GUNN** (on notice): When is it anticipated that the reinstatement of the Innes Avenue railway crossing at Thevenard will be completed?

The **Hon. G. T. VIRGO**: Because of the problem of drainage resulting from the run-off from the Waratah and bulk handling areas, a permanent solution of the condition of this crossing is not wholly the concern of the Rail Division. It is also a matter for consideration of the District Council of Murat Bay. Designs of alternative road surfaces have been developed, and it is proposed to use the crossing for the site of prototype trials. In the meantime the District Council of Murat Bay has been requested to undertake temporary repairs as required.

PREMIER'S OVERSEAS TOUR

Mr. **MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Does the Premier propose, within the next 12 months, to make a tour overseas on Government business and, if so—

(a) when;

(b) for how long is it expected to last;

(c) for what purpose;

(d) to which countries does he propose to go;

(e) by whom does he expect to be accompanied; and

(f) at what expected cost?

The **Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN**: I have been asked repeatedly to go to Libya, Algeria, and Jordan in relation to work undertaken or under investigation in those countries, and to lead a trade group to the U.S.A. It was at one stage intended that I would undertake such a trip with my wife and appropriate staff immediately following my visit to Singapore and Malaysia; however, the business of Parliament made this impossible. Decisions about the making of such visits next year have not been made as yet.

PREMIER'S TRIP

Mr. **DEAN BROWN** (on notice): Can the Premier now give details sought in my Question on Notice on October 25, 1977, concerning his recent overseas trip?

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

(a) October 31 to November 14, 1977.

(b) See reply given on October 25, 1977.

(c) See attached prepared itinerary.

(d) Yes. See reply given on October 25, 1977, and see above.

(e) The Premier's wife and the Director-General, Premier's Department.

(f) The cost of air fares—\$4 400; cost of accommodation, meals and internal travel—\$1 400.

Visit

of

The Premier of South Australia

Mr. Don Dunstan, Q.C., M.P.

and

his wife

Ms. Adele Koh

to

SINGAPORE * MALAYSIA * INDONESIA

PROGRAMME

October 31 to November 14, 1977

Accompanying the Premier and his wife

Mr. Graham J. Inns
Director-General, Premier's Department

MONDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1977

7.01 a.m. Depart Adelaide for Sydney T.A.A. flight 21.
9.10 a.m. Arrive Sydney.
4.30 p.m. Depart Sydney for Singapore Qantas flight 1.
8.40 p.m. Arrive Singapore.

To be met by: the Australian Deputy High Commissioner in Singapore, Mr. Alan Edwards; the President of AAMO, Mr. Richard Eu; and the National President of A.I.M., Mr. David Pank.

Accommodation: Shangrila Hotel.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1977

9.30 a.m. Discussions with High Commission officials.
Attendance at sessions of Sixth International Conference of Asian Association of Management Organisations (AAMO).
12.30 p.m. Luncheon—Australian Alumni Association with membership of Singaporean graduates of Australian universities.
5.30 p.m. Businessmen's meeting organised by AAMO.

Accommodation: Shangrila Hotel.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1977

a.m. Arrangement of details of conference and business appointments for Singapore and Malaysia.
12.50 p.m. Lunch with Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew.
3.00 p.m. Press conference.
3.30 p.m. Discussions with Mr. Tay Choo Soon, trade agent.
7.30 p.m. Premier to address the closing banquet of the AAMO—Conference—Shangrila Hotel.

Accommodation: Shangrila Hotel.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1977

8.45 a.m. Depart Singapore for Kuala Lumpur. M.A.S. flight 682.
9.30 a.m. Arrive Kuala Lumpur. To be met by Australian High Commissioner to Malaysia, Mr. Graham Feakes.
10.00 a.m. Discussions with High Commission and press conference.
11.00 a.m. Discussions with Mr. Bernard Thomazios of M.A.S., re North Malaysia Week.
12.30 p.m. Discussions with Mr. Mg Ek Teong—S.A. trade agent in Malaysia.
3.30 p.m. Malaysian Prime Minister—Datuk Hussein Bin Onn.
8.00 p.m. Dinner at the home of the Australian High Commissioner to Malaysia, Mr. Feakes. Dress: long sleeved sports shirt.

Accommodation: Hilton Hotel.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1977

Tour of West Malaysian States—Selangor, Sembilan, Melaka.
Inspection of craft industries, paddy straw, etc.

Evening free.

Accommodation: Hilton Hotel.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1977

7.15 a.m. Depart Kuala Lumpur for Penang. M.A.S. flight 304.
7.55 a.m. Arrive Penang. To be met by Chief Minister, Dr. Lim Chong Eu and taken to E. & O. Hotel.
9.30 a.m. Discussions with Chief Minister and officials.
12.15 p.m. Courtesy call on His Excellency Yang DiPertua Negeri at Residency, Penang.
1.00 p.m. Lunch by His Excellency Yang DiPertua Negeri.
8.00 p.m. Private dinner hosted by the Hon. Mr. Khalid Ahmad at 46, Taman Jesselton, Penang.

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1977

a.m. Proceed to V.I.P. bungalow Batu Feringghi.
7.30 p.m. Dinner by State Government at Edinburgh Room, Hotel Merlin.

Accommodation: E. & O. Hotel.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1977

10.00 a.m. Discussion with Hon. Chief Minister Penang at Bangunan Tuanku Syed Putra on: trade ventures between South Australia and Penang; Adelaide visit to North Malaysia, November-December, 1978; Penang students exchange; other State projects and developments.
1.00 p.m. Lunch by P.D.C.—Steak Room, Hotel Ambassador.
3.30 p.m. Visit to Panelex Factory, Butterworth.
8.30 p.m. Private dinner with Chief Minister at Chief Minister's residence.

Accommodation: E. & O. Hotel.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1977

10.30 a.m. Depart Penang for Alor Star.
12.00 noon. Discussions with Menteri Besar, Kedah, Datuk Sri Syed Shahapudin, and State Secretary, Datuk Radzi bin Basir.
1.00 p.m. Lunch with Menteri Besar, Kedah.
2.30 p.m. Depart Alor Star for Kangar.
3.00 p.m. Discussions with Menteri Besar, Perlis, Datuk Jaafar bin Hassan; and State Secretary, Datuk Mansor Osman. (Matters to include proposed Adelaide visit to North Malaysia November-December, 1978.)
Travel by air to Alor Star and by car to Perlis.
4.00 p.m. Tea with Menteri Besar, Perlis.
5.00 p.m. Return to Penang.
Accommodation: E. & O. Hotel.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 1977

10.00 a.m. Depart Penang for Ipoh by car.
12.00 noon. Discussion with Menteri Besar, Perak, the Honourable Wan Mohamed bin Haji Wan Teh, and State Secretary, Datuk Radin Soenarno.

(Matters to include proposed Adelaide visit to North Malaysia, November-December, 1978.)
1.00 p.m. Lunch by Menteri Besar, Perak.
3.00 p.m. Return to Penang.

Accommodation: E. & O. Hotel.

Commission	8 0166
direct	8 8099
residence	2 2208
(telex No. 30260)	
Foreign Affairs, Adelaide telex No.	8 2068
Premier's Dept., Adelaide telex No.	8 2827
Agent-General, London telex No.	91 8749

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 1977

8.45 a.m. Depart Penang for Medan, Sumatra. M.A.S. flight 854.
8.50 a.m. Arrive Medan. Assistant Secretary for Sumatra, Tengku Puya Aziz.
11.00 a.m. Discussions with members of Regional Planning Board of North Sumatra regarding studies of industrial joint ventures.
1.15 p.m. Proceed to Kisaran-Uniroyal rubber plantation.
7.00 p.m. Dinner hosted by Managing Director of Uniroyal, Sumatra, Mr. G. W. Lavinder.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 1977

9.30 a.m. Inspection of Uniroyal rubber plantation at Kisaran. Inspect footwear factory and other ventures.
12.00 noon Proceed to Prapat. View paddy straw projects en route.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1977

No definite arrangements made.

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1977

1.15 p.m. Depart Medan for Jakarta. Garuda Airlines flight GA 183.
3.20 p.m. Arrive Jakarta. To be met by Australian Ambassador to Indonesia Mr. R. (Dick) A. Woolcott. Discussion with Embassy officials.
7.00 p.m. Depart Jakarta for Sydney. Qantas flight QF 730.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1977

7.10 a.m. Arrive Sydney.
8.50 a.m. Depart Sydney for Adelaide. T.A.A. flight TN2.
10.10 a.m. Arrive Adelaide.

TELEPHONE NUMBERS

Hotels:	
Shangrila (Singapore)	37 3644
(telex No. 21505)	
Hilton (Kuala Lumpur)	42 2122
(telex No. 30495)	
E. & O. (Penang)	6 3543
(no telex listed)	
Embassy personnel:	
Deputy High Commissioner to Singapore:	
Mr. Alan Edwards	37 9311
(telex No. 21238)	
Australian High Commissioner to Malaysia Mr. Graham Feakes (Kuala Lumpur)	

TELEPHONE NUMBERS

Australian Ambassador in Indonesia: Mr. R. A. (Dick) Woolcott (Jakarta)	
Embassy	35 0511
residence	4 8989
(telex No. 44329)	
Malaysian Government:	
Chief Minister, Penang, Dr. Lim Chong Eu	6 4461
Menteri Besar, Perlis, Datuk Jaafar bin Hassan	75 1006
State Secretaries:	
Datuk Mohamed bin Yeop, Penang	6 4461
Datuk Mansor Osman Kangar, Perlis	75 1511
Datuk Radzi bin Basir, Alor Star, Kedah	72 2088
Datuk Radin Soenarno Ipoh, Perak	3381
Danny Lee, Kuala Lumpur	29 0360
Neil Lawson E.P.U. K.L. Malaysia	8 3144

TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Mr. DRURY (on notice):

- Who is responsible for repair and maintenance of Flaxmill and Brodie Roads, Morphett Vale?
- Are the installation costs of traffic lights shared equally between the Highways Department and local councils?
- When will traffic lights be installed at the following intersections:
 - Sherriffs Road and Hilliers Road, Reynella;
 - Bains Road and South Road, Morphett Vale;
 - Wheatsheaf Road and South Road, Morphett Vale; and
 - Flaxmill Road and Brodie Road, Morphett Vale?

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

- Corporation of the City of Noarlunga.
- No. Installation costs are shared pursuant to section 19 of the Road Traffic Act, namely two-thirds Highways Department and one-third council where the installation is on a road controlled by the department and one-third Highways Department and two-thirds council, where the installation is on a road controlled by a council.
- (a) (b) (c) Subject to the availability of resources, it is expected that traffic signals will be installed at these intersections in the latter half of 1977-78.
(d) The department has no knowledge of any proposal to install traffic signals at this intersection. This is a matter for consideration by the Corporation of the City of Noarlunga.

COPLEY YOUTH CLUB

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

- When funds are sought from the department by youth clubs such as the Copley Youth Club, does a representative from the Childhood Services Council visit the area before the allocation of funds?
- Were all the conditions, which are laid down by the Federal criteria, adhered to by the Copley Youth Club?
- Who is in charge of the youth activities at Copley?

4. Where are the activities held?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows: Childhood Services Council involvement with the Copley Youth Club pertains solely to the vacation programme run during the August-September, 1977, school vacation. Thus the following information applies to this programme only, and not to any of the club's regular day-to-day activities.

1. In consideration of the short duration of the programme, the small amount of funds applied for and the time and expense involved in such visits, each area is not necessarily visited by a representative of the Childhood Services Council. Copley was not so visited prior to the August-September, 1977, vacation.

2. To the best of the Childhood Services Council's knowledge, yes.

3. The application for grant was signed by a Community Welfare Department employee from Leigh Creek, and accompanied by a supporting letter signed by the District Officer of the Leigh Creek Branch of the Community Welfare Department. It was the Childhood Services Council's understanding that a co-ordinator satisfactory to these people was engaged by the club to conduct the programme.

4. Activities for the vacation programme at Copley were held in a disused cafe at Copley.

BANKS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Did Cabinet, on October 11, 1977, approve of a policy that all departments and statutory authorities should now bank with either the State Bank of South Australia or the Savings Bank of South Australia and, if so, why?

2. What benefits will the Government receive by such a move?

3. Is there gradual computerisation of wages and salaries by various Government departments and statutory authorities and—

(a) are personnel employed being requested to transfer their personal accounts to either the State Bank of South Australia or the Savings Bank of South Australia or open accounts with those banks for simplification of wage or salary payments; and

(b) will wage and salary withdrawals be exempt from stamp duty on cheque forms required and, if not, why not?

4. Will either the State Bank of South Australia or the Savings Bank of South Australia open additional branches to handle the expected increase in new business and, if so, where?

5. If there is such a policy will the operations of the State Bank of South Australia and the Savings Bank of South Australia be amalgamated, or integrated by special arrangements retaining their separate identity?

6. Will both banks have sufficient staff to handle any increased volume of business or will additional staff have to be recruited and, if so—

(a) approximately how many by each bank;

(b) when;

(c) will preference be given to young people who left school at the end of 1976, who are still unemployed;

(d) will special training schools be established by each bank to encourage such applicants, and, if not, why not?

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

1. On October 11, 1977, Cabinet approved a policy "that all statutory bodies should bank either at the State Bank or the Savings Bank of South Australia, unless there are good and practical reasons for doing otherwise".

This policy is in line with the Government's policy of ensuring that as much of the deposits of State departments and instrumentalities are held with State banks so that such funds in turn can be invested to South Australia's benefit.

2. It is anticipated that benefits will accrue from increased scale of operations for the State banks, allowing a better distribution of overheads and widening the Government's options for investments.

3. Officers of the Public Service Board advise that there has been a policy of gradual computerisation of the payment of salaries of salaried staff within the Public Service. Departments have been encouraged to adopt a common pay-roll system. It is expected that, by this time next year, all salaried public servants will be paid on this basis. The system enables a variety of methods of payment, namely, by cash or cheque, or into any bank account. It is normally a matter for each department to decide what restrictions if any should apply to methods of payment, but in no case is it intended or necessary to restrict the number of banks into which salaries could be paid.

(a) No.

(b) No. It would be administratively difficult to provide such a stamp duty exemption. Employees are not obliged to have their salaries paid into a cheque account and can thus avoid paying stamp duty, as well as incidental bank charges, if they wish.

4. The policy of both the State banks regarding the opening of additional branches is the responsibility of their respective boards of management.

5. No.

6. The sufficiency of both of the State banks' staffing arrangements is again a matter for their respective managements.

BANK ACCOUNTS

Mr. BECKER (on notice): Will all Government departments and statutory authorities banking with the Reserve Bank of Australia now transfer their accounts to the State Bank of South Australia, or the Savings Bank of South Australia and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. There are a number of advantages in conducting the central accounting system through the Reserve Bank. Some of the "good and practical reasons" for maintaining the present arrangements with the Reserve Bank include:

1. The Reserve Bank is a large banking organisation capable of withstanding the large day-to-day fluctuations in our cash holdings.

2. Substantial overdraft facilities have been made available.

3. Most Australian Government organisations deal with the Reserve Bank and remittances are therefore made direct to our account without risk of delay.

4. Treasury is well satisfied with the range and extent of services provided by the Reserve Bank.

COUNCIL BANKING

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Are all local government authorities being requested

to bank with the State Bank of South Australia or the Savings Bank of South Australia?

2. Will such a request be made in future?

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

1. No.
2. No.

BANKS AMALGAMATION

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What further consideration, studies and examinations have been carried out by the Economics Division of the Economic Development Department into amalgamating or integrating the operations of the State Bank of South Australia and the Savings Bank of South Australia?

2. Have discussions and examinations been considered to place under one authority Government banking and insurance institutions?

3. Has consideration been given to the establishment of a Government finance company or hire-purchase company, specialising in small loans and, if not, why not?

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

1. No further considerations, studies, or examinations, at all have been carried out by the Economics Division of the Economic Development Department into amalgamating or integrating the operations of the State Bank and the Savings Bank of South Australia.

2. No.

3. Yes, though not one specialising in small loans which is already a function of the State Bank. It was decided to buy into Beneficial Finance to give a service in this field now commonly given by competing banks.

LOCKLEYS TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Mr. BECKER (on notice): Has the Road Traffic Board received an application from West Torrens council for the erection of traffic lights at the junction of Rowells Road and Henley Beach Road, Lockleys, and, if so—

- (a) has the application been approved;
- (b) when will the lights be installed;
- (c) what type of lights will be installed; and
- (d) what is the estimated cost of the lights and installation?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No. The proposal was initiated by the Highways Department, which is preparing plans for the installation.

- (a) The department will seek Road Traffic Board approval in due course.
- (b) 1978-79, subject to approval and to the availability of resources.
- (c) Traffic signals incorporating pedestrian crossing facilities.
- (d) The sum of \$35 000, including roadworks.

DENTAL NURSES

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many vacancies will there be this year for trainee dental nurses in the course offered by the Dental Department of the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

2. How many applications has the department received to date?

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

1. 12.
2. 510.

WATER DRAINAGE

Mr. BECKER (on notice): Will the Government make available a special grant to West Torrens and Henley and Grange councils to enable them to undertake urgent works to kerb and drain water from the western side of Military Road, West Beach, between Hamra Avenue and the exit from the West Beach Caravan Park and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is not intended to make Highways Department funds available for this work, as the provision of kerb and gutter and stormwater drainage is the responsibility of local government. This section of Military Road is under the care, control and management of the two councils mentioned. Any departmental assistance in the future would be limited to roadworks that have a low priority at present.

CABINET FEES

Mr. EVANS (on notice): Have South Australian Cabinet members at any period during the last 15 years been entitled to a fee for attending meetings outside normal business hours (that is 9 a.m.-5 p.m.) and, if so—

- (a) what were the periods when the practice operated;
- (b) what was the monetary entitlement when first introduced;
- (c) if the practice of paying the fee has been stopped, what were the reasons;
- (d) was the fee increased at any time and, if so—
 - (i) to what amounts has it been increased; and
 - (ii) what were the dates of the increases;
- (e) what have been the amounts received by each Cabinet member for each fiscal year that the practice has operated?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In the last 15 years no fees have been paid for attendance at Cabinet meetings, whether outside of normal business hours or not. Furthermore, I am not aware of fees ever having been paid.

PLEASURE CRAFT

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. How many persons currently hold licences to operate "pleasure craft"?

2. How many boats are currently registered by the Marine and Harbors Department?

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

1. 45 453 at at October 31, 1977.
2. 30 542 as at October 31, 1977.

FISHING LICENCES

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. How many people in South Australia hold A class fishing licences?

2. How many people hold B class fishing licences?

3. How many people hold permits to trawl for prawns?

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

1. 918 people hold class A fishing licences.
2. 506 people hold class B fishing licences.
3. 60 people hold prawn authorities, and, of these, eight hold special permits.

Mr. GUNN (on notice): What is the reason for

withholding fishing licences from persons who surrender either a cray permit or any other special permit to take other forms of fish?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Research has shown the need to introduce a management regime for the scale-fish industry in South Australia. This is to ensure the survival of the fish stock and to maintain the income of fishermen. A rock lobster authority is an endorsement on an A class licence; therefore, when such an authority is transferred, the new authority holder gains an A class licence. Obviously if the previous authority holder was allowed to retain his A class licence a loophole would exist whereby a succession of transfers would create many new A class licences. This would be contrary to the management objectives for the industry.

FISHERIES SECTION

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. How many persons are currently employed by the Fisheries Section of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department?

2. How many persons are employed as inspectors in the Fisheries Section?

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

1. Eighty-two.
2. Twenty-five.

MARREE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. Why has work which was programmed for the Marree Primary School been deferred?

2. Will immediate action be taken to have this work carried out as soon as possible?

3. Is the Minister aware of the concern being expressed by the Marree Primary School Council at the decision of the Public Buildings Department to defer work which was previously programmed at the school?

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

1. There was a temporary deferment because of the funding situation.

2. Action had already been taken by the Public Buildings Department to include the work in that to be undertaken in this financial year before the receipt of this question.

3. The council did not write to me or my officers in Adelaide. However, I would expect that the council would show concern at postponement of what is considered essential work.

OUTBACK AREAS TRUST

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. Which Minister will be in charge of the Outback Areas Development Trust?

2. What are the duties of the newly appointed Research Assistant to that trust?

3. Will funds that are provided be made available to individual groups, or will each project have to be submitted to the trust for its approval?

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

1. It has not yet been decided which Minister will have the responsibility for the Outback Areas Development Trust.

2. No staff have been appointed to the trust at this stage. Mr. Connolly has been employed as an advisory

officer within the Local Government Office and his duties include developing proposals for the Outback Areas Development Trust.

3. The trust's methods of funding will be determined by legislation. While it could be expected to operate in close co-operation with local progress associations and other groups, the Government would expect it to be interested in examining projects which it funds.

FISH FEES

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Is the Government aware of an alleged anomaly in respect of the fees payable for a fish dealer's licence and a fish factory operator's licence, and what action, if any, has been taken to alleviate the difficulty?

2. Have negotiations between the Minister of Agriculture and the Wholesale Fish Merchants Association of S.A. in respect of this matter broken down and, if so, why?

3. What opportunity now exists for further negotiation to obtain a satisfactory result?

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

1. The fees for all types of fishing licence and fish dealers' licences were doubled on July 1, 1977, at the request of the Australian Fishing Industry Council. The revenue from the increase has been used to fund a full-time executive officer from A.F.I.C. The only anomaly in the recommendation from A.F.I.C. was a proposal that fish dealers' licences should not double but increase from \$10 to \$200 unless the licence was held by a fisherman. The Minister did not accept this part of the recommendation and the fish dealers' licence was treated on an equal basis.

2. No.
3. Ample.

SURS PROGRAMME

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What projects have been funded since July 1, 1977, under the SURS programme, and what number of job opportunities is each project expected to provide?

2. What is the amount involved in each project and, if any project incorporates special conditions for extra spending on materials or brought in services, which ones are they and what special funds apply?

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

1. All projects funded during each State Unemployment Relief Scheme grant period are amalgamated and a composite schedule of approvals in sponsor order is forwarded to the Parliamentary Library, where it is available for reference by any honourable member. The consolidated schedule for the April to August, 1977, inclusive programme is so available. The schedule for the September, 1977, to March, 1978, inclusive programme will be available in the Parliamentary Library early in 1978. Due to the wide variation in employment opportunities together with the fact that many projects are treated as one part of an overall works programme involving the same employees, it is not practicable to provide the number of job opportunities. It is possible to do this, but in view of the very considerable additional work required, the time and effort needed could be better spent. In any event the final analysis could be misleading for the reasons set out above.

2. The schedule for the September, 1977, to March, 1978, programme will detail material and other contributions made by project sponsors to each project. All project

applications are negotiated with sponsors so that the highest possible labour component from the amounts granted by the Government can be attained.

If the honourable member has a specific project on which he desires additional information, I would be prepared to obtain it for him.

SPEAKERS' PORTRAITS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Have portraits of previous Speakers of the House of Assembly since 1965 been commissioned and, if not, why not?

2. If it is proposed to commission portraits, what would be the estimated cost for each portrait, would local artists be used, and how long would it take to complete the gallery?

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

1. No. It is not proposed at this stage to commission portraits of Speakers of the House of Assembly since 1965.

2. See 1.

ITALIAN VILLAGE

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What alternative land has been investigated and offered to Italian Village Incorporated?

2. What does the Government now propose to do with the land owned by the Highways Department and bounded by Henley Beach Road and Ayton Avenue, Fulham?

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

1. It is understood that the Italian Village Incorporated has signed a contract to purchase land from a private seller.

2. It is proposed that the land owned by the Highways Department and bounded by Henley Beach Road and Ayton Avenue, Fulham, be offered at auction in the near future.

BANKING ARRANGEMENTS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Which departments and statutory authorities under the Minister's control as at October 18, 1977, bank with banks other than the State Bank of South Australia and the Savings Bank of South Australia?

2. What are the average monthly high and low credit and overdraft balances for each department and statutory authority for the past 12 months?

3. Which departments and statutory authorities have indicated they will transfer their bank accounts and to which bank in accordance with the Premier's memo dated October 19, 1977?

4. What reasons have been given to date by the respective departments and statutory authorities to decline the request to transfer their banking arrangements, and will these departments and statutory authorities be further requested to reconsider their respective decisions?

5. Will the State Bank of South Australia and the Savings Bank of South Australia take over all mortgages, debentures, loans, and overdraft arrangements that currently exist and, if not, why not?

6. Will all departmental and statutory authority personnel be requested to transfer their personal accounts to the State Bank of South Australia or the Savings Bank of South Australia?

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

1. All central departmental banking is done through the Reserve Bank; however some branch banking and statutory body bank accounts are held outside the Reserve Bank. From information reported to the Economics Division of the Department of Economic Development, the following bodies, under my control as Premier and Treasurer, had bank accounts with banks other than the State Bank or Savings Bank of South Australia: Premier's Department (Immigration Branch); Art Gallery Department (two small accounts); South Australian Theatre Company; Adelaide Festival of Arts; State Lotteries Commission.

2. Such information as requested by the honourable member was not sought by the Economics Division in its investigation of State banking procedures. It would be extremely time-consuming and difficult to provide this detailed information.

3. A report on the action taken by State Government bodies regarding any banking transfers is not required until December 31, 1977.

4. See 3.

5. These matters would be subject to negotiation between individual organisations and either of the State banks before any transfer of accounts was undertaken.

6. No.

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Which departments and statutory authorities under the Minister's and the Minister of Agriculture's control as at October 18, 1977, bank with banks other than the State Bank of South Australia and the Savings Bank of South Australia?

2. What are the average monthly high and low credit and overdraft balances for each department and statutory authority for the past 12 months?

3. Which departments and statutory authorities have indicated they will transfer their bank accounts and to which bank in accordance with the Premier's memo dated October 19, 1977?

4. What reasons have been given to date by the respective departments and statutory authorities to decline the request to transfer their banking arrangements and will these departments and statutory authorities be further requested to reconsider their respective decisions?

5. Will the State Bank of South Australia and the Savings Bank of South Australia take over all mortgages, debentures, loans, and overdraft arrangements that currently exist and, if not, why not?

6. Will all departmental and statutory authority personnel be requested to transfer their personal accounts to the State Bank of South Australia or the Savings Bank of South Australia?

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

1. All central departmental banking is done through the Reserve Bank, however some branch banking and statutory body bank accounts are held outside the Reserve Bank. From information reported to the Economics Division of the Department of Economic Development, the following bodies, under the control of the Deputy Premier and Minister of Agriculture, had bank accounts with banks other than the State Bank or Savings Bank of South Australia: Engineering and Water Supply Department (36 branch accounts); Marine and Harbors Department (11 branch accounts); Samcor; Dried Fruits Board; Environment Department—Botanic Garden (four accounts); National Parks and Wildlife Service (various local office accounts).

2. Such information as requested by the honourable member was not sought by the Economics Division in its investigation of State banking procedures. It would be

extremely time-consuming and difficult to provide this detailed information.

3. A report on the action taken by State Government bodies regarding any banking transfers is not required until December 31, 1977.

4. See 3.

5. These matters would be subject to negotiation between individual organisations and either of the State banks before any transfer of accounts was undertaken.

6. No.

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Which departments and statutory authorities under the Minister's control as at October 18, 1977, bank with banks other than the State Bank of South Australia and the Savings Bank of South Australia?

2. What are the average monthly high and low credit and overdraft balances for each department and statutory authority for the past 12 months?

3. Which departments and statutory authorities have indicated they will transfer their bank accounts and to which bank in accordance with the Premier's memo dated October 19, 1977?

4. What reasons have been given to date by the respective departments and statutory authorities to decline the request to transfer their banking arrangements and will these departments and statutory authorities be further requested to reconsider their respective decisions?

5. Will the State Bank of South Australia and the Savings Bank of South Australia take over all mortgages, debentures, loans, and overdraft arrangements that currently exist and, if not, why not?

6. Will all departmental and statutory authority personnel be requested to transfer their personal accounts to the State Bank of South Australia or the Savings Bank of South Australia?

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

1. All central, departmental banking is done through the Reserve Bank, however some branch banking and statutory body bank accounts are held outside the Reserve Bank. From information reported to the Economics Division of the Department of Economic Development, the following bodies, under the control of the Minister for Mines and Energy had bank accounts with banks other than the State Bank or Savings Bank of South Australia: Pipelines Authority of South Australia; South Australian Housing Trust; Electricity Trust of South Australia.

2. Such information as requested by the honourable member was not sought by the Economics Division in its investigation of State banking procedures. It would be extremely time-consuming and difficult to provide this detailed information.

3. A report on the action taken by State Government bodies regarding any banking transfers is not required until December 31, 1977.

4. See 3.

5. These matters would be subject to negotiation between individual organisations and either of the State banks before any transfer of accounts was undertaken.

6. No.

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Which departments and statutory authorities under the Minister's control as at October 18, 1977, bank with banks other than the State Bank of South Australia and the Savings Bank of South Australia?

2. What are the average monthly high and low credit and overdraft balances for each department and statutory authority for the past 12 months?

3. Which departments and statutory authorities have indicated they will transfer their bank accounts and to which bank in accordance with the Premier's memo dated

October 19, 1977?

4. What reasons have been given to date by the respective departments and statutory authorities to decline the request to transfer their banking arrangements and will these departments and statutory authorities be further requested to reconsider their respective decisions?

5. Will the State Bank of South Australia and the Savings Bank of South Australia take over all mortgages, debentures, loans, and overdraft arrangements that currently exist and, if not, why not?

6. Will all departmental and statutory authority personnel be requested to transfer their personal accounts to the State Bank of South Australia or the Savings Bank of South Australia?

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

1. All central departmental banking is done through the Reserve Bank, however some branch banking and statutory body bank accounts are held outside the Reserve Bank. From information reported to the Economics Division of the Economic Development Department, the following bodies under the control of the Minister of Transport and of Local Government had bank accounts with banks other than the State Bank or Savings Bank of South Australia: Highways Department (one advance account); Transport Department (10 Motor Registration Division branch accounts); Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board; West Beach Trust; Enfield General Cemetery Trust.

2. Such information as requested by the honourable member was not sought by the Economics Division in its investigation of State banking procedures. It would be extremely time-consuming and difficult to provide this detailed information.

3. A report on the action taken by State Government bodies regarding any banking transfers is not required until December 31, 1977.

4. See 3.

5. These matters would be subject to negotiation between individual organisations and either of the State banks before any transfer of accounts was undertaken.

6. No.

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Which departments and statutory authorities under the Minister's control as at October 18, 1977, bank with banks other than the State Bank of South Australia and the Savings Bank of South Australia?

2. What are the average monthly high and low credit and overdraft balances for each department and statutory authority for the past 12 months?

3. Which departments and statutory authorities have indicated they will transfer their bank accounts and to which bank in accordance with the Premier's memo dated October 19, 1977?

4. What reasons have been given to date by the respective departments and statutory authorities to decline the request to transfer their banking arrangements and will these departments and statutory authorities be further requested to reconsider their respective decisions?

5. Will the State Bank of South Australia and the Savings Bank of South Australia take over all mortgages, debentures, loans, and overdraft arrangements that currently exist and, if not, why not?

6. Will all departmental and statutory authority personnel be requested to transfer their personal accounts to the State Bank of South Australia or the Savings Bank of South Australia?

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

1. All central departmental banking is done through the Reserve Bank, however some branch banking and statutory body bank accounts are held outside the Reserve Bank. From information reported to the Economics

Division of the Economic Development Department, the following bodies under the control of the Minister of Education had bank accounts with banks other than the State Bank or Savings Bank of South Australia:

S.A. Teacher Housing Authority;
Torrens College of Advanced Education;
Teachers Registration Board;
Further Education Department (4 colleges accounts);
State Library;
Childhood Services Council.

Some schools may have non-State bank accounts, but this detailed information was not sought.

2. Such information as requested by the honourable member was not sought by the Economics Division in its investigation of State banking procedures. It would be extremely time-consuming and difficult to provide this detailed information.

3. A report on the action taken by State Government bodies regarding any banking transfers is not required until December 31, 1977.

4. See 3.

5. These matters would be subject to negotiation between individual organisations and either of the State banks before any transfer of accounts was undertaken.

6. No.

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Which departments and statutory authorities under the Minister's control as at October 18, 1977, bank with banks other than the State Bank of South Australia and the Savings Bank of South Australia?

2. What are the average monthly high and low credit and overdraft balances for each department and statutory authority for the past 12 months?

3. Which departments and statutory authorities have indicated they will transfer their bank accounts and to which bank in accordance with the Premier's memo dated October 19, 1977?

4. What reasons have been given to date by the respective departments and statutory authorities to decline the request to transfer their banking arrangements and will these departments and statutory authorities be further requested to reconsider their respective decisions?

5. Will the State Bank of South Australia and the Savings Bank of South Australia take over all mortgages, debentures, loans, and overdraft arrangements that currently exist and, if not, why not?

6. Will all departmental and statutory authority personnel be requested to transfer their personal accounts to the State Bank of South Australia or the Savings Bank of South Australia?

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

1. All central departmental banking is done through the Reserve Bank, however some branch banking and statutory body bank accounts are held outside the Reserve Bank. From information reported to the Economics Division of the Economic Development Department, the following body under the control of the Minister of Labour and Industry had a bank account with banks other than the State Bank or Savings Bank of South Australia: Labour and Industry Department (10 district office accounts).

2. Such information as requested by the honourable member was not sought by the Economics Division in its investigation of State banking procedures. It would be extremely time-consuming and difficult to provide this detailed information.

3. A report on the action taken by State Government bodies regarding any banking transfers is not required until December 31, 1977.

4. See 3.

5. These matters would be subject to negotiation

between individual organisations and either of the State banks before any transfer of accounts was undertaken.

6. No.

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Which departments and statutory authorities under the Minister's control as at October 18, 1977, bank with banks other than the State Bank of South Australia and the Savings Bank of South Australia?

2. What are the average monthly high and low credit and overdraft balances for each department and statutory authority for the past 12 months?

3. Which departments and statutory authorities have indicated they will transfer their bank accounts and to which bank in accordance with the Premier's memo dated October 19, 1977?

4. What reasons have been given to date by the respective departments and statutory authorities to decline the request to transfer their banking arrangements and will these departments and statutory authorities be further requested to reconsider their respective decisions?

5. Will the State Bank of South Australia and the Savings Bank of South Australia take over all mortgages, debentures, loans, and overdraft arrangements that currently exist and, if not, why not?

6. Will all departmental and statutory authority personnel be requested to transfer their personal accounts to the State Bank of South Australia or the Savings Bank of South Australia?

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

1. All central departmental banking is done through the Reserve Bank, however, some branch banking and statutory body bank accounts are held outside the Reserve Bank. From information reported to the Economics Division of the Economic Development Department, the following body under the control of the Attorney-General and Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs had a bank account with banks other than the State Bank or Savings Bank of South Australia: Legal Services Department (10 local court accounts).

2. Such information as requested by the honourable member was not sought by the Economics Division in its investigation of State banking procedures. It would be extremely time-consuming and difficult to provide this detailed information.

3. A report on the action taken by State Government bodies regarding any banking transfers is not required until December 31, 1977.

4. See 3.

5. These matters would be subject to negotiation between individual organisations and either of the State banks before any transfer of accounts was undertaken.

6. No.

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Which departments and statutory authorities under the Minister's and the Minister of Health's control as at October 18, 1977, bank with banks other than the State Bank of South Australia and the Savings Bank of South Australia.

2. What are the average monthly high and low credit and overdraft balances for each department and statutory authority for the past 12 months?

3. Which departments and statutory authorities have indicated they will transfer their bank accounts and to which bank in accordance with the Premier's memo dated October 19, 1977?

4. What reasons have been given to date by the respective departments and statutory authorities to decline the request to transfer their banking arrangements and will these departments and statutory authorities be further requested to reconsider their respective decisions?

5. Will the State Bank of South Australia and the Savings Bank of South Australia take over all mortgages, debentures, loans, and overdraft arrangements that currently exist and, if not, why not?

6. Will all departmental and statutory authority personnel be requested to transfer their personal accounts to the State Bank of South Australia or the Savings Bank of South Australia?

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

1. All central departmental banking is done through the Reserve Bank, however some branch banking and statutory body bank accounts are held outside the Reserve Bank.

From information reported to the Economics Division of the Economic Development Department, the following bodies, under the control of the Minister of Community Welfare and Minister of Health had bank accounts with banks other than the State Bank or Savings Bank of South Australia:

Community Welfare Department (26 district office accounts);

Hospitals Department (15 country hospitals and health centres).

2. Such information as requested by the honourable member was not sought by the Economics Division in its investigation of State banking procedures. It would be extremely time-consuming and difficult to provide this detailed information.

3. A report on the action taken by State Government bodies regarding any banking transfers is not required until December 31, 1977.

4. See 3.

5. These matters would be subject to negotiation between individual organisations and either of the State banks before any transfer of accounts was undertaken.

6. No.

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Which departments and statutory authorities under the Minister's and Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport's control as at October 18, 1977, bank with banks other than the State Bank of South Australia and the Savings Bank of South Australia?

2. What are the average monthly high and low credit and overdraft balances for each department and statutory authority for the past 12 months?

3. Which departments and statutory authorities have indicated they will transfer their bank accounts and to which bank in accordance with the Premier's memo dated October 19, 1977?

4. What reasons have been given to date by the respective departments and statutory authorities to decline the request to transfer their banking arrangements and will these departments and statutory authorities be further requested to reconsider their respective decisions?

5. Will the State Bank of South Australia and the Savings Bank of South Australia take over all mortgages, debentures, loans, and overdraft arrangements that currently exist and, if not, why not?

6. Will all departmental and statutory authority personnel be requested to transfer their personal accounts to the State Bank of South Australia or the Savings Bank of South Australia?

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

1. All central departmental banking is done through the Reserve Bank, however some branch banking and statutory body bank accounts are held outside the Reserve Bank. From information reported to the Economics Division of the Department of Economic Development, the following bodies, under the control of the Chief Secretary and Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport,

had bank accounts with banks other than the State Bank or Savings Bank of South Australia:

Police Department (various police stations);
Correctional Services Department (three country gaols);

Government Printing Division;
State Supply Division (one advance account);
Racecourse Development Board;
Betting Control Board;
T.A.B.

2. Such information as requested by the honourable member was not sought by the Economics Division in its investigation of State banking procedures. It would be extremely time-consuming and difficult to provide this detailed information.

3. A report on the action taken by State Government bodies regarding any banking transfers is not required until December 31, 1977.

4. See 3.

5. These matters would be subject to negotiation between individual organisations and either of the State banks before any transfer of accounts was undertaken.

6. No.

BUILDERS' LICENSING

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. How many complaints did the Builders' Licensing Board receive during the fiscal year 1976-77 and of these how many were resolved in favour of—

(a) the client;

(b) the builder?

2. How many of these complaints were considered trivial and not proceeded with?

3. How many of these complaints were considered to be outside the jurisdiction of the board?

4. In what number of these complaints was the amount involved considered less than—

(a) \$500;

(b) \$1 000;

(c) \$2 000;

(d) \$5 000;

(e) \$10 000?

5. In what number of these complaints was the amount involved considered more than \$10 000?

6. How many people were employed in the Builders' Licensing Section in the years 1974-75, 1975-76, 1976-77, and at present, respectively, and in each of these periods how many of these employees were inspectors?

7. How many complaints did the board receive for the year 1975-76 where the builder was unable to complete the work because of insolvency or other factors where no recourse for compensation was available to the complainant, and what was the estimated total cost of these complaints?

8. What was the estimated total cost of running the Builders' Licensing Section of the department, including the board, for the last three fiscal years?

9. On how many occasions has the Builders' Licensing Board met in each of the past three fiscal years?

10. How many times has the Builders' Appellant Disciplinary Tribunal met in the past three fiscal years?

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

1. 438. (a) and (b)—The complaints are not resolved in favour of either the client or the builder. The board maintains an impartial approach and endeavours to get the builder to carry out remedial work where, in the board's opinion, the complaint is justified. In cases that the board considers to be trivial the complaint is not proceeded with

and the complainant is advised accordingly. In either case the builder or the complainant is notified of his right of appeal to the tribunal. No records are kept of the number of occasions that the board intervened in an endeavour to get a builder to carry out remedial work or declined to intervene. It is not practicable to keep such records because many complaints are made up of some matters in which remedial action appears to be justified and some which are considered to be trivial. It is the individual items comprising the complaint which are considered rather than the complaint taken as a whole.

2. Figures are not available of complaints which are considered to be completely trivial or unjustified, but it is considered that the number of complaints in this category would be very few. A much more common complaint is the case where some items are considered to be unjustified and others accepted as warranting investigation.

3. This information is not available without searching each of the 438 complaint files. However, there would be very few of these as most complainants make their initial approach by telephone or by personal visit and they would be told at this time if their complaint was outside the board's jurisdiction. A few would still proceed to lodge a complaint, but the number would be very few.

4. Information not available. The board is not concerned with the amount involved in a complaint. Its concern is with defective workmanship and structural defects and not with the cost of the remedial work involved in correcting the omissions or faults. The cost of such work is not a matter of concern to the board, nor are its officers required to have the expertise to assess the cost. As well, the cost of rectification is often dependent on the method adopted, which is left to the builder subject to the board being satisfied that the method is sound.

5. See 4 above.

6. Number of staff:

	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77	Present
Total staff	14	17	19	19
Inspectors (incl. Senior Inspector)	5	5	7	7

Note: Three temporary assistants were employed for several months in 1976-77 to assist with licence renewals.

7. This information is not available as records are not kept of reasons for closure of complaints. However, it is hoped that the establishment of such a record may be possible during the current financial year. Very often in cases of insolvency or the like the board is not in a position to pursue the complaint; in such cases the board refers the complainant to the receiver or liquidator and no advice is received of the result of such a claim. As explained in 4, records are not kept of costs of remedial work.

8.

1974-75	1975-76	1976-77
\$	\$	\$
149 235	206 238	299 182

These figures include estimates of cost of rental, cleaning, electricity and telephones, which are paid by Public Buildings Department with similar costs for other departments.

9. 1974-75 — 54
1975-76 — 44
1976-77 — 48

10. 17/10/75 (date of inception)
to 30/6/76 — 51 days
1976-77 — 63 days.

These figures relate to formal sittings and do not include periods when tribunal has met to consider appeals which have been heard and to formulate judgments.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. What was the total revenue received by the State Transport Authority from advertising in 1975-76 and 1976-77, and what is the anticipated revenue for 1977-78 from those sources?

2. If rights are let out to one firm, what is the name of that firm?

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

1. 1975-76—\$154 553
1976-77—\$192 728
1977-78—\$242 000 (estimated).

2. Rail Division advertising rights are not let out to any one particular firm. Bus and Tram Division advertising rights are let out to Frank Mason and Company (Aust.) Pty. Ltd.

SCHOOL HOLIDAYS

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. Has any progress been made in having the school holiday periods of the different States staggered to give a greater spread of tourist trade throughout the year, and, if so, what is that progress?

2. If there has been no progress, will the Premier actively negotiate with other States to achieve a greater success in this area?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The issue of staggering school holiday periods between the different States has been the subject of considerable discussion at meetings of the Tourist Ministers' Council and the Australian Standing Committee on Tourism in recent years and similarly, by the Australian Education Council and the Conference of Directors-General of Education. In view of the many important and often divergent factors surrounding the determination of school vacation periods, a uniform policy has not yet been established. The South Australian Government believes that the proposal must continue to be examined at a national level and will actively support further negotiations and investigations as appropriate.

DENTAL TECHNICIANS

Mr. EVANS (on notice): Does the Minister intend to introduce a system of registration for dental technicians and, if so—

- what improvements in apprenticeship training will take place;
- what courses for continued education will become available;
- will owners and administrators of dental laboratories need to register;
- will dental technicians who receive improved training and registration be permitted to deal direct with the public; and
- what is to be the composition of the registration board?

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

(a), (b), (c) and (e) will be considered by a working party.

(d) Yes.

VANTAGE

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. What was the cost of producing the publication *Vantage*, spring edition?
2. What is the extent of its free circulation?
3. What is the anticipated sales figure?
4. How many copies were produced?
5. Were any of the authors of articles in the publication paid a fee for their writing and, if so, what was the name and amount paid to each of the contributors?
6. Was there a fee paid for photographic work and, if so, to whom and how much?
7. Was a fee charged for advertising and, if so, what were the amounts paid by each advertiser?
8. Was the opportunity for distribution put to tender and, if not, why not?
9. In an endeavour to obtain a comparison in printing costs, was the printing of the publication put to tender before being given to the Government Printer?
10. Who is the editor (or editors) of the publication?
11. Were any fees or charges paid for other than articles, photography, or Government printing charges for the production and, if so, to whom and what amounts?
12. Did any member of the Public Service receive any payment over and above normal wages or overtime for working on the publication?

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

1. Final figures are not to hand but it is anticipated to be approximately \$12 250.
2. 5 000 copies.
3. 4 000 copies.
4. 10 000 copies.
5. In some cases standard fees were paid for the commissioning of articles; however, the fees were negotiated in a mutually confidential manner between the author and the editorial committee. Standard fees for *Vantage* were set with reference to rates established by writers and authors associations in Australia.
6. Fees were paid for reproduction rights for some photographs appearing in *Vantage* and these were determined in a mutually confidential manner between the photographers and the editorial committee. These fees were paid in accordance with the standard scale of fees set by the Australian Institute of Photographers.
7. (a) Yes.
(b) South Australian Government Tourist Bureau \$350.
Trans Australia Airlines \$350.
Cowell's Group Limited \$350.
The State Bank of South Australia \$350.
State Government Insurance Commission \$350.
Department of Economic Development \$350.
South Australian Housing Trust \$350.

8. In order to obtain maximum distribution the editorial committee decided to use the firm of Gordon and Gotch (Australasia) Limited because they were able to effectively place the magazine to each of their 400 South Australian agencies. Gordon and Gotch (Australasia) Limited are recognised as the leading distributing house in South Australia.

9. The Government Printer was chosen because it is the policy of the Government to utilise the services that can be offered at Netley wherever possible.

10. The editorial committee comprises staff of the Publicity and Design Services branch of the Premier's Department and for the first edition they were Mr. J. Parkes, Mr. J. Mitchell, Mr. O. Laukirbe and Mr. K. Hope.

11. No.

12. No.

MINISTERIAL CARS

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. What are the names of the Parliamentarians who have had the service of Ministerial cars during the last four fiscal years, and—

- (a) how many kilometres has each member's car travelled for each of the past four fiscal years;
- (b) what were the total wages paid to each of the drivers for each of the cars in the last four fiscal years; and
- (c) what percentage of the total wages paid to drivers in the Parliamentary car fleet for those four years was overtime?

2. Are members of Parliament who are not allocated cars entitled to a car when representing, at any function, a member who has been allocated a car?

3. Has consideration been given to having a pool of cars available for Ministerial and Parliamentary use in lieu of individual allocation and, if so, what was the result of these considerations?

4. Has consideration been given to using taxis after 5.30 p.m. for those members allocated individual cars, in lieu of employing drivers at penalty rates for a minimum of three hours whenever called out after normal working hours?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is considered that the work required to obtain this information is beyond what would be reasonable, and it is therefore proposed not to supply an answer.

INCINERATORS

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. What, if any, redress is available to a householder forced to suffer constant inconvenience and discomfort from the repeated burning by his neighbour of a domestic incinerator?

2. If there is currently no redress available under the Local Government Act, will the Minister consider amendments to the Act which would effectively assist the situation described?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Local Government Act (section 667(37) (a) provides for the making of a by-law to control burning of any substance which is offensive to the inmates of a dwellinghouse. This provision is applicable to municipalities only, and most have adopted it. A model by-law XXII (Public Health) has been proclaimed, which makes it an offence for any person within 100 yards of any dwellinghouse not occupied by that person to burn any rags, clippings or parings of leather, or any other substance so that the burning is offensive to the inmates of the dwellinghouse. Such person is liable to a penalty of \$2. Difficulty arises in prosecution relating to proof that the burning was offensive. The Local Government Act could be amended to provide that a person be prosecuted on the complaint of three adjoining residents. It would also seem that an increase in penalty is justified. A working party is

currently investigating the updating of the model by-laws and its report will be completed in a short time for presentation to the Minister.

HORWOOD BAGSHAW LIMITED

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. What financial assistance in the form of guarantees, loans or any other assistance has been given by the Government to Horwood Bagshaw Limited for specific use at Mannum during the past 10 years?

2. What are the details of dates, amounts, and repayments for any assistance given?

3. What is the total amount paid by Horwood Bagshaw Limited to the Government for both pay-roll tax and land tax during the past 10 years?

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

1. Horwood Bagshaw in 1972 acquired the assets of David Shearer from the Receiver. This acquisition was assisted by the Government's purchasing Horwood Bagshaw's Mile End factory for \$1 500 000 as part of Highways Department land acquisition programme for the proposed north-south transportation corridor. Horwood Bagshaw assumed responsibility for repayment of a loan of \$100 000 to the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation. Repayments on this loan are on schedule.

2. See 1 above.

3. Confidential company information.

DAVID SHEARER LIMITED

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. What financial assistance in the form of guarantees, loans, or any other assistance has been given by the Government to David Shearer Limited for specific use at Mannum during the past 10 years?

2. What are the details of dates, amounts, and repayments for any assistance given?

3. What was the total amount paid by David Shearer Limited to the Government for both pay-roll tax and land tax during the past 10 years?

4. What amount did the Government pay to meet obligations under financial guarantees to this company?

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

1. The following assistance was provided to David Shearer Limited in the past 10 years after recommendation by the Industries Development Committee.

(1) 1970 (Hall Government)—Government guarantee of loan of \$950 000.

(2) 1970 (Dunstan Government)—Loan of \$150 000.

(3) 1972 (Dunstan Government)—Government guarantee of loan of \$400 000.

David Shearer Limited went into receivership in 1972.

2. See 1 above. The Government was called on under its guarantees to pay out \$991 929. In addition, loans to the value of \$77 000 outstanding were written off.

3. Confidential company information.

4. See 2 above.

Mr. G. M. STEVENS

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Is Mr. G. M. Stevens a Commissioner of the State Industrial Commission and, if so, when was he appointed as a Commissioner?

2. What industrial awards have been allocated to Commissioner Stevens as his responsibility?

3. Was Mr. G. M. Stevens a member of the committee which presented to the 1975 State A.L.P. convention a report entitled, "The Working Environment Committee, Report and Recommendations"?

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

1. Yes. He was appointed by the Governor on April 15, 1976.

2. The allocation of awards is determined by the President of the Industrial Court and Commission. Of course, the list varies from time to time. The present allocation of awards and conciliation committees to Commissioner Stevens is set out below:

Awards:

Aerated Waters
 B.H.P. Hostels
 Billiard Recreation Centres
 Boarding Houses, Guest Houses
 Bread and Yeast Goods
 Bread Carters
 Cafes and Restaurants
 Cake and Pastry Baking Trades
 Canteen Employees (Industrial and Commercial)
 Canteens, Dine-Ins and Buffets
 Caretakers and Cleaners
 Caretakers and Cleaners (Colleges of Advanced Education)
 Catering and Reception Houses
 Delicatessen, Fruit and Vegetable and Confectionery Shops
 Drivers of Vehicles (Goods Carrying)
 Dry Cleaners
 Draughtsmen, Planners, Technical Officers and Tracers
 Fish and Crustacea
 Goods Transhipping
 Hotels, Clubs, etc.
 Laundries
 Milk Processing and Cheese, etc., Manufacturing
 Motels
 Musicians
 Pest Control
 Poultry Processing
 Rubber Workshops and Tyre Retreading
 Service and Parking Stations
 Sugar Refinery Employees
 Taxi-Cab (Motor Vehicle) Drivers
 Ten Pin Bowling
 Transport Workers (Passenger Vehicles)
 Vehicle Industry (South Australia) Repair Service and Retail
 Watchmen
 Watchmen (Ships)
 Wine and Spirit Industry
Conciliation committees:
 Bag and Sack
 Bicycle Makers
 Biscuit and Confectionery
 Boot and Shoe
 Brushmaking
 Casing Workers
 Fire Watchmen
 Jewellers and Watchmakers
 Manufacturing and Wholesale Chemists and Grocers
 Optical Workers
 Paint, etc., Manufacturing
 Printing
 Saddlery, Leatherware, etc.
 Sail and Tent Making
 Service and Parking Stations
 3. Yes.

RECORDS INQUIRY

Mr. MILLHOUSE: (on notice):

1. What are the precise terms of reference of the inquiry to be carried out by Mr. Acting Justice Michael White concerning records kept by the Special Branch of the South Australian Police Force?

2. What specific criteria have been set down for an examination of files and/or other medium of recording information, and by whom?

3. When is it expected that His Honour will report to the Government as to "the conformity of the records then currently held with the criteria laid down and the suitability of the criteria as laid down"?

4. Will the Government give an assurance that His Honour's report will be made public and, if so, when will the report be made public and, if not, why not?

5. What authority, if any, has been given or is to be given, and which, to His Honour to make this inquiry?

6. Is it expected that the time involved in this inquiry will affect the volume of work which His Honour will be able to undertake as an acting Supreme Court Judge and, if so, to what extent and what action, if any, is to be taken as a result of this expectation?

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

1. The terms of reference are as follows:

1. Inquire from and discuss with the Commissioner of Police, and such other officers of the Police Department as may be necessary, in relation to Special Branch records:

(a) The criteria used to determine what information is currently being recorded.

(b) The rank of the officer responsible for the determination of what is recorded.

(c) How that information is recorded.

(d) Who has access to such information.

2. To examine a random sample of files and/or other medium of recording information, to gain an appreciation of the type and extent of records held in order to ascertain that they comply with the following criteria:

No records, or other material, shall be kept by the Police Commissioner, or any person under his control as Commissioner, with respect to any person unless:

(1) That record or material, either alone or with other existing records or material, contains matters which give rise to a reasonable suspicion that that person, or some other person, has committed an offence, or

(2) That record or material, either alone or with other existing records or material, contains matters which formed the whole or part of the facts with respect to which that person has been charged with an offence in respect of which proceedings have not been dismissed or withdrawn, or

(3) That record or material, either alone or with other existing records or material, contains matters which give rise to a reasonable suspicion that that person may do any act or thing which would overthrow, or tend to overthrow, by force or violence, the established Government of South Australia or of the

Commonwealth of Australia, or may commit or incite the commission of acts of violence against any person or persons.

3. Following upon 2, if in your view necessary, to require the Commissioner of Police to have records currently held examined to ensure that all information retained as in accordance with the criteria referred to in 2 above.

4. To require the Commissioner to give a certificate (after causing an examination of current information) that the records then held contain only information in conformity with the criteria in 2 above.

5. Following receipt of the certificate to make such random checks as you consider necessary to satisfy yourself as to the accuracy of the certificate of the Commissioner.

6. At the conclusion of the initial inquiry to report to the Government of South Australia as to:

(a) The conformity of the records then currently held with the criteria laid down in 2 above.

(b) The suitability of the criteria as laid down in paragraph 2 as a basis for future control of recording information.

7. To report annually to the Government of South Australia at the end of each calendar year as to the conformity of records then currently held with the criteria then in force.

2. See 7.

3. As soon as practicable.

4. This matter will be considered following receipt of the report from Mr. Acting Justice Michael White.

5. On November 7, 1977, Cabinet approved the appointment of Mr. Acting Justice J. M. White to conduct an inquiry with the terms of reference set out in 1 above. A letter in those terms was sent to him the following day.

6. It is not expected that the time involved in this inquiry will affect the volume of work which His Honour will be able to undertake as an acting Supreme Court judge to any great extent. However, the matter will be kept under review and appropriate action taken to alleviate any difficulties should they arise.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is the expenditure, if any, on maintenance and improvements to Parliament House during the present financial year?

2. What are the details of any such expenditure?

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

1. Estimated Expenditure is \$58 500.

\$

2. (a) Install fire dampers and fire-proof duct-work under the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council 6 000
- (b) Fire alarm system 5 000
- (c) Staff common room on the lower ground floor 15 000
- (d) Modifications to the emergency power supply 2 000
- (e) Alterations to Legislative Council rooms as requested by the President 2 000
- (f) Maintenance electrician wages 18 000
- (g) Labour for rearranging books in stack rooms 500
- (h) Regular maintenance 10 000

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is the expenditure, if any, on furniture and fittings in Parliament House during the present financial year?
2. What are the details of any such expenditure?

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

1. \$32 500.
2. Restoration of dining room furniture 11 000
Restoration of some corridor benches 2 500
New dining room curtains 5 500
Cutlery, crockery, kitchen and dining equipment 12 500
Restoration of tables and cupboards 1 000

FAUNA

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

Is an officer of the Legal Services Department undertaking an inquiry into actions by officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service regarding the trapping of birds or the sale of confiscated fauna, or either, or both of these matters and, if so—

- (a) who is that officer;
- (b) what are his terms of reference; and
- (c) when is it expected that the inquiry will be completed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows: There is an inquiry being conducted by an officer of the Legal Services Department into the trapping of birds, but not with respect to the sale of confiscated fauna.

(a) The officer conducting the inquiry is a Government Investigations Officer in the Crown Law Office of that department.

(b) There are no formal terms of reference. Inquiry being undertaken by the Government Investigations Officer follows from allegations contained in a letter received by the National Parks and Wildlife Service and discussions had with the Director of that organisation.

(c) As soon as practicable.

EYRE PENINSULA HOUSES

Mr. BLACKER (on notice):

1. What is the 1977-78 building programme for the South Australian Housing Trust in respect of the towns of Port Lincoln, Cleve, Cummins, Wudinna, Tumby Bay, Cowell, Kimba, and Lock?

2. What is the waiting list for each of these towns, identifying each of the house types available from the trust?

3. What programme beyond 1977-78 has been accepted for each of the towns listed?

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

1. 1977-78 building programme

	Completions	
Port Lincoln	10	Timber-framed single units
	6	Timber-framed double units
Cleve	2	Timber-framed single units
Cummins	2	Timber-framed single units
Wudinna	2	Timber-framed single units
Tumby Bay	1	Timber-framed single unit
	2	Pre-made single units
Cowell	Nil	
*Kimba	3	Timber-framed single units
Lock	1	Timber-framed single unit

2. Waiting list (i.e. applications on hand)

	Rental	Sale
*Port Lincoln	220	7
Cleve	8	6
*Cummins	12	1
*Wudinna	12	1
*Tumby Bay	7	Nil
Cowell	Nil	1
Kimba	4	2
Lock	1	Nil

*Note—Application totals for these particular towns include a high percentage of doubtful applications though it is often difficult to predict whether or not they are genuine until an offer of housing has actually been declined. Sale application figures also suffer from unreliability since many applicants cannot meet deposit and repayment requirements.

Rental Stock

	Cottage flats	Single units	Double units	Timber single units	Rental Grant houses	Total
Port Lincoln	20	18	334	96	3	471
Cleve				15		15
Cummins				23		23
Wudinna				10		10
Tumby Bay				4		4
Cowell				2		2
Kimba				6		6
Lock				7		7

3. *Future building programme*

Port Lincoln	30-35 units per annum
Cleve	Dependent upon the availability of land
Cummins	Dependent upon demands
Wudinna	Dependent upon the availability of land
Tumby Bay	Dependent upon demands
Cowell	Nil
Kimba	2 units per annum
Lock	Nil

The predicted building programme is based on demand, less vacancy assumptions from existing rental stock.

MONARTO ACQUISITION

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Does the Minister propose to answer the letter of January 27, 1977, to him from Mr. Barry F. Maloney of Maloney Field Services concerning Monarto acquisition procedures and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

2. Why has no answer yet been given to the letter?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It was understood that the member would be communicating to Mr. Maloney the offer to review any specific acquisition if hardship were claimed. As a consequence the letter was not answered, but in view of the member's question an answer will now be sent.

DISABLED PERSONS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

What specific action is the Government taking to provide employment for young disabled persons?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Commonwealth Employment Service, which has a specialised section to assist handicapped workers obtain employment, is an agency of the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. BECKER (on notice): When will the Government introduce legislation requesting employers to engage a percentage of disabled persons and, if no legislation is to be introduced, why not?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: No, as the tripartite working party that reported to me earlier this year expressed the opinion that the introduction at the present time of any

quota system for the employment of disabled persons has significant disadvantages.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many acres of national parks have been destroyed by fire during the past 12 months?

2. What is the location of the fires and the estimated cost including damage to native flora and fauna?

3. Have fire breaks now been cut in all national parks and, if not, why not?

4. Will fire breaks be cut and maintained in future?

5. What fire-fighting equipment is available at each national park and what is the value of such equipment?

6. What heavy earthmoving equipment is available to national parks and at what locations?

7. What arrangements have been made to use local Country Fire Services facilities in emergencies?

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

1 and 2. 69 fires recorded in the 1976-77 year. The cost of researching the remaining parts of these particular questions is not warranted.

3 and 4. No. Fire break and fire access tracks are being constructed on an annual programme basis which is expected to be completed in 1985.

5. The following list includes the major items of equipment available to the National Parks and Wildlife Service. It would be extremely difficult to place a realistic value on such equipment.

	Toyotas with Slip-ons (100 gall.)	Major Fire Units (400 gall.)	Trailer Units
Central region			
Belair	2 + 2 S.P.A.	1	
Cleland	2	1	
Morialta	1 + 1 Holden 80 gall.	1	
Para Wirra	2	1	
(+ 1 ~ 800 gallon Pillow Tank)			
Southern region			
Mount Gambier	1		
Bool Lagoon	1		
Naracoorte Caves	1		
Canunda	1		1
Coorong	1		1
Danggali	1 + Trailer with tanks (800 gall.)		
Loxton	1		1

	Toyotas with Slip-ons (100 gall.)	Major Fire Units (400 gall.)	Trailer Units
Kangaroo Island			
Murray's Lagoon	1		
Kelly Hill	1		
Flinders Chase	1 + truck with two steel tanks (1 000 gall.)		
Brookfield	Small truck and tank (200 gall.)		
Northern region			
Innes	1		
Mount Remarkable	2		
Flinders Range	2 + 200 gall. International		
Leigh Creek			1
Port Lincoln	1		
Coffin Bay	1		
	—	—	—
	26	*4	4
	—	—	—

*Plus one under construction for South-East.

Units Summary:

ACCO or similar 4 x 4 400 gall.	4 (+1 under construction South-East)
Toyotas with 100 gall. Slip-on	26 (+5 under construction)
80 gall. Trailer Units	4
800 Pillow Tank	1
Trucks with tanks (1 000 gall.)	1
Small old Fire Unit to be replaced (200 gall.)	1
Trailer with water tanks (800 gall.)	1
Small truck with 200 gall.	1
Holden Ute (80 gall.)	1
6. Heavy earthmoving equipment:	
Flinders Chase (Kangaroo Island)	1—D4 1—Grader
Danggali	1—D4 1—D6
7. Close liaison is maintained with local C.F.S. Brigades.	

GOVERNMENT APPOINTMENTS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What former members of the South Australian Parliament are currently members of Government appointed positions, boards, or authorities, and what are the specific appointments, the date of appointment, and the term?

2. What is the total remuneration which applies to each of the appointments?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There are very many boards, positions and authorities in South Australia. To review the memberships of all of them to establish which members are former members of Parliament will be extremely time-consuming and wasteful. The honourable member should seek specific information for particular boards.

TEACHERS

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

Are there any teachers currently working within the Education Department who under normal circumstances would be retired on age grounds and, if so, how many are in this position?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: There are no persons currently working as teachers within the Education Department who under normal circumstances would be

retired on age grounds. However, 37 persons over the age of 65 years are currently approved for casual work as Temporary Relieving Assistants (relief teachers). The reason for this is that there is still a shortage of relief teachers in some localities.

BICYCLE PARKING

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Will the proposed Government building on the corner of Wakefield Street and Gawler Place contain undercover bicycle parking facilities and, if not, why not?

2. If no bicycle parking facilities are planned, will the Minister reconsider this decision with a view to supplying such parking facilities?

3. Is the Minister aware that there are inadequate facilities for the parking of bicycles since the demolition in 1974 of the bicycle shed adjacent to the old Education Building?

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

1. No. Thirty-six bicycle parking spaces have been provided for the total Government office complex bounded by Wakefield and Flinders Streets, Gawler Place and Victoria Square in the Education Centre courtyard.

2. See 1.

3. The need for additional bicycle parking facilities is periodically assessed and further provision made as the need is defined.

MALAYSIAN LANGUAGES

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Have applications been called for additional teachers in Malaysian languages and studies?
2. How many positions are available?
3. How many applications were received?
4. What qualifications were required?
5. When will appointments be announced?

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

1. No.
2. There are 92 students undertaking Malaysian studies in three schools—Plympton High School, Croydon High School and Dover High School. The only inquiry has been by the Principal of Daws Road High School, who has sought information as to the possibility of a group of Malaysian students at his school studying Matriculation Malay so that they are not disadvantaged by having to take an English based humanities subject.
3. 4. and 5. Not applicable.

SCHOOL SECURITY

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What action is being taken at present by the Education Department to improve security of schools in South Australia?
2. Will special arrangements be made to protect school property during the summer vacation and, if not, why not?
3. Have schools which installed security alarms, had any recurring breakings and entries and, if so, to what extent?

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

1. The department is actively pursuing a programme designed to deter and detect intruders. This has been given added impetus by the appointment of an assistant to the security officer. Measures being considered include security patrols, alarming of school buildings, security lighting and marking of equipment.
2. Special arrangements are in hand to protect schools during the summer vacation. There are several schemes currently under consideration but I am loath to divulge specific details for obvious security reasons.
3. A number of schools have recently installed security alarm systems and no breakings and entries have been reported by those schools since the installations were completed. However, it is considered that it is too soon to be able to determine the effectiveness of these systems.

CONTAINER TERMINAL

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What was the total cost of the official opening of the Outer Harbor container terminal and how does this amount compare with similar openings?
2. Who were the caterers for this function?

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

1. (a) \$4 693.
(b) Port Giles (opening of Bulk Berth May, 1970, \$3 088).
2. Catering and Trading Services of the Railway Division of the State Transport Authority.

STATE DINNER

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What was the total cost of the State dinner given to the Chinese delegation earlier this year?

2. How many persons attended, and how does the cost a head compare to similar functions?

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

1. and 2. A dinner hosted by me as Premier of South Australia was held at Ayers House on January 20, 1977, at which a total of 18 men and women attended. The principal guests were the leader and members of the Chinese delegation to the Chinese Archaeological Exhibition which at that time had not planned coming to South Australia. Other distinguished guests included His Excellency the Chinese Ambassador to Australia, my wife, one of my Ministers, and representatives of the Art Gallery, the Australia Council, the Foreign Affairs Department and my department. I was pleased on the occasion in question to have been afforded an opportunity to entertain the delegation on behalf of the Government and citizens of this State. I do not consider it diplomatic to disclose the cost of this dinner for such an important group of guests but I assure the honourable member that I consider the total cost to have been reasonable. The success of the Government's activities to get the exhibition here gave a great deal of pleasure to over 80 000 South Australians.

AYERS HOUSE

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many Government functions have been held at Ayers House since its inception?
2. For each such function—
 - (a) what was the total cost;
 - (b) for whom was it held; and
 - (c) what number of persons were entertained?

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

1. Not known.
2. See above.

POWER BOATS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many persons have been reported and prosecuted, respectively, for—
 - (a) not possessing a licence to drive a power boat; and
 - (b) failure to register a power boat?
2. How many persons have been fined in each category and—
 - (a) what was the minimum and maximum fine;
 - (b) how many charges were withdrawn in each category; and
 - (c) how many warnings have been issued in each category?
3. What is the total amount of fines outstanding?

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

1. (a) 31.
(b) 34.
2. 17.
Unlicensed operator Unregistered motor boat

(a) No penalty to \$75	No penalty to \$50
(b) 1	1
(c) 3	10
3. Nil.

THORNDON PARK RESERVOIR

Mrs. ADAMSON (on notice):

- Because of the close proximity of Thorndon Park reservoir to Fifth Creek and the Torrens River, will the

Minister consider extending the scope of stage 3 of the River Torrens Co-ordinated Development Scheme to encompass the reservoir as a major recreational resource, and commissioning the consultants for the scheme accordingly?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No. The Monarto Development Commission has been asked to investigate the possible recreational use of the Thorndon Park reservoir.

EDUCATION EXPENDITURE

Mrs. ADAMSON (on notice):

How can the increase of 25.11 per cent be accounted for in total expenditure on salaries of administrative teaching and ancillary staff for the financial year 1975-76 over the previous year?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The increase referred to, of 25.11 per cent, is explained as follows:

Base, 1974-75 expenditure	\$m	161
Full year further effect in 1975-76 of employees engaged during 1974-75		5
Award increases, being full year further effect of 1974-75 awards (\$17 000 000) and 1975-76 awards (\$13 000 000)		30
Teacher salary increments according to the Teachers Salaries Board award		2
Staff expansion—teachers, trainee teachers and others		4
		————
	\$202	————

SCHOOL DAMAGE

Mrs. ADAMSON (on notice):

1. What has been the cost in high schools and primary schools, respectively, in the year 1976-77 of—

- (a) theft;
- (b) arson; and
- (c) wilful damage?

2. What measures are being taken to increase security at schools in order to deter and detect offenders?

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

1. The costs relating to theft, arson and wilful damage are as follows:

	Primary Schools	Secondary Schools
	\$	\$
(a) theft	37 400	36 900
(b) arson	38 800	33 200
(c) wilful damage	16 700	19 100

2. The department is actively pursuing a programme designed to deter and detect intruders. This has been given added impetus by the appointment of an assistant to the security officer. Measures being considered include security patrols, alarming of school buildings, security lighting, and marking of equipment. For obvious security reasons, I am loath to provide specific details but the honourable member can be assured that all possible efforts are being made to combat these persons.

TEACHER RENTALS

Mrs. ADAMSON (on notice): On what basis was the decision taken by the Teacher Housing Authority to deduct rental for 42 weeks of the year and not during vacation periods?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: All Government employees recruited to country areas are given the benefit of a rental subsidy equating approximately 20 per cent. Historically, married teachers gained this subsidy by paying 80 per cent of assessed house rental for 52 weeks of the year. This is contrasted to the situation where single teachers paid 100 per cent of assessed rental for term time (42 weeks) and no rental for vacation time (10 weeks), thereby obtaining a subsidy equating approximately 20 per cent. The South Australian Teacher Housing Authority, in conjunction with the Education Department, Department of Further Education, and Kindergarten Union, investigated this rental deduction system which was found to be complicated in concept and application. This mix of methods resulted in the necessity for complicated calculations with a resultant delay in information processing, culminating in the undesirable circumstances of rental arrears being deducted from teachers' salaries over a number of pay periods.

It was determined by the aforementioned bodies that all rentals should be collected on a 42-week basis. This rationalisation was approved by the South Australian Institute of Teachers after circularising all country teachers associations. It should be noted that no change to rental collection from single-teacher tenants was effected as these were already subject to the 42-week rental provision. Adoption of this procedure has resulted in greater efficiency; hence, cost savings, less administration costs and, therefore, more funds for teacher housing. There has been no change to the historic fact of subsidy for country service and it should be noted that the Teacher Housing Authority is unable to comment on subsidy or incentives. The honourable member's attention is drawn to the fact that the "42-week scheme" became operative from the last day of the third term, 1976. The Authority believes that teacher tenants are satisfied with the operation of rental collection systems which have greatly increased in efficiency (as predicted) since the adoption of the scheme.

SUCCESSION DUTY

Mr. DRURY (on notice):

1. How many properties in South Australia have been assessed at \$60 000 or more for succession duty purposes?

2. How many of these have been assessed at \$100 000 or more?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not possible to give information in the way requested. The State Taxes Office does not keep detailed statistical information for succession duty purposes because it has been found that to keep meaningful information would require a considerable amount of clerical effort. For purposes of considering the effect of proposed amendments to the succession duties legislation, it has been found more effective to take out samples directed to providing the specific information relevant to the proposed amendment.

SENATE VACANCY

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

Has a vacancy been notified in the representation of this State in the Senate and, if so—

- (a) when was it notified; and
- (b) when is it proposed that there be a joint sitting of the Houses of Parliament pursuant to section 15 of the Commonwealth Constitution to choose a person to fill the vacancy?

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

- (a) November 16, 1977.
(b) No decision has been made.

Departments, the transfer of Dr. Grant Inglis was a case of providing the best man for the direction of the Museums and Botanic Garden Services.

INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it proposed to introduce legislation to register independent schools and, if so, when and why?

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

1. As a consequence of certain problem areas which had become apparent in recent years, a committee was formed to investigate the establishment and continuation of non-government schools. Those areas requiring investigation were:

(a) Incidents where parents were dissatisfied with the current educational institutions and had commenced, or indicated their intention to form home-based schools.

(b) Increase in applications from groups, both religious and secular, for approval to form an independent school.

(c) Absence of any requirements under the Education Act, 1972-1976, for a school to obtain approval to commence operation.

(d) The funding of business colleges.

2. Members of the committee were drawn from the Education Department and bodies associated with non-government schools.

3. The committee has completed its investigations, and the report is at present being considered.

4. No decision will be made on the implementation of the recommendations until the impact and possible implications have been discussed with interested bodies.

Dr. W. G. INGLIS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Why was Dr. W. G. Inglis transferred from his position as Director of the Environment Department?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member will be aware that the Government of the day is perfectly entitled to arrange departments or divisions of departments as it sees fit. Following the last election a reallocation of portfolios took place in which I became the Minister for the Environment, as well as continuing to hold my former portfolios as Deputy Premier, Minister of Works, and Minister of Marine and Harbors. Two divisions of the Department for the Environment, namely Museums and Botanic Garden, were reallocated to the Education Department. The logic behind this move was that the work of these two divisions was primarily scientific in nature but with a large educational component in so far as the services provided by these two divisions extend to advice to the public at large and to education to very many schoolchildren.

By reducing the size of the Department for the Environment it has become a much more cohesive unit of Governmental activity, able to focus on the important environmental concerns facing the Government and the State. As the honourable member knows, Dr. Grant Inglis is an eminent scientist with a specific background of experience in the work of museums. He is ideally suited, through his academic training and his Public Service experience, to take on the responsibilities of Museums and Botanic Garden, which are now situated within the Education Department. Given the reallocation of the divisions as between the Environment and Education

MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Why was the Hon. Donald William Simmons removed from his position as Minister for the Environment?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member will be aware that a Premier has a perfect right to allocate portfolios within his Ministry as he sees fit. This is a normal and proper part of Government in the Westminster system; it is practised by all Governments of whatever political persuasion; it quite often takes place subsequent to elections.

BOARD MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What criteria are employed by the Government to determine the membership of boards created by legislation where specific interest groups are not identified?

2. Are the same criteria used for determining the membership for tribunals, trusts and authorities?

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

1. The Government, in common with previous South Australian Governments, selects members for boards, tribunals, trusts and authorities in accordance with the relevant law. Where no specific interest group is specified, selection is based upon judgment as to suitability.

2. Criteria used include many factors, and the weight given to some aspects may be varied according to the nature of the position.

WOMEN'S SHELTERS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What funds have been received from the Commonwealth in the financial years 1973-74 to 1976-77, inclusive, for the activities of women's refuge shelters, and what amount is expected for 1977-78?

2. To which shelters and in what amounts have the funds been distributed in the same period?

3. What amount of State funds has been provided in the same period?

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

1. Funds received from the Commonwealth from 1973-74:

	\$
1973-74	Nil
1974-75	Nil
1975-76	105 192
1976-77	144 200
1977-78	245 310 (expected)

2. Schedule attached shows payments (from both State and Commonwealth funds) made to women's shelters from 1973-74 to 1976-77 and the estimated payments for 1977-78.

3. Funds provided by the State from 1973-74:

	\$
1973-74	Nil
1974-75	23 843
1975-76	14 371
1976-77	67 713
1977-78	91 190 (expected)

	Actual payments												(Estimated)	
	1973-74		1975-75		1975-76		1976-77		1977-78		1977-78		Total	
	Total	Cwth.	Total	Cwth.	Total	Cwth.	Total	Cwth.	Total	Cwth.	Total	Cwth.		
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	
Travellers Aid Society	—	—	5 000	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Womens Emergency Shelter, North Adelaide	—	—	7 273	—	30 514	3 807	—	39 330	5 007	—	45 835	17 445	63 280	
Hope Haven	—	—	6 000	—	25 358	2 817	—	43 688	6 325	—	38 182	12 728	50 910	
Whyalla Y.M.C.A. (Eloura)	—	—	—	—	14 865	2 735	—	5 638	1 380	—	13 334	4 446	17 780	
S.A. Mutual Assistance Association (Naomi)	—	—	5 570	—	34 455	5 012	—	55 544	7 568	—	43 125	14 375	57 500	
Salvation Army (Bramwell House)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6 124	—	—	20 867	7 553	28 420	
Women and Childrens Emergency Shelter, Christies Beach	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15 637	—	—	16 942	5 648	22 590	
Para Districts Womens Shelter	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	14 887	—	—	22 206	7 404	29 610	
Women and Childrens Hostel of Port Augusta	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10 785	—	—	18 877	6 293	25 170	
Mount Gambier	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10 737	6 563	17 300	
Western Area	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15 205	8 735	23 940	
Totals provided	—	—	23 843	—	105 192	14 371	—	144 200	67 713	—	245 310	91 190	336 500	
					23 843			119 563			211 913			

URANIUM

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is the only problem arising out of the mining and export of uranium from South Australia that of waste disposal and, if not, what other likely problems are there?

2. What action, if any, does it propose to meet any such problems?

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

1. The problems concerned with the mining and export of uranium were fully canvassed in the House of Assembly debate on the matter—see *Hansard*.

2. Vide No. 1.

COROMANDEL VALLEY LAND

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What land at Coromandel Valley has the Government bought from Mr. Frank Smith?

2. When was transfer of title made?

3. When was occupation given by him?

4. To what use is such land at present being put?

5. What uses are proposed for it in the future?

6. Has Mr. Smith objected to any such uses and, if so, on what grounds?

7. Is the Government at present negotiating with him to buy other land and, if so—

(a) how much land;

(b) where is it situated; and

(c) what stage have negotiations reached?

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

1. None.

2. Not applicable—see question No. 1.

3. Not applicable.

4. Not applicable.

5. Not applicable.

6. Not applicable.

7. (a) 0.8 hectares.

(b) Between the eastern boundary of the existing school site and the Sturt River.

(c) Agreement on price has been reached, a right of entry given on about August 22, 1977. Transfer not yet signed.

DENTAL CARE

In reply to Mr. ARNOLD (November 2).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: No. The Government is not prepared to negotiate with private dentists to provide free dental care for schoolchildren. To expend limited funds on the provision of private dental care in areas where this may be available in advance of the Government programme would inevitably slow down the completion of that programme.

WHYALLA HOSPITAL

In reply to Mr. MAX BROWN (October 26).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The first stage of the redevelopment of Whyalla Hospital will provide accommodation for splintmaker, pharmacy, central sterile supply department, energy plant, maintenance workshops, staff change rooms and education unit, with tenders being called in March, 1978, and work is expected to start on site in June, 1978. Before this work can commence it will be necessary to relocate the nurse training school, maintenance staff offices, seamstress accommodation and several storage sheds, and tenders for this work will be called in January, 1978.

WALLAROO ACCIDENT REPAIRS

In reply to Mr. RUSSACK (November 3).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Marine and Harbors Department will be using its own employees normally engaged on the operation and maintenance of the plant who would otherwise be unemployed as a result of the accident. Three additional employees from the Wallaroo district have been taken on and more will probably be required shortly, although exact numbers are not yet known. No labour will be imported into Wallaroo for the project except as necessary to obtain specialised skills or experience not available locally.

ST. AGNES PRIMARY SCHOOL

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (October 13).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The child-parent centre

building on the St. Agnes Primary School site was handed over to the school on Friday, November 4. It commenced operation on Monday, November 14, to the satisfaction of children, parents and staff. Site works are proceeding.

WORK EXPERIENCE COURSES

In reply to Mr. KLUNDER (November 22).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The following figures indicate the extent of work experience programmes in Education Department secondary schools as at November, 1977:

Metropolitan high schools	37
Country high schools	27
Area schools	11
Total number of students	5 050
Total number of employers	1 760

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: FIRE CONTROL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister for the Environment): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: With two of the State's major national and conservation parks already damaged badly by fire even before summer begins, I judge the time to be right for a considered statement on the policy adopted by the National Parks and Wildlife Service for dealing with fires.

Mr. Gunn: I didn't think they had a policy.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the honourable member listened, he might learn for the first time that there has been a policy for some time. One of the reasons why I am making this statement to the House is so that members can be informed. In this statement, I will also deal with measures taken by the previous Minister for the Environment to improve the communications network in parks, and also I will finally announce measures I have found necessary to authorise.

The statement that follows leans heavily on an urgent review of procedures and equipment I sought from the National Parks and Wildlife Service following, first, my inspection of the annual training day for Adelaide Hills rangers on November 2. There had already been an extremely damaging fire on Kangaroo Island which began in fact only two days after I became Minister responsible for parks. Then came the most serious fire which raced through the major portion of the Messent Park, inland from Salt Creek. This has since been passed into the hands of the Coroner, who will conduct an inquiry into the cause, and I am pleased to observe that this inquiry can take place very shortly. With these incidents as a most disturbing background, I have conferred with senior officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service and with the Acting Director of my department to make sure our efforts in fire prevention and control are as effective as possible.

I requested the service to inform me of any deficiencies in equipment or manpower that might hamper its efficiency in a bad summer fire season. On receipt of this report, which was provided speedily, I obtained Cabinet agreement for the purchase of more equipment and the engagement of more staff, involving in all the expenditure of \$238 000. I wanted to be certain that we were doing all that we ought, and that we were doing everything possible to cope with the fire threat. If we seek co-operation from country fire services, I want to be able to offer them, from

the parks organisation, a well trained and well equipped force operating with clear objectives. I am now in a position to make public exactly where we stand, so there can be no misunderstanding. My Director of National Parks has provided the following list of five objectives:

1. To establish progressively in each manned reserve or ranger station self-contained and effective fire control and suppression resources consistent with the needs of the reserve and the manpower resources of the reserve.
2. To liaise with Country Fire Service, State Emergency Service, police personnel, and establish a co-operative relationship with these services in each key reserve within twelve months of establishment.
3. To develop progressively radio communications at each reserve in accordance with established policy.
4. To develop in each manned reserve and important conservation park by 1985 a system of perimeter fire break/access tracks in accordance with established policy.
5. And finally, to undertake fire control and fire suppression measures as required.

Those are the general objectives; it is necessary to have them so we know where we are going. Then there is also the carefully worded fire policy, a document that has evolved over the years, involving the guidance of the National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council. There are eight points of policy, as follows:

1. The attitude of the National Parks and Wildlife Service is that, where practicable, fire will be extinguished when—in the opinion of a prescribed officer—there is any threat to installations within a reserve or to properties surrounding it. In effect, this means that attention must be paid to all fires in or near reserves. However, in remote reserves it may only be possible to observe or patrol wildfires. Naturally-occurring fires may on occasions be permitted to take their course in reserves where such fires are compatible with management objectives, and where the safety of adjoining properties or installations and amenities within reserves are not threatened. Other wildfires, regardless of origin, that threaten adjoining properties or installations and amenities within reserves will be controlled and extinguished where possible. This attitude is almost identical to that adopted as policy by the United States National Parks Service. Any decision on a fire just to "let it burn" must be reached only after the most careful consideration.
2. Where necessary, aids for fire suppression—access tracks, dams, spotting towers and air-strips—should be established where these aids are proven to be of value, and are compatible with the requirements of the aims of reserve management. That means that in most reserves the basic aid for suppression will be a boundary access track. In some reserves additional fire access tracks will be constructed to supplement the boundary track where this is compatible with other management objectives. There have been pressures for reserves to be cut up into what have been termed "manageable blocks" which might be altogether helpful in fire suppression. But this must be set against the ecological need to preserve the centre of parks in as natural a state as possible. A separate decision on this matter

will be made in each of our large reserves. We must accept that from time to time large areas will be burnt out.

3. Reserves that attract many human visitors will receive a larger share of fire control measures, like fire trucks, control burning around perimeters, and access tracks. This applies most directly to the reserves in the Adelaide Hills. The service admits an obligation to provide a reasonable amount of protection for visitors in recreation parks. At present the heaviest concentration of fire control equipment is in the most popular parks like Belair.
4. In more remote reserves, where visitor levels are lower, perimeter tracks for access and fence protection should be established and maintained. Management plans will govern the extent, if any, of controlled burning in these reserves.
5. Boundary access tracks will be constructed to a maximum five-metre width, unless it is found to be necessary otherwise in accordance with accepted safety principles. Where feasible, these tracks will be constructed by a "tritter" rather than bulldozed or graded. A tritter is a large and powerful slasher that cuts and mulches vegetation. There has been pressure for large, wide breaks around reserves, as wide as three chains. Breaks of such size cannot be accepted as necessary. Two or three chain breaks do not contain "spotting". In certain climatic conditions and in certain vegetation types, "spotting" has occurred up to three, or even five, kilometres from a fire. Firebreaks as well as providing a physical barrier to fires, also provide the principal means whereby fire-fighting efforts can be directed at the fire. The main requirement in these cases is good access and the policy of perimeter access tracks is aimed specifically at this point.
6. As the Bush Fires Act provides for the overall control of wildfires to be the responsibility of local councils, close liaison should be maintained with councils by all national parks staff. This should ensure that council fire control officers understand our management aims. This liaison, of course, should include country fire brigades and adjoining landholders. At present the new Country Fires Act is not fully operative, so our parks fire policy still refers to the Bush Fires Act.
7. Experimental work on the effects of various regimes of prescribed burning and wildfire is to be undertaken. Specific areas are being identified for long-term studies and monitoring points established so the effects on reserve ecosystems of wildfire can be established. Information so obtained could be vital in any future debate for or against wholesale burning.
8. The fire-fighting capabilities will be brought up to, and maintained at a standard commensurate with, the risks involved. In recent years the risks involved have increased with the increase in population, the spread in settlement and the greater mobility of travellers—all adding to the pressures on the countryside. So we have had to improve our fire service. So we have placed far more emphasis on fire prevention and suppression.

Last year, the then Minister authorised urgent purchase of badly needed radio communications equipment. This was as a direct consequence of the very serious threat faced in

the final months of the 1975-76 summer fire season from the activities of firebugs in the Adelaide Hills. As I will explain in a minute, I have taken that process much further. But first I make one or two more observations so that I can inform the House and the people of South Australia more fully on this matter.

Several techniques may have to be implemented in some parks where the need is compulsive. Where dense or tall vegetation occurs close to the vital perimeter access tracks, it may be found expedient to reduce this fuel supply. We envisage the possibility of periodic chaining of vegetation along a predetermined width, where such an action does not conflict with other management objectives. This chaining, or even rolling, could be done, say, as far as 20 metres in from the five-metre break.

Further, I can say that we will set about preparing working plans for fire prevention and suppression for each reserve. These plans will include details of measures to be taken and suppression aids to be established. There will have to be a parallel environmental impact assessment of any such action. On each manned reserve our basic fire-prevention resource will be a Toyota four-wheel drive vehicle with a 100-gallon "slip-on" unit and a 100-gallon trailer unit. Larger fire units and other support equipment will work in key reserves, and in each region throughout the State we will be endeavouring to provide a pool of heavy fire-fighting equipment with mobile transporting facilities.

Training programmes for park staff have been greatly expanded since the appointment of a fire-protection officer within the parks organisation. The National Parks and Wildlife Service has set about systematically dividing up internal areas of responsibility during major fires, allocating jobs and responsibilities for specific tasks. It is becoming more like a military operation, and that makes sense if one sees fire as a destructive force that has to be fought scientifically.

What, it may reasonably be asked, is the expected size and shape of this enemy force? A few statistics spell this out. In the year 1976-77, the National Parks and Wildlife Service recorded 69 fires. Luckily most of them were relatively small and dealt with in, at most, a few hours. The worst were recorded at Danggali, Billiatt, Para Wirra, Morialta and Hincks. The worst months were December and January and the most often affected reserve was Morialta. It is believed that at least 16 of the 69 fires were deliberately lit and that about a dozen came from burning-off operations that got away.

In the current season, there have been to date 18 fires, two of them—at Flinders Chase and at Messent—very destructive indeed; four were thought to have been started by lightning and four by burning-off escapes. We have had our early warning and I hope it registers all around. My response to the early burst of fires in our parks was to request, at short notice, an inventory of equipment needed to complete our fire-fighting capability. The reply came back in some detail in no more than a week. Cabinet has approved the complete order, that is, equipment to the value of \$201 500 and three extra staff—a "dozer operator", a driver for tritter and tractor, and a radio attendant, costing \$37 000.

Fire prevention and suppression is not just a matter of stockpiling equipment: it must balance hardware, such as fire trucks, software, such as tracks and firebreaks, and manpower. Hardware needs support and back-up systems. We have endeavoured to achieve this balance. We will, as rapidly as orders can be placed and fulfilled, provide extra fire-fighting units and/or radio equipment to the following reserves: Strathalbyn, Coorong, Naracoorte, Bool Lagoon, Canunda, Mount Gambier, Brookfield, Loxton,

Danggali, Kangaroo Island, Flinders Range, Leigh Creek, Port Augusta, Mambray Creek, Streaky Bay, Port Lincoln and Coffin Bay, and Innes, all in the country.

Then for the central region, mainly the Adelaide Hills, where there are the most people and the greatest potential for loss of life and damage to property, we are adding to our heavy equipment. This is primarily a bulldozer with low-loader and prime mover, replacement of a major unit at Morialta, more radio sets and all sorts of necessary smaller gear, such as rakehoes and knapsack sprays. The bulldozer, which will be based in the central region near Adelaide, will be shifted as required throughout the State to major fires. The vast bulk of this equipment is similar in nature to that already in use. Rangers thus do not need additional training in its operation. All radio communications items are compatible with Country Fire Services and other fire-fighting organisations.

Though this statement has been lengthy (and I thank the House for its forbearance), I think members will agree that after such a disastrous spell of dry weather we do need to sharpen our wits to avoid tragedy in the months ahead. I want to demonstrate that we have done, and are doing, everything possible in national parks to minimise the potential for destruction that so clearly awaits the unwary.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: UNEMPLOYMENT AND CRIME

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Further evidence of a connection between crime rates and the disastrous economic policies of the Fraser Government that have led to so much unemployment has come to light, and I feel obliged to put this before the House. It is well known that the proportion of young people unemployed is very high in comparison with the community at large and is climbing rapidly. To remind members of this, I will quote the following statistics published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, relating to percentages of the labour force in the 15 to 19 years age group unemployed. These statistics exclude schoolchildren:

Year	Quarter	Percentage of people aged 15 to 19 years in labour force unemployed
1975	February	13.7
	May	10.9
	August	11.9
	November	13.5
1976	February	14.6
	May	12.1
	August	13.0
	November	12.7
1977	February	16.8
	May	15.2

As the figures show, there has been a dramatic increase in the only figures available for 1977.

My advice from those involved in the industrial and labour market area is that job vacancies—the other relevant statistics—are falling rapidly, and that school leavers in 1977-78 face a desperately bleak situation. The best estimates are that, by next February, at least 30 per cent, and possibly up to 40 per cent of those in the 15 to 19 years age group of the labour force may be unemployed.

Now let me turn to a crime statistic which has recently come to hand and which indicates clearly that all this unemployment is bad news for the community. This is a statistic relating to vandalism cases in South Australia during the year 1975-76. The categories of crime involved here are arson, malicious damage to property, wilful damage, and other destructive acts. During the statistical year 1975-76, there were 351 appearances before juvenile courts and juvenile aid panels in relation to this kind of offence by people under 18 years of age; 178 of these 351 were over 15 years of age. Of these 178, 92 (or 52 per cent) were either unemployed or not attending schools.

I have said that in this period, 1975-76, the unemployment rate for those in the 15 to 19 years age group of the labour force was about 10 to 13 per cent. Clearly, therefore, there is a vastly greater proportion of the young unemployed committing acts of vandalism and similar acts than would be expected from the overall unemployment rate. Over half the young offenders are unemployed, as against 13 per cent for the work force as a whole. It is easy to see what is happening. The disillusioned young, despairing of the future, resentful at being abused by the ignorant as dole bludgers, are taking out their frustrations on society at large. Under the federal system, the State Government has responsibility for areas such as education, transport, law and order, and so on. But the responsibility for general overall management of the economy and for the present unemployment situation rests with the Fraser Government.

The handling of its duties by the Dunstan Government has just received strong endorsement from the people of South Australia in the recent State election. However, it is clear that the Commonwealth Government, as led by Mr. Fraser, is failing in its overall task of maintaining the economy and keeping the work force employed. There is no doubt that, unless we see a change of Federal Government policy—

The SPEAKER: Order! Only recently in this House we have had comments about political speeches, and I ask the honourable Attorney-General to bear that in mind.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The point I was making is that unless there are changes in policy the community will be faced with a disastrous situation concerning law and order in future.

QUESTIONS RESUMED

URANIUM

Mr. TONKIN: At long last, Mr. Speaker, and I remind the Attorney-General that leave has to be given for Ministerial statements.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TONKIN: How does the Premier justify his statement, as reported in this morning's *Advertiser*, that there had been no development of uranium under his Government in South Australia, and that none would be allowed in the light of the planned presentation by officers of the South Australian Mines Department on December 8 and 9 of a seminar on the current potential for exploration and development of resources, including uranium, in South Australia? The Premier is reported as saying in Sydney yesterday that there had been no development of uranium under his Government in South Australia, and that none would be allowed.

The Premier in this House has acknowledged that his Government is continuing to license exploration for uranium, and is currently studying the feasibility of a uranium enrichment plant, holding secret talks on that

subject only last month. Now we learn that officers of the S.A. Mines Department are to present on December 8 and 9 a seminar, which "has been conceived as a means of presenting to mineral and energy exploration and development companies the current potential for exploration and development in South Australia".

Mr. Millhouse: And there's no doubt it's with Hudson's authority.

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

Mr. TONKIN: I would be surprised if it were not with the Minister's authority. The programme includes, on Thursday, December 8, at 2 p.m.:

A series of short technical presentations, including summaries of recent energy and mineral developments in South Australia. Topics include:

- the onshore and offshore potential for petroleum and natural gas;
- recent coal discoveries;
- the potential for mesozoic and tertiary uranium;
- the Stuart shelf and Torrens hinge zone [which involves deposits of 50 per cent uranium];
- the mineral potential of the Gawler craton, the Olary Province and the Adelaide Geosyncline [projects involving about 50 per cent uranium];
- non-metallic minerals and the future.

The credibility of the Premier on this subject has reached an all-time low.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader, in finishing his question, has commented. He has complained many times about this practice, but he is now commenting himself.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader of the Opposition has suggested once again in this House that I have allowed development of uranium by holding secret, and these were his words, talks with a consortium last month. I do not know what is supposed to be secret about any talks that were held with Urenco. Those talks were held in this building, with Urenco officials coming in here in front of the Opposition, at the request of that company, to see me to be told exactly what this House has been told, and that is that no-one would be allowed to proceed with uranium development in South Australia.

Mr. Millhouse: There wasn't any publicity about it, though.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What was the point? A whole series of people can come in and ask what is the Government's policy. Not everyone who comes to see me do I make the statement about and say, "Look, I told them today what I have told the public over a long period".

Mr. Millhouse: It's a wonder—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has been interjecting quite strongly again this afternoon and, if he continues to do so, I will warn him.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Regarding the Leader's reference to a seminar that is being held in the Mines Department, it is one of a series of normal seminars that are concerned with existing minerals in South Australia. Most of it is concerned with the situation on the Stuart shelf.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: And oil and gas.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, a whole series of things of this kind. In the course of the seminar, what minerals there are in South Australia will be discussed. However, the Government's position remains exactly the position that was announced in this House when a motion was put to the House in March of this year.

Mr. Chapman: Except that exploration—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra.

Mr. Chapman: —is not—

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That debate concerned itself with what was unsafe—that it was unsafe to provide uranium to a customer country. That is the Government's position: we will not allow what is unsafe. It is not, however, unsafe to know what is in the ground.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members should be a little quieter; I cannot hear the honourable Premier speak.

Dr. Eastick: If he had his front to you instead of his back you might.

The SPEAKER: I warn the honourable member for Light.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am waiting for the staged laughter across the floor to die down, because that is obviously what it is: it is completely staged.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You're quite a comic, really.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Members opposite are in a difficult position as a result of all voting for that motion, something they now regret. They have since had their arms twisted by their Federal colleagues, and they now put on turns about the situation and are reluctant to have the public know that each one of them voted for a motion that it was unsafe to provide uranium to a customer country. Thus they now get up in here and try to cover their embarrassment by false laughter.

Mr. Gunn: Why don't you answer the question?

The SPEAKER: Order! I spoke to the honourable member for Eyre earlier during Question Time, and I now warn him, too.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If members opposite suggest that there is anything unsafe at all about companies in South Australia proceeding with the exploration rights that they have previously had over long periods without any development of uranium in South Australia, perhaps they will tell us what is unsafe about it. So far, all they do is carry on with staged laughter, which is not convincing to the public, even if they manage to convince themselves.

Mr. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition for the last time. I assure honourable members that I really mean it.

SCHOOL LEAVERS

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say what action he has taken over the financial plight that will face many thousands of school leavers and their families at the end of the present school term? It is beyond dispute that a large percentage of this year's school leavers will not get jobs. It has been made quite plain by the Federal Government—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

Mr. WHITTEN: That is not commenting.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will make that decision.

Mr. Venning: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: I do not need help from the honourable member for Rocky River. I thought the honourable member was commenting and I hope he will not continue to do so.

Mr. WHITTEN: School leavers unable to gain employment will be ineligible for unemployment benefits for six weeks from the end of the term. At the end of that six-week period, another 3½ weeks will elapse before unemployed school leavers will begin to receive regular fortnightly benefit cheques. The end result of this will be that, for the first 9½ weeks after leaving school, school leavers under the age of 18 years who have been unsuccessful in finding jobs will have received a single week's benefit of \$36. This will barely cover the cost of public transport required in job seeking, let alone help their families feed and clothe them.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I thank the honourable member for raising this question because there is another aspect to it.

Mr. Arnold: And a prepared answer.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It might be a prepared answer but, even if the honourable member does not want to hear it, I am sure other members may wish to hear what is going to happen to the kids leaving school at the end of this year. Is the honourable member saying that he does not care what happens? Members on this side of the House do care, and I will explain what I am trying to do about it as a representative of this Government in an area that really belongs to the Commonwealth Minister and the Commonwealth Government, which is incapable—

Mr. Chapman: Make a press statement.

The SPEAKER: I warn the honourable member for Alexandra for the second time.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The question being raised is one which affects seriously many families in South Australia. I am surprised to hear the member for Chaffey trying to defuse this issue because many families in his area will be affected by the situation I am going to outline to the House. I am sure he will be prepared to listen, because I am sure at heart he knows he will try to do something for these people if they approach him.

What is not well known is that the family allowance (previously called child endowment but altered by the present Government to family allowance) will not be paid in respect of school leavers after the end of the school term in December. Many families will have young children who are 16 years of age leaving school. The family allowance now being paid will stop and the unemployment benefit will not commence for at least 63 days. Not only will there be no income going to the young people themselves for nine weeks but the family support which would obviously be an integral part of the family's financial arrangements will cease from that date. If this is not serious, I do not know what is. I am certain the member for Chaffey, at heart, would agree that this problem will affect families. It is an important matter and ought to be considered by members of this House. I think I heard someone ask what we are doing about the matter. I will say what I am doing about it, if members will do me the courtesy of listening.

Last Friday I sent a telex to the Minister concerned (Senator Guilfoyle) in Canberra in which I asked her urgently to consider finding a solution to overcome this hardship which will be inflicted on those families. I have asked her to consider paying the family allowance in respect of the unemployed school leavers for that period before they gain unemployment benefits. I think every member would agree that it is not an unreasonable proposition that I am putting forward. I asked Senator Guilfoyle, in a telex sent last Friday, to do that, but I have not received yet an answer. I can only presume (and I do not intend to try to pre-empt the issue) that the Minister is aware that this problem will arise in families all over

Australia and that she has been giving the matter her consideration, but until now I have had no answer.

URANERZ EXPLORATION

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say whether it is a fact that the Uranerz exploration licence was granted without the South Australian Cabinet being informed? The Premier obviously did not know about the seminar on uranium scheduled for early December. A report appeared in the *Australian* this past weekend which asserts that what I have stated is the case—that in fact the licences were granted and Cabinet was not informed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Exploration licences do not go before Cabinet. As the honourable member knows, they are granted for exploration for minerals at large; they are not granted for particular minerals at all. In the case of people who come to search for minerals, the exploration licences are purely a formality in the Mines Department. They do not come to the Government, because in themselves they do not involve mining development. If something were to occur which ran counter to the Government's policy that there would be no mining development in this area, that, of course, would have to come before Cabinet, but in this case the matter of exploration licences did not come to Cabinet. There are a great many exploration licences in South Australia, and some of them are quite long-standing and over vast areas of South Australia, which give a right for exploration of minerals at large.

Mr. Tonkin: But you know they were exploring for uranium, didn't you?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Who were?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Goldsworthy: The Minister knew and the Premier did not.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I was certainly not personally aware of the Uranerz activities, but given the policy of the Government there was no reason why I should have been.

DEAD FISH

Mr. OLSON: Can the Chief Secretary inform the House as to the advisability or otherwise of eating dead fish taken from the Port River? I draw the Minister's attention to a report in today's *News* which states that the police and health and fish authorities are warning the public not to eat any of the thousands of dead bream found floating in the Port River until the results of tests being undertaken are known.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: This could potentially be a quite serious matter, and I think it is desirable that the House be informed as quickly as possible. Just a few minutes ago, I received word from the police that they had received a report about these fish floating in the Port River this morning and that samples had been taken by the Fisheries Department to determine the cause of death. It is suggested that it might have been due to the large amount of rain and flood water yesterday. The seriousness of the problem became more evident when it was reported that some people had taken a utility load of these fish away and also, because investigations by the police had revealed that yesterday 31 drums of insecticide fell off a truck and that nine of those drums fractured and went into storm water drains and some of that water had subsequently gone into West Lakes and the Port River area. Therefore, the fish should not be eaten. The report in today's *News* states:

A spokesman for Safcol said some of the fish collected in the river were sold at the co-op's early morning market today.

Obviously, it is most important that people should not eat bream until it has been established definitely that it is safe to do so. Tests are continuing, and I understand that the Public Health Department has an antidote, if such is found necessary. However, it is most desirable that people should not consume the fish that were found floating in the Port River until it has been determined that it is safe to do so.

URANIUM

Mr. ALLISON: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether the Government has any designated guidelines for the mining and stockpiling of uranium deposits at Roxby Downs? During a televised debate with the Leader of the Opposition during the most recent State election campaign, the Premier said:

I believe that Roxby Downs will be developed. There is not only copper and uranium there but other minerals as well. If they were to mine uranium before adequate safeguards were provided, we would want them to stockpile it, and we have made that perfectly clear.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The position with respect to Roxby Downs is that any statement at this stage as to what would happen is entirely premature. First, it must be demonstrated that enough water could be provided to Roxby Downs to enable any processing to take place there.

Mr. Allison: Is that leaching?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The water is basically required to refine the raw ore into copper concentrate. After all, we do not want to be carting 10 tonnes of material by rail to the coast when a very much smaller amount could be carted, if it could be treated on site. A substantial quantity of industrial process water (some millions of litres a day) would be required. There would have to be an extensive feasibility study into the availability of that water in such a dry area of the State. Most probably, it would have to be obtained (if it can be obtained at all) from the Great Artesian Basin. Whether Western Mining Corporation would be willing to commence at Roxby Downs with the sale of copper only is obviously a matter for the determination of W.M.C. and a judgment by it as to whether or not that would be economically viable. If that were to be the case, and if copper and other minerals were produced and not uranium, presumably the uranium would have to be stockpiled.

However, I draw members' attention to the fact that this House, in the resolution it passed, referred to the supply of uranium to a customer country. The safeguards talked about at the time of that debate, at the time of the passage of the resolution, and subsequently have related to safeguards necessary for the disposal of the waste products from a nuclear reactor, which occurs in the customer country and not as a consequence of the mining and stockpiling of uranium. When the Premier made that statement on television during a previous election campaign he was referring, by implication, to that fact. It would be conceivable for uranium to be mined and stockpiled, while the other minerals were processed and sold if that were viable from the company's point of view. However, that remains to be seen, like many other things.

Roxby Downs would need, as well as industrial process water, a large urban infrastructure and large quantities of housing. The question arises whether the Commonwealth Government would be willing to declare Woomera an

open town so that it could be used for that purpose, but even Woomera would not be large enough.

The issues involved in such a project are extremely large and it will take a long time before they can be effectively determined. Any kind of speculation involved in the type of question asked by the honourable member is pretty much a waste of time, because no—

Mr. Millhouse: Why don't—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member might do me the courtesy of listening for once.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: I have been listening.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Not very well.

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

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Any hypothesis about the possible development of one of the minerals without development of the other is purely hypothetical at this stage, and much further information would have to be obtained before any kind of decision could be made on that. After all—

Mr. Dean Brown: But the State Government—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have listened to the honourable member for Davenport. He has interjected on two or three occasions while the Minister has been answering the question. I do not want to find it necessary to warn the honourable member, but I hope he will cease interjecting; otherwise, I shall do so.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: After all, the Roxby Downs deposit in terms of its extent and in terms of the minerals contained in it has not been effectively proved. At least another 18 months or more of exploration will have to take place there before it can be so proved. I know honourable members opposite, not least the member for Mitcham, are all concerned now to try to get some political capital out of this issue: the Liberal party from one point of view, and the sole representative of the Australian Democrats from another.

Mr. Millhouse: The fact is that—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Mitcham for the second time. I want the Minister to stick strictly to answering the question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have been answering the question that has been asked, and I have been subjected to a continual barrage of useless and stupid interjections from members opposite. They are doing it purely for Party-political reasons, in order to get some publicity. They do not mind if it is crook publicity; they do not mind if it is untrue; and they do not mind if they misrepresent—and that includes the member for Mitcham. All they are concerned with is Party politics.

Mr. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the Minister is answering the question. I believe that the Minister himself is playing politics. It has been ruled previously that that must not happen during answers to questions. I ask you to uphold the point of order.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. I hope honourable members will be more consistent in future. The situation with the asking and answering of questions becomes embarrassing at times, as it is often awkward to adjudicate on these matters.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Basically, the answer to the question is that, before any final answer can be given about any kind of development at Roxby Downs, there will be at least another two and possibly three or even four years of work to be undertaken before the ore body can be properly assessed, before its potential value can be known, before it can be determined whether the ore body can be mined by open cut methods or whether underground methods have to be used, before the extent of any

infrastructure to be provided can be known, and before it can be known whether sufficient industrial process water is available to make the project viable. Any honourable member who tries to suggest otherwise is misrepresenting the position, presumably for his own devious purposes.

AMERICAN RIVER WATER

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Works adjust the Government's water supply policy, requiring a minimum of 10 per cent return on the capital costs of extension schemes, in order to recognise the needs of some areas in the State experiencing desperate water shortages, and accordingly treat the case of the American River townspeople and those in adjacent areas as a matter of extreme urgency?

An article headed "Severe drought hits K.I." appearing in the *Advertiser* on Monday, November 28, refers to water stealing and to the plight of the American River townspeople in some detail. There is no needed volume of rainwater available in that area other than that which may be stolen, and it is apparent from reports that the cartage rate of creek water of \$25 a thousand gallons from the nearest supply point is beyond the reach of those low-income residents. The tourist industry in that area is in serious jeopardy, particularly as we are now entering a new tourist season, because of the water shortage. However, the problem does not end there.

I draw to the Minister's attention the plight of other persons. For example, the latest correspondence drawn to my attention arrived this morning from a farmer located outside that township area in the hundred of MacGillivray. I am told in that correspondence that tomorrow 160 of that person's cattle will be slaughtered, directly as a result of no water being available to him. He is the proprietor of the Kangaroo Island dairy, the source of milk supply not only for the townspeople in the island township areas but also for the local hospital. His dairy herd has been receiving water carted at the cost to which I have already referred, but no longer can he afford to cart water for his beef herd, and from that herd tomorrow morning 160 cattle are to be slaughtered. Numerous items of correspondence and petitions have come to hand in recent weeks and, because of the circumstances applying in that area, I call on the Minister to take the appropriate action in the interim and to give serious consideration to the policy change that I call on the Government to consider.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I make clear that I sympathise with people in this predicament. The honourable member will know that they have been in this predicament for many years. As he has said, constant approaches have been made. The Government would not necessarily have to change its policy: indeed, the honourable member should be aware, because he has been told several times, that we do not require in every case a 10 per cent return on capital outlay. He knows that, and he also knows that about two years ago this Government, for the first time in the history of this State, instituted a policy, which provides that each year \$500 000 (and this amount is subject to review) will be spent in order to provide uneconomic water schemes. He also knows (he has been told often, and so have his constituents) that there are about 38, 39, or 40 such schemes operating throughout the State—

Mr. Chapman: If he—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: —and they are all in difficulties.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have twice warned the

honourable member for Alexandra. He has asked the question, and he now interjects whilst the Minister of Works is replying to his question. I hope that he does not continue in this vein.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Your reference to my interjecting is a bit unfair. I was simply answering a stream of abuse coming from the other side.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The Deputy Leader was answering the question, I thought to the satisfaction of the honourable member.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: One can never satisfy the honourable member. I was not abusing the honourable member. I was outlining to the honourable member facts that are well known to him. They are also known to other members who have been striving for years to have similar needs of their constituents satisfied. The honourable member knows that.

The plight in which these people find themselves is of no comfort to me. However, it is of no comfort to me to know that if I met everyone's requests in this State in relation to uneconomic water supplies we would not be paying what we are paying for water now but would be paying much more. The honourable member recognises that. If he could convince the people of South Australia, particularly the people of Adelaide, that they should be doing that to meet the needs of his constituents, he is a better man than I am.

The Government has considered this situation several times. Only this morning I asked the department what was the current cost of this scheme on the short route, and was told it was now \$1 100 000. I also inquired about the values of the properties for one mile on either side of the pipeline and in the township area that would be served. The honourable member would be interested to know that the value of the properties in 1971 (and the figure can be escalated) was \$1 100 000. What I am saying is that the supply of reticulated water to some of these areas is so uneconomic that it would pay the Government to buy the properties concerned.

In those circumstances the honourable member cannot seriously ask the Government to implement a scheme that is as uneconomic as that. It is not a matter of 10 per cent. A stand pipe has been provided, as the honourable member knows. The District Council of Dudley can, if it wishes, enter into an arrangement for water to be carted to the area, but the council has not been in touch with me. That council certainly has some responsibility in this matter, too.

Mr. Chapman: The stand pipe has been there for years.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am simply pointing out to the honourable member that the stand pipe is there and that it is a factor in this situation. Of course, the honourable member did not mention that. It is competent for the council, if it so desires, to do something about the situation: it could approach me on that matter, but it has not done so. As far as I am concerned, the situation stands where it has been in the past and where it is now. The honourable member is well aware of that. I am not in a position to change the policy; the policy does not need to be changed.

I approved only recently of a scheme where people have been screaming from the high heavens for years about a lack of water. I should like to know what their attitude would be if I suddenly stopped everything that was happening in that area and said that it all had to go to the area about which the honourable member is complaining. I ask the honourable member to be reasonable about the matter.

HOUSING COSTS

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Has the Minister for Planning analysed the cost figures of a major building company that sought to establish that a standard house was \$3 800 cheaper in Melbourne than in Adelaide? Such figures have been used in this House in recent weeks, and it has been suggested to me by people who should know that the difference was related to the fact that the standard of housing in Adelaide is much higher than it is in Melbourne. I would appreciate if the Minister could inform me whether he has considered this matter and what is the exact position.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think I have said before in this House that the comparison of building costs among the States is complicated by several factors, including the different standards and types of construction typical of each State. That is also influenced by the varying structures of the building industry itself and by whether the comparison is made between a project home or "one off" construction.

It is, however, a fact, as the Premier has stated, that foundations in most South Australian residential areas are significantly more costly than in other States. This is because of the existence of unstable soil conditions and reactive clay formations. There is also evidence that Adelaide construction is of a higher standard and quality than in other States. Some items that are considered as being standard in South Australian houses are regarded as additional items and are not included in the base price of similar homes in other States.

These facts are illustrated in a recent exercise undertaken by a major national building company that compared the variation in costs of one of its standard model houses in Adelaide and Melbourne. That company's original figure showed that an Adelaide house was \$3 800 dearer than a Melbourne house. That is the figure that has been quoted and bandied around. The following differences in standards and costs were revealed by the close examination that occurred.

In Adelaide, an engineer's soil report and footing recommendation is made on every job, whereas in Melbourne engineers' fees are extra if required by soil conditions. The cost difference is \$60. In Adelaide, grillage concrete footing with three metre span floor joists are included, whereas in Melbourne strip footings and stumps are used. The cost difference is \$1 000. In Adelaide, all service runs up to 32 metres are included in the base price, but in Melbourne all service runs are costed per metre as extras. The difference in cost is \$1 100. In Adelaide, toilet pans and cisterns, plus connections, are included in the price, whereas in Melbourne they are not included in the base price, and the difference is \$200. In Adelaide, fly screens are installed to all openable sashes in the standard house of this major building company, but in Melbourne a fly screen is attached only to the kitchen window. The cost difference is \$80.

In Adelaide, mosaic floor tiles are provided in wet areas, whereas in Melbourne only the water closet is provided with a rubberised sheet. The cost difference is \$400. In Adelaide, all wet area walls are lined with versilux, whereas in Melbourne only filled areas are backed with versilux. The cost difference is \$100. In Adelaide, frame members are in kiln dried softwood or oregon, whereas in Melbourne frame members are of green hardwood, and kiln dried timber costs extra. The difference is \$1 800. In Adelaide, ground poisoning and ant capping std. is a standard precaution taken for all jobs, whereas in Melbourne termite protection is an extra cost. The cost difference is \$35.

The total cost differences add up to \$4 775. Thus, although the standard model house of this major building company was priced as being \$3 800 cheaper in Melbourne, if both cases were compared in identical terms, the Adelaide house would be cheaper by up to \$1 000. The comparison of differential building costs between States forms part of a current Federal inquiry and is also a matter of study by the South Australian Housing and Urban Affairs Department. Further information will be made public when it is available.

WHYALLA SOCIAL WORKERS

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Community Welfare say whether or not his department has given or will give any thought to the obvious lack of social workers in Whyalla, and whether anything can be done to assist in what is happening there? The question of so-called social work in Whyalla has always, to my knowledge, been demanding. I put this down to multiple nationality, the effect of isolation, shift work and, to a great degree, the lack of employment of females. The overall position as far as these problems are concerned is that they are not improving, particularly regarding the unemployment of females. Regarding unemployment, the position of social work is growing worse day by day. I would be particularly pleased if he will consider this matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting. The honourable Minister of Community Welfare.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I shall be pleased to consider the position outlined by the honourable member. About a fortnight ago I was considering a docket that suggested that we have had some difficulty in filling one or two positions in Whyalla. Perhaps it would be surprising for members to know that in some cases social workers, just like other professionals, have their likes and dislikes about where they work. That is possibly a reason why one vacancy there has not been filled recently.

I think the honourable member will know, because he maintains a good liaison with all sorts of organisations within the town, that the Government as a whole is looking at the employment problem in Whyalla. Much has been said about the problem which is caused in some cases by lack of support for local industry by the Federal Government and in other cases because of other factors, including the distance from Adelaide. The Government has a working party operating in the area involving the Departments of Health, Community Welfare, Education, and the Premier. It is looking at the problem raised by the honourable member as well as many other problems to try to ensure that a maximum effort goes into the area to cater for the needs of the people in Whyalla. I will get a report on the situation for the honourable member and bring it down soon.

PORT PIRIE BRIDGE

Mr. VENNING: Will the Premier now admit that the bridge project on the Port Pirie waterfront known locally and infamously as the bridge to nowhere is intended for a secretly planned uranium enrichment plant in South Australia? A press release by John Oswald reads as follows:

Mr. John Oswald, Liberal candidate for Grey, challenged the Premier, Mr. Dunstan, to deny that the costly bridge project on the Port Pirie waterfront, known locally as the bridge to nowhere, was not intended for South Australia's

future uranium enrichment plant. Mr. Oswald stated that since the project commenced the State Government had claimed a "top secret" classification on the project and refused to supply information to the local council and members of Parliament.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting.

Mr. VENNING: No, I am reading.

The SPEAKER: I do not think anyone would say the honourable member was not reading, but he was commenting, whether or not what he said was written out. I hope the honourable member will not comment.

Mr. VENNING: The press release continues:

Mr. Oswald called for a clear declaration of the position from the Premier following secret talks between Mr. Dunstan and the Overseas Uranium Enrichment Consortium held in South Australia recently. Mr. Oswald said that the Premier clearly had a duty to the people of Port Pirie to declare himself on the uranium enrichment project. If the South Australian Government planned for a plant on the secret site, then the people were entitled to know.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The fantasies of the honourable member's candidate in Grey seem to be consistent with the fantasies which can be dreamed up by the more unlikely members of the Opposition. The bridge at Port Pirie was provided by RED scheme money at the behest of the local council for the opening up of a small industrial area on the other side of the river. Negotiations are presently going on concerning the establishment of a small boat-building industry on that side of the river. The Port Pirie council believed that it would open up that land, and that that would be useful. There has never been any suggestion to my knowledge by anyone that a uranium enrichment plant could be established across the river from Port Pirie. If the honourable member looks at the original uranium enrichment study done in South Australia he will see that it was done in relation to the Redcliff site. I know of no other suggestion on this score. I can assure the honourable member that no-one whatever has suggested to the Government that there should be a uranium treatment works of any kind across the river from Port Pirie making use of that bridge. It seems to me that Mr. Oswald is indulging in fantasy for political purposes, just as he has indulged in fantasy in suggesting, as has the Prime Minister, that I have held secret talks about anything in relation to this project. I have not.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: DR. INGLIS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Last Tuesday, in the Address in Reply debate, *inter alia* I complained about the failure of the Government to answer all questions on the Notice Paper each Tuesday and canvassed three of the questions which I had asked and which were not answered on that day. In the course of so doing, with reference to a question relating to the National Parks and Wildlife Service, I said:

I have been told (and this question was designed to test the reliability of this information) that there is a matter of some considerable scandal in the Environment Department . . . and that this matter is the real reason for the dismissal of the previous Minister for the Environment and the permanent head of the department.

In saying that, I did not mean to imply that Dr. Inglis, the former permanent head of the department, was involved in any dishonesty. On reading *Hansard* I can see that this

may possibly be an implication of what I said. It was certainly not meant to be, nor do I believe that it sounded that way when I spoke. The Minister of Works, who is usually quite alert, was in the Chamber (in charge of the House) and, while he interjected, he did not take a point of order, as he was entitled to do if he thought I had transgressed in such a way.

Since I made the speech, the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Minister of Works have told me that Dr. Inglis has been upset and hurt by what I said. Curiously, the Government did not take the usual action of an immediate statement in the House. This was in contrast to its reaction to some other remarks in the same speech concerning the exploration for uranium by Uranerz. The Minister of Mines and Energy made a long Ministerial statement on that subject the following day. I point out that had my Question on Notice been answered on time all this would have been avoided.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member not to comment. He was going very well until the last few sentences.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have almost reached the end, Sir.

The SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member will not comment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, there will be no comment. A subsequent Question on Notice asking why Dr. Inglis was moved has been answered today and, while it is remarkable more for what it does not say than for what it does say—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps that was getting a bit close. I want to apologise to Dr. Inglis for any hurt I may have unintentionally caused him. I reiterate that I had no intention at all of implying any dishonesty on his part.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Mr. WOTTON (Murray): I wish to move a motion without notice.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member has not moved the suspension of Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: What is the motion?

Mr. WOTTON: I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to allow the Chief Secretary to make immediately a full and detailed report to this Parliament concerning the accident involving 31 drums of insecticide near the Port River.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (19)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, Wilson, and Wotton (teller).

Noes (26)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, Klunder, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the House to debate the following motion:

That this House expresses grave concern at the spillage of nine cans of insecticide, as revealed in this House today by the Chief Secretary, and calls upon the Government to take

urgent steps to correct the situation and to warn the public of South Australia of the potential dangers.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House has just decided that matter. Also, a question of a similar nature was asked today and was answered by the honourable Chief Secretary. I rule the motion out of order.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The question today did not relate to the insecticide at all. In fact, it related to the dead fish in the Port River. The Minister, in answer to that question, revealed that 31 drums of insecticide (not named) had fallen off the back of a truck and that nine drums had split. The Minister passed vague reference to the matter, but it is a matter of obvious public importance, even though it got little attention from the Minister; therefore, I support the point of order I have taken. I believe the matter should be debated immediately.

The SPEAKER: I rule the honourable member out of order, and I have ruled the Leader out of order, also.

Mr. TONKIN: I take another point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is that the motions are not similar, because the motion previously voted upon in this House called for the suspension of Standing Orders to enable the Minister to make a statement. I am asking for the suspension of Standing Orders so that this House may debate the motion that the House views with grave concern the spillage of insecticide and calls upon the Government immediately to take urgent steps to correct what is potentially a dangerous situation and to inform the public of South Australia of the potential danger.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order; I have already ruled.

Mr. TONKIN: As this is a matter of grave importance to the health of the people of South Australia, I am obliged to move:

That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Leader must bring up his reasons in writing.

Mr. TONKIN: I will do so.

Mr. Mathwin: They are so busy fiddling around wasting Question Time—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order. Interjections were rife today, and that is why more questions were not dealt with.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the huff and the puff?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition states:

I move that the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to, because the matter of the proposed motion was not the same, because in no way can a motion to allow the Chief Secretary to make a statement on the spillage of insecticide into the Port River be the same as a motion to debate the issue in this House, and call on the Government to take urgent steps to warn the public of South Australia of the potential danger.

Is the motion seconded?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TONKIN: I take this action with grave regret and with some surprise, because I believe this is a matter of grave importance. We had today (quite by accident) a statement from the Chief Secretary during which, in answer to a question, he mentioned that 31 drums of insecticide (without saying what kind of insecticide) had fallen off the back of a truck, that nine drums had apparently split, and that insecticide had run into the gutter and been washed not only into the Port River, as I understand, but into West Lakes.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On a point of order. The honourable member may not debate the substance of what he proposes the House should deal with; he may only debate the question of whether your ruling was correct in

saying that he was out of order in moving a further suspension of Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The honourable Leader must confine his remarks to the subject matter contained in his motion.

Mr. TONKIN: I was simply outlining the circumstances leading up to my moving a motion to disagree to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I think that you will agree with me that I am obliged to raise these matters, despite the Premier.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Why are you disagreeing?

Mr. TONKIN: I will explain why I am disagreeing to your ruling, Sir. The matter is of grave concern, and it was for that reason, I believe, that the member for Murray raised the subject, and that matter was dealt with. It was a matter with which he dealt by asking the Minister to clarify the position, and that the Minister be allowed, under the suspension of Standing Orders, to make a statement, for instance, as to what insecticide was involved, what concentrations were involved, why the fish were found dead in the river, the cause of their death, and what proportion of insecticide has been found in the fish.

The SPEAKER: Order! The motion concerns disagreement to my ruling. There is nothing in it concerning the spillage of insecticide.

Mr. TONKIN: I am speaking to my motion of disagreement, because you, Mr. Speaker, have ruled that the matter raised by the member for Murray is the same matter I am trying to raise. I am appalled that a matter of potential public danger of this kind should not be debated in the House. How am I to disagree to your ruling if I am not permitted to discuss the original motion, which you, Mr. Speaker, have ruled is the same as the motion I want to move?

The SPEAKER: Order! As the motion concerns the honourable Leader's disagreement to my ruling, he must confine his remarks to the motion.

Mr. TONKIN: I shall do that, Sir. I refer you to the terms of the reason which I have given, which you have read out, and which refers to both motions and gives as the reason for my disagreement that you cannot in any way consider a motion to allow the Minister to make a statement as being the same as a motion calling on the Government to take urgent steps to correct the situation and to warn the people of South Australia of a potential danger. I do not know whether or not a danger exists, and, if the Minister, in his first motion, had been able to make a statement, we would not be placed in this ridiculous situation of disagreeing to your ruling on a matter of grave public concern. This, frankly, is abhorrent to me, because a matter of grave public concern is involved, yet we as an Opposition are reduced to debating a procedural motion on the matter. What does the Government have to hide? What is the Minister hiding?

Let us now get back to the reasons for my disagreeing to your ruling. I do not believe that it is in the best interests of the House. The ruling which you have made is, I believe, patently wrong, in that the two motions are not identical. The wording is different and, although they may relate to the same subject, the emphases are totally different. One emphasis is to ask the Minister to make a statement. Obviously, he did not want to make a statement. He is trying to cover something up. Therefore, that motion was dealt with, as was proper. To say that another motion calling on the Government itself to take urgent steps to investigate the situation and to warn South Australians about what could be a real danger (we may find that people are eating these fish even now, and that someone even now may be receiving treatment—

Mr. Kenelly: That's scaremongering.

Mr. TONKIN: It may be scaremongering according to the member for Stuart, but it is certainly not meant to be. I am most concerned about this matter, and I am amazed that the Government is not prepared to debate the issue and, indeed, to meet its responsibilities.

It is with grave concern that I have moved my motion. I am sorry that the motion had to be in such a form, because it is directed not specifically at you, Mr. Speaker, but at my concern over a potential danger to the health of the people of South Australia. I am appalled that the Government should see fit to gag debate and discussion on this matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The debate before the Chair is the question of your ruling, Mr. Speaker. The member for Murray moved the suspension of Standing Orders in order to allow a particular subject matter to be dealt with in a Ministerial statement. That motion for suspension was defeated. The Leader of the Opposition then moved that there be a suspension in order that there be debate on the same subject matter. Clearly, that is within the terms of Standing Order 202, which states:

No question shall be proposed which is the same in substance as any question which, during the same session, has been resolved in the affirmative or negative.

The House had already dealt with the matter of the suspension of Standing Orders for the purpose of dealing with that particular subject matter, and the Leader does not get around it by simply altering a few words as to procedure and saying, "In one case, it was a proposal for the Minister to make a statement, and, in the other case, it was a proposal for the House to proceed to debate the matter." As I believe that your ruling was correct on the matter, I believe that the House should uphold that ruling.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (28)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Eastick, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hoppood, Hudson, Keneally, Klunder, McRae, Nankivell, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 10 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Legal Practitioners Act, 1936-1972. Read a first time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill is designed to remove doubts as to whether legal practitioners employed in a department of the State Government but not in the Crown Solicitor's Office would have a right to practise in and appear before all State courts and tribunals. The doubts in this area arise from the rule that it is only principals in a legal practice, in contradistinction to employed practitioners, who have this unqualified right of practice and audience and the application of this rule to practitioners in the employment of the Crown. These doubts have been reawakened by the administrative arrangement to establishment a department of corporate affairs, and the obvious need to have legal

practitioners employed in that department. It is pointed out, however, that the provision presaged by the Bill extends this right only to officers or employees who are duly admitted and enrolled as practitioners of the Supreme Court and while acting in accordance with the approval of the Attorney-General.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the enactment of a new section 69, providing that legal practitioners employed by the Crown in right of the State have a full right to practise in and appear before any State court or tribunal if, in the case of officers not subject to the direction of the Crown Solicitor, they are acting with the approval of the Attorney-General.

Mr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 17. Page 888.)

Mrs. ADAMSON (Coles): This Bill seeks to amend legislation which many South Australians regard as reprehensible. It seeks to amend an Act which is based on the premise that classified publications or, to use the more common term, pornography, are acceptable and can be graded into degrees of acceptability, and that that is the function of the Classification of Publications Board. Its function is to classify pornography and to release it into the community. It is as a result of this legislation that the community has been lulled into a false sense of security about the dangers posed to all the community, but notably to children, by the availability of pornography.

The Classification of Publications Act has had the effect of screening pornography at the point of sale from the public view, and this is what has led to the false sense of security. The Government is obviously sensitive to a point to the public feeling engendered on the matter of pornography, which is why it has introduced this Bill. The Bill has four main purposes: it seeks to enable the board to vary or revoke a classification, to render a previously restricted publication open to prosecution, to remove publication of classified publications from newspapers and to restrict them to the *Government Gazette*, and to prevent mail ordering of certain publications at the board's discretion by requiring the purchaser to be present at the place of sale.

I should like to refer to clause 2, which amends section 14 of the principal Act by striking out paragraph (d) and inserting the following paragraph:

(d) a condition prohibiting the delivery of the publication except to a purchaser who requests the publication whilst he is at the place at which the publication is for sale and takes delivery thereof at that place;

I imagine that the Government's intention is to prevent this kind of publication from falling into the hands of children or into the hands of people who would find it offensive, but this amending clause and the sections of the Act are completely ineffective in terms of limiting the access of all but the purchaser to this material.

I think members on both sides of the House would have had reports from all over South Australia and would have

received complaints from people, particularly from parents, that pornographic material is being found in this State well away from the point of sale and well away from the possession of the purchaser. It has been found in parks, in caravan parks, outside schools, and in car parks. Members on both sides will have had complaints about this and will have proof of it. I should like to read one or two examples of the kinds of complaint received. I have a letter from the Supporting Mothers Association of South Australia, in which the Honorary Secretary states:

The committee of the Supporting Mothers Association is very concerned about the availability of pornographic material of all types to our children and yours and the influence that such material can have on young people. We are also very concerned about the attitude of Government bodies to the perpetrators of such material and to the use of children as models.

To that complaint I can add sundry other specific complaints. Hard core pornography has been found recently at a Mount Gambier service station. It has been found recently at a convent at Plympton and in schools, brought there by children who have been given it by older brothers or sisters or, in other cases, by children who have picked it up casually where they have found it by the roadside.

It is quite inadequate for the Government to be thinking of a clause that prevents mail ordering when in fact the very sale of pornographic material in effect makes it available to anyone in South Australia, irrespective of whether or not the person wants it. The Bill is completely inadequate in that it lacks any teeth that would give the board the power to refuse classification, to confiscate and destroy material, and to put an end to the profiteering that is going on and expanding at the expense of human dignity.

It is most important, in discussing the Bill and the classification of publications generally, that we understand what we are talking about in terms of what we mean by classified publications. Basically, there are three categories of material which could be described as sexually explicit. The first is sex instruction material, which is a perfectly legitimate kind of publication and which has its use and value. The second is erotica, designed to create erotic thoughts, and found in the popular media and in art and literature. The third category—and it is the third category to which we should be directing our attention—is pornography, which I would define as a portrayal of sexual relations in which all standards are violated and in which human beings are submitted to acts of unredeemed depravity, cruelty, and violence.

It is important that this Parliament and the people of South Australia know exactly what we are talking about when we refer to pornography. We are not talking about the so-called girlie magazines that are displayed in delicatessens: we are talking about material which can best be described in the words of a member of the Classification of Publications Board. I refer to an interview with Mrs. Wendy Worrall broadcast on A.B.C. *Broadband* on November 15, 1977, in which she stated:

Most of the stuff that's submitted to the board ends up being sold in sex shops. It ranges from I guess what you would call soft-core porn which is pictures of people naked in various sexual situations but without any blatant display—what used to be called blatant—to very frank display of genitals, sexual positions of every conceivable type and numbers and sexes, and combinations of people, also including animals, also including cruelty, sado-masochism, and a whole range of fetishes and rather kinky sex to do with faeces and urine.

Mrs. Wendy Worrall continued:

Well the degree of cruelty, outright cruelty, but not just that but the way that people were depicted as just gyrating sets of genitals, and this usually involving the woman being exploited and being used as an object for sexual gratification of men: men not as human beings but as mechanical beings.

It is offensive to me to be using these descriptions in this House, and I have no doubt that it is offensive to all members, and it should offend all members. It is offensive to the general public of this State, and it is to us that the general public is looking to put a stop to this kind of material. The Act provides that the board shall have regard to standards of morality, decency, and propriety that are generally accepted by reasonable adult persons. I ask members opposite who sets those standards: is it the pornographers, or members of this Parliament? I believe it is the latter, and that it is our responsibility to ensure that this spread of pornography in South Australia is stopped. Although the Bill goes some way towards tightening the provisions, in my opinion it does not go anywhere near far enough. The purpose of clause 4 (b) is to remove the publication of the classified publications from the daily newspaper and restrict the publication to the *Government Gazette*. We should examine the list of these publications in order to know what this Government, through the board, is making available to the people of this State. An extract from an editorial which appeared in *The Times*, London, on August 3, 1976, states:

As pornography has begun to circulate freely and legitimately, the reporting of serious sex crimes, like rape and attempted rape, has risen. The rise has been most striking in those countries where changes have been made most rapidly after an earlier restrictive pattern. New Zealand and Australia exemplify the pattern well. Between 1969 and 1973, reports increased in New Zealand by 72 per cent and in Australia by 74 per cent, while even for Copenhagen the comparable figure is an increase of 41 per cent.

Home Office statistics for England and Wales show that the rate of reports of rape and attempted rape rose from 0.90 per 100 000 population in 1963 to 2.02 in 1973. New Scotland Yard reports that comparable figures for London were 0.60 in 1963, and 1.70 in 1973. It is tempting to attribute this all to an increase in reporting rapes by victims.

No doubt the Government will claim that. The editorial continues:

Certainly the last year or two has seen an increased awareness of this need, but there is no evidence that such readiness was increasing in the period prior to International Women's Year.

The editorial continues:

What was once a subversive fringe element to civilised existence is fast becoming an intrinsic element in daily life. In the name of freedom the freedom to publish has become the freedom to exploit. Hiding behind a further myth of our time, that demand for pornography would die by making it legal, the industry has consolidated.

It has increased. I am certain that proprietors of sex shops would testify to that, and we in Australia and throughout the western world, and certainly in this State, are placed in the extraordinary position of failing to react when young children's sexual development is put at risk by the dissemination of pornography. No member of the House has been submitted as a child to the kind of pornography that is displayed in this city and around this State. None of us had to endure that sort of thing in our early stages of development, but it is now common in South Australia. None of us knows the effect that it is having on children, but the wiser among us believe that it is having a serious effect. I think that members on both sides should examine this amending Bill seriously in Committee and, in doing so, should consider the effect that this legislation has had

on South Australia. I have no doubt that it has had the effect of increasing the incidence of rape, and world-wide evidence would sustain this belief. An article in a Canadian newspaper of August this year states:

Dr. John Duffy, a forensic psychiatrist with the Attorney-General's ministry, told a judge that "It is my clinical experience that many sex offenders, when arrested, are found to possess pornographic material, either in their pockets, cars, or homes."

This statement was recently supported in South Australia by an Adelaide psychologist, Mr. A. E. Whitford, who said:

The wide availability of books and magazines about sex must be one of the causes of the increasing incidence of rape in South Australia.

Recently in July, in Britain David Holbrook, editor of the book *The Case Against Pornography*, is reported as having said:

In Sydney, Australia, after a particularly horrible act of rape, two Crown psychiatrists testified that the crime had been triggered-off by a pornographic film. And, of course, we all remember the case of the Cambridge rapist who not only enjoyed blue films but actually peddled films of rape.

So pornography which emerges from this kind of perverse excitement is always liable to trigger-off cruel and even murderous impulses in a minority of disturbed people.

Again, we read of a case reported this year on July 26 from London that an offender admitted grabbing and raping a girl as she was on her way to school. He said that he had been excited by a pornographic magazine. Judge Alan King-Hamilton, in Britain, who has decided that it is time to cry halt to the spread of pornographic material, agreed with the defence submission that the pornographic literature found in the home of a boy who was on trial before him on a charge of rape almost certainly had contributed to what had happened.

What happened was that a girl had been dragged into a stolen car, taken to grounds on the banks of a river and raped by a group of boys in turn, each of them committing other horrifying sex acts and kicking her because she cried.

We hear the Premier saying that people should have the right to see and hear what they wish and that his Government will not censor as long as people are not being exposed to undue danger as a result of what others see and hear. The time has come to sum up what that danger is and to put pornography more into perspective.

To those advocates of permissiveness who say that it is all right for pornography to be made available, I say that it is like implying that a person's religious freedom is restricted if he is prevented from putting living people on funeral pyres and setting fire to them. That is a reasonable analogy, because what is happening is equally dangerous to the moral and spiritual development of children who are exposed to pornography.

All the matters that I have raised so far point to the need for far more caution to be brought to bear in terms of our policies and attitudes in relation to pornography. An urgent need exists for the board to have a built-in sensitivity to community values. Whilst the Government might claim that such a sensitivity now exists in the composition of the board, I believe that it is necessary and urgent that the composition of the board be increased to take a more sensitive account of community attitudes. I foreshadow that, in Committee, that move will be made. Parliament needs to be aware of the board's activities and the basis on which its decisions are made. Research is certainly needed into this matter because none of us knows the effect that this material is having on people. We are throwing overboard the accumulated wisdom and knowledge of centuries when we allow this material to be

made available comparatively freely to children, young people and adults.

In speaking of this classified material, we are speaking about books and magazines that depict women being bound, beaten and abused. The Opposition and I are protesting about the messages that this material gives to the people who see it. If it does not bother Government members that this material is available in Adelaide and is being seen by children, it certainly bothers members on this side of the House. Although we do not disagree with the principle of adults being entitled to see, read, and view what they wish, we believe that this principle must always be balanced with the responsibility of a Government to protect minors and others to whom such material is abhorrent.

The Premier is vocal in saying that people should have this right, and he expressed his view on the matter recently regarding *East*. It is interesting to see the Premier wading through the mire of inconsistency and saying that his Government will not censor, when members of his own Classification of Publications Board acknowledge that they are censors. Again I quote Wendy Worrall in her interview on A.B.C. *Broadband*, when she said:

In fact when I was first asked to join the board I said "Who? Me? A censor?" I couldn't hold my head up amongst my friends, but I think once faced with the material we have really had to examine our attitudes to censorship because it is just not O.K. to allow everything to be available to everybody.

The Classification of Publications Board, in effect, classifies material in six categories, but those categories are then made available to consumers through the medium of sex shops situated around Adelaide and South Australia. We should get back to the philosophic question: If the State should not intervene in prescribing this type of perverted and sick material, what is the purpose of the State? Government today has a real responsibility to legislate for the required standards of morality under which we protect children, women, and the community as a whole.

I hope that when this Bill goes into Committee members on both sides of the House will be keenly aware of their responsibility. I submit that it is a Bill in which Government members should surely be allowed to exercise a conscience vote because it deals with a matter that should trouble the conscience of everyone in this House. Since this Act was passed South Australians have been subjected to an ever-increasing flow of material that is degrading to women. I have had many representations made to me on this aspect. I do not disagree with those representations, but go further and say that anything that is degrading to women and treats them as sex objects is no less degrading to men: it is degrading to humanity as a whole.

A couple of hours ago in this House we prayed to God to give us the guidance to act for the well-being of the people of this State. I hope that when we go into Committee on this Bill, and in the debate that ensues, we will have that prayer to the forefront of our minds and will seriously search our conscience and ask ourselves whether the proposed amendments in the Government's Bill go far enough to ensure that the well-being of the people of this State, particularly the children, is cared for as it should be by members of this Parliament.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the Bill. It is, I would have thought, of a narrowly technical nature, and I had not intended to speak in this debate until I heard the member for Coles canvassing rather wider issues (it was perfectly proper for her to do so because of the subject

matter of the principal Act) than those contained in the Bill itself. I agree with much of what she said, but there are a few comments which I should like to make and which, frankly, she has pricked me into making by what she said.

First, I believe she is being rather unfair to members on the other side of the House to suggest that they do not care about what comes into South Australia and what is read by people here. I know that that has been said quite widely, particularly by members of the Liberal Party, indeed, it was also said against me, I believe, in the recent election campaign. Although the honourable member did not mention me, I believe that she went rather too wide in her strictures on the attitude adopted by members of the Labor Party on this matter. She knows, and she conceded as much in her speech, that this is an appallingly difficult problem to which there is no real solution. The solution will change as community attitudes change.

Mrs. Adamson: Who sets community attitudes?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The whole community sets them.

Mr. Mathwin: Who helps them?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We all help them in one way or another.

Mr. Wotton: There's a setting of standards surely.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Apparently several members want the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Mathwin: We're just waiting for you to sit down.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have only just started.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has the floor.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should think so. I was saying that this is an appallingly difficult matter for which there is no real solution because community attitudes change from time to time. We have, on the one hand, the view that has been expressed forcibly in this place that people should be allowed to read and see what they like, provided they are adults.

On the other hand, we have the attitude which was expressed by the member for Coles and backed up by interjection by the members for Glenelg and Murray that community attitudes should be moulded in some way, presumably by Act of Parliament or by members of Parliament. If either of those agencies be in the minds of those members, I think they are attributing rather too much influence to—

Mr. Mathwin: What about by example of the Government?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg will have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We have these two conflicting points of view. While one can try to reconcile them, it is impossible ever to reconcile them to the satisfaction of all people. I fear that frequently, certainly in this State, for the reasons that I have given, an attempt is made to make this a political matter.

I was chided a moment ago by the members for Glenelg, Murray and Coles for not acknowledging, apparently (before I had a chance to say anything on this matter), that community attitudes and standards can be moulded. I suppose they can be, and that our job here is, in part, to set standards and give a lead to the community. How far what influence we have extends is, I think, open to debate. I think we tend to think we have far more influence than we really do have. I point out to the members of the Liberal Party who have interjected in this way that what is going on here is part of a world-wide trend, and in my view South Australia is not distinguished very much from the other States of Australia or from many countries overseas.

I am sure it is simply a symptom of the break-down of western civilisation of which we are a part, but I do not want to go into that too deeply. It is baying at the moon to blame the Government for what is going on here in South Australia.

Certainly, pornography is widely available in this State and I agree on this point with the member for Coles. We see it in all sorts of places. I have had my education (if education be the right word) rather furthered by some of the stuff which my children have brought home from the incinerators and rubbish bins in Heywood Park next to which I live. Someone was obviously putting this material in one of the bins on a regular basis, and we have all had the "benefit" of it at home because it was within about 50 yards of our front gate. That is not desirable, because that park is used, as these places are, largely by children. On our running expeditions on Saturday mornings a group of us has sometimes come across this material in strange places, on the Mount Osmond golf course and places like that. I think they are probably good parking spots. This stuff is found lying about and it is not desirable that it should be.

In saying this, I hope I am not being too frank and therefore exposing myself to even more stories than have been peddled about me in the past, but I think that we are being utterly hypocritical if we say that only children can be harmed and affected by this material. It has an effect on all of us, if we see it. However hard we may try to avoid its having an effect, it does have an effect. It is absurd to say it only affects children. I suppose the theory behind it is that the older we get the more able we should be to resist the temptations which this stuff conjures up in our minds. Well, that is a matter for each one of us; I do not know whether it is true or not. It is not right to say that only children are affected by it.

I am also moved to say by what the member for Coles has said that it is not only what is written that affects people and which may or may not encourage crimes of violence and sex. It is completely unproven as to whether this really encourages such crimes although as a matter of common sense one would expect it did because the thought is the father of the act. It is not only what is written that causes this sort of thing. We see plenty of it on television; it is not as lurid but it is in some ways more suggestive and sometimes these suggestions are on radio programmes as well, and they are media over which we have no control at all.

While I support this Bill and generally support the approach of the honourable member I think, first, she was rather unfair to other members of the House in labelling their attitudes according to their political Party and that she is distorting and exaggerating the influence which we have, as members of Parliament, or which the Government has, just because it is the Government, and which legislation has, on the morals and general standards of the community.

Mr. WOTTON (Murray): I support this Bill. At the outset I would like to congratulate the member for Coles on the way in which she has handled this debate so far. As a new member of this House, she has spoken well indeed and adverted to many matters that concern many of us in this place. I want to disagree with the member for Mitcham, since I do not think that the member for Coles was in fact blaming the Government; I believe that the member for Coles was asking the Government to act in a responsible way and that it should give guidelines because that is what a Government should be doing.

In my Address in Reply speech a few weeks ago, I referred to the need for Governments to take responsible

action to curb influence in the community by setting guidelines. I referred particularly for the need to influence in some way or to protect young people. I agree with the member for Mitcham that it is not only the young people who need protection; we all need to be protected in some way. We can all be influenced, but I think we should particularly watch the situation as it affects young children. There is a real need for this Government to take responsible action to curb influences in the community that are leading juveniles into permissive and deviant behaviour. I see the introduction by this Government of this legislation as a step in the right direction, but I suggest there is still a long way to go.

I firmly believe that television particularly (and reference has been made to various aspects of the media) has a major responsibility in today's society in shaping the behaviour of our community. I believe that there is a real relationship between the incidence of sexual crime and the promotion of R movies in particular. The number of R movies made available has increased tremendously.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not want to restrict the debate in this matter, but I raise the point that this is a measure dealing with the classification of publications, and R movies are not contained in this Bill, so it is beyond the second reading to discuss them.

The SPEAKER: Order! I uphold the honourable Premier's point of order and ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. WOTTON: I appreciate the point made. It was not my intention to take up much time with this matter because I intend to speak, particularly in support of the amendments that the member for Coles will be moving, during the Committee stage. I support what she has said in that regard. In making that point I say again that I see the legislation we have before us as a step in the right direction. I hope that this is only the beginning and that further legislation will be introduced in this regard. I support the Bill at this stage.

Mr. WILSON (Torrens): I did not intend to speak in this debate, but I want to make some points in answer to the member for Mitcham. I support the Bill. I also support the amendments on file of the member for Coles. The member for Mitcham mentioned a worldwide trend that is occurring, and I certainly agree with him. A worldwide trend is occurring, and of course community standards must rise and fall with that worldwide trend. I believe that there is a dichotomy in this worldwide trend. We also have the trend toward the equality of women in the community, and I assume that there is no member in this House who would disagree with that. With this worldwide trend toward pornographic literature we have a concurrent degradation in the status of women.

I am unfortunate enough to have three sex shops in my electorate. I visited two of the shops to see what was available. From under the counter, one of the proprietors showed me some literature (if that be the name) and on that literature was marked the classification stamp of the Classification of Publications Board, so it was legal to sell it. That literature contained photographs of women chained and bound in all sorts of various attitudes that I will not go into in this House, but it disgusted me in the extreme. I believe, indeed, in the liberal principle that people should be able to read this sort of thing if they wish, but what worries me is the degradation in the status of women. The Attorney-General, in a speech to the South Australian Status of Women Committee seminar on September 24 this year, said:

Australia is still a grossly sexist society. Women are

exploited for their sex.

I admit that I quote that out of context a little, but I am sure the meaning is quite pertinent because what we must watch with legislation relating to classification of publications, and indeed the whole of this sphere of interest, is that we protect the status of women. That is why I will be particularly pleased to support the amendment, which would allow the addition of special women's representatives on the board.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill. I have been concerned, as have several of my colleagues, about the situation in this State that has occurred recently. Many decent people throughout the State want to know just where South Australia is going. The Premier, since he has taken office, has allowed, through his Government, practically anything to happen, anything to be read and anything to be seen. In so doing the Government is responsible for creating a monster that it now finds most difficult to control.

I believe, whether it is old fashioned or whether or not I may appear to be a square, that there must be some standard of decency set. It can be set by the Government's giving a lead to the community, and this is one way that it ought to be done. The member for Mitcham has said that this sort of pornography is a worldwide trend, as if that was something new. Indeed, Sir, most members would realise that this sort of thing has happened for many years, even in the pre-war years, in places such as France, Germany and the Latin American countries. It is certainly not new, and to say that by some misfortune it happens to be a world trend at the moment and this has just happened in South Australia is just a load of hogwash. It could have happened years ago, not just now.

On many occasions the Premier has explained to people that they have no need to look at this material, to go to a film, or to read the material, and that may be so. I am pleased to see that in this Bill the Premier is at last realising that drive-in theatres are causing some concern in this area.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That's not in this Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN: I will read the Premier's second reading explanation, because I think he has forgotten what he said. It states:

There are some R films that are, in my Government's opinion, far too explicit in matters of sex and sadism for exhibition in drive-ins.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I am afraid that was about a different Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN: We will deal with the situation as I see it.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I am sorry; it is a different Bill you are looking at; we dealt with that previously.

Mr. MATHWIN: It all boils down to one ultimate end. I think even the Premier would agree with me that the whole thing is in one area.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No, I don't.

Mr. MATHWIN: I would have hoped that when the Minister brought this Bill down that he would include in it some classification relating to theatres in this State.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Bill before the House is the Classification of Publications Act Amendment Bill. It has already been pointed out there is no intention to inhibit the debate because it is an important matter, but it is about the classification of publications and I would ask the honourable member to restrain his comments to that Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN: I think you would agree with me, Sir, that when one talks about theatre one talks about scripts, and if one reads a script that would then be in line with this

legislation.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Bill is about publications and is not to do with theatre, films, etc. I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to publications.

Mr. MATHWIN: I will revert to the earlier part of my argument, when I said this was nothing new and was happening in different parts of the world before the Second World War, and I referred to a number of countries. It is all very well for people to say that anybody can read these books if they so desire, but what is of concern is what they do with them when they have finished with them and cast them aside. The readers of these books leave them (as the member for Mitcham has said and as I have seen in my area) on the seafront and esplanade where they are available for anyone to pick up. Whether persons retrieve them from a refuse bin does not matter; they are there for young people to get hold of and pollute and corrupt their minds through reading that material. If one really wants to try to stop this kind of practice, the best place to stop it is at the publication point. If no-one will publish it, its control will be more easily policed. I support the Bill, which has been a long time coming forward.

Mr. RUSSACK (Goyder): I, too, commend the member for Coles on saying so well the many things she said. I believe that literature has a real bearing on a person's personality. We have found at times that there has been a change in thinking, for example, in political philosophy or in other interests in life as a result of the reading of a book. Pornographic literature has no good effect on people. It has been said that, if one wished to know a person's character, one should study the literature he reads. I suppose that that saying could also be applied to authors.

Another reason for my speaking is that, earlier this year (in common with most other members, I should think), I received numerous letters on this matter from members of the Country Women's Association. Despite its name, the association has branches in the city and in the metropolitan area, so the letters set out the attitude of association members throughout the State. They were concerned, in the main, because pornographic literature was being found in many places, as has already been explained earlier in the debate. I am sure that this was no accident. Such literature has not just been left by an uncaring person: it has been left by persons who took care about where it was being left. As members probably know, I find it necessary to obtain accommodation in the city. One day, I found pornographic literature in a room that I occupied, and I do not mind saying that it found its way to the incinerator. I point out the real concern in the community at (and it would be remiss of me if I did not do so) and in opposition to this type of literature, which, unfortunately, is being distributed throughout the State.

In his second reading explanation, the Premier said:

Furthermore, a power of revocation will clearly enable the board to render a previously restricted publication open to prosecution under the Police Offences Act, if the board considers that it is appropriate to do so. As the Act now stands, the board has power only to refuse a classification initially, or vary an existing classification.

As the Bill will enable the board to revoke a previous classification, I believe it is a commendable move. I support the Bill.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I, too, support the Bill. In common with my colleagues who have already spoken, I point out that this is the matter on which I have had the most representation during the past year, mainly from the groups referred to by the member for Goyder, such as the

Red Cross, the Country Women's Association, concerned mothers, and parents and friends associations of the various high schools in my district. They have all expressed concern at the type of literature now coming into the hands of young people. Whilst I believe that adults can sort out what they want to look at, an inherent danger exists in making pornographic literature available to young people. We must guard our young people's minds for the future. The Bill is a step in the right direction and the foreshadowed amendments have been commendably researched by the member for Coles.

I wanted to make a brief contribution because of the persistent and strong representations I have had from people in my district and from those in the South-East generally who have expressed their sincere concern about this type of literature becoming available to almost anyone who cares to look at it. What is even more important is that such literature has been found in all kinds of places that are available to the young.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): In supporting the Bill, I first congratulate the member for Coles on her remarks. I believe that her interpretation of the Bill is similar to that of many people in my district. Reference has already been made to representations members have had from organisations such as the Country Women's Association and from school welfare clubs and associations. On one occasion, a meeting was held at Cummins on this very subject, and it was addressed by various speakers. One interesting facet of the meeting was that all of those present were involved directly in educating children and all were parents (mothers outnumbered fathers by about four or five to one). Those present were concerned citizens of the community, and all those I knew personally were highly respectable citizens of the community, and I would back their judgment to the very end.

The argument always put to me has been, "How can you talk about pornography if it is not so readily available?" I have not accidentally come across pornographic material in my travels. To those who have approached me on the matter, I have said, "We must have evidence before debating this issue," and it was not very long before evidence was forthcoming. The ladies who were pushing the main drive in the anti-pornography issue produced evidence that had been picked up in park lands and in other places in which it was readily available, particularly to the young, who were the main concern in the community. Although the people who obtained this material were reluctant to present it to me, I asked for it, and I got it.

I might add that I believed it could be conceived, printed and published only by someone with a twisted mind. It did not in any way reflect a general point of view. It had to involve the ideas and views of people who were sick. I use those terms because I was surprised (I admit that it churned up my stomach) that such ideas could be put into print. One could go a step further and say that some employees must be asked to print this material, which raises another question.

During this session, I have presented three petitions, involving 5 800 signatures, all of which have asked that the pornography issue be tightened up and some action taken regarding it. This Bill goes part way towards fulfilling a motion moved at the meeting held at Cummins, to which I referred earlier and at which it was asked that the criteria be amended to enable the Classification of Publications Board to be more decisive in the application of the Act. I support the second reading, in the hope that such clearer criteria can be provided to enable the board to act on them.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I do not wish to speak at length on this Bill, as all that has needed to be said has been said. I have received many representations from my district over many years, particularly in the past five of six years, regarding literature that some people have considered to be pornographic; perhaps others may not have done so. Indeed, a string of people have made representations to me about such material getting into the hands of primary and secondary school children.

I cannot prove that such material has come directly from shops; nor have the people who have made representations to me tried to prove this. However, material, which is in many ways absolute filth, has been getting into the hands of such children. People have a right to see some control and some sort of standard being set by the Government. Possibly a higher standard in this respect should emanate from this place, even though some members represent people who may not hold such a point of view and even though it may not be the view of most people in the community, because such an assessment can never be made. However, there is a need for the standard to be set at some point.

The member for Coles made the point that we should be setting the standard here with the legislation that we pass and the sort of opportunities for control that we give to those who are in a position to make the final decision. That is what we are doing.

When previously legislation was introduced giving more leniency to society and to those making decisions, many people said that we were making the wrong move and that we would see the error of our ways. Those people were then considered to be reactionaries and conservatives, or as being old hat. It was said that they were not willing to accept change. It is strange that we are now going back a step in the direction that they wanted us to take then. We are now reacting to the legislation which was passed previously and which allowed more leniency in such matters. The Government is reacting to a practice that was allowed to become prevalent in our society. Although we are accepting change, we are taking a step back. Many people realised that we went too far previously: that society was given by the Government an opportunity to have more freedom but was not made to heed the responsibilities that should have gone hand in hand with such freedoms.

I am pleased that I was one who pointed out previously the problems involved in giving too much leniency in this type of area, that we are now going back a little, and that those who claimed that certain people were reactionaries or conservatives are now admitting, by the introduction of this Bill, that it is not wrong for one to be a little conservative in relation to the types of power that are given to people in areas where decisions must be made, in relation to the opportunities that must be given to protect people, particularly the young people, in our society, and in relation to the setting of some standard regarding the type of literature that should be available and the way in which it is made available.

I support the Bill, which I hope is amended in one or two areas, as suggested by the member for Coles (who I know will move in that direction) to make it better. I shall be surprised if her amendments are not supported and if the Government does not allow the amendments to be decided on a conscience vote. Surely, if anything is a matter of conscience, this is, as the member for Coles said, such a matter. It should not involve a Party-political decision. Indeed, it is an area of conscience as much as any other of the matters on which conscience votes have been permitted over the years. I hope that it is seen in that light,

and that the leaders of both Parties will regard this as a conscience vote matter so that members can, indeed, vote according to their consciences on the amendments and the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I support the changes that are being effected by the Bill. I trust that other changes which have been promoted and which will soon be promoted more forcefully by the member for Coles will also be considered by Government members. I recall presenting to the House, for the consideration of members, evidence of filth and material which could be referred to only as rotten and degrading and which was available in delicatessens. It could be found on the floor and on the counters adjacent to the icecream and sweets cabinets in such delicatessens. This was material permitted by the Government and, indeed, the Premier refused my plea that it was a matter requiring attention.

However, only 10 days later, by way of regulation, fairly quietly and without any drum beating, the Premier saw fit to introduce amendments that markedly reduced the accessibility of such filthy material, which was then available to children. Although this reduced the immediate access to this material by children and others in the State, it did not solve the continuing problem that has been highlighted by other members, certainly by the members for Coles and Mitcham, of material being taken up, left around, or dropped.

I suggest that the manner in which much of this material is disposed of, that is, in hedges, under trees, and in out-of-the-way places, indicates the concern of the person who has purchased it and who does not want to be seen disposing of it in the normal manner. Such a person does not want this material to be found in his garbage tin or on his person. Certainly, on the previous occasion to which I have referred, and subsequent to the airing of the matter in this House, many primary and high school principals in this State have forwarded to me material that they had found circulating in their schools.

It went further. I had contact from people who identified material which had been forwarded to them from other States, unsolicited by them, but following their inquiries for relatively harmless items such as cigarette holders, special cigarette lighters, and various other knick-knacks which attract the attention of people when advertised in weekly and monthly magazines and which require the forwarding of a postal order or an order to an address, generally in New South Wales or in Victoria.

Some of the material which came to these people unsolicited had to be seen to be believed. Much of it was passed on in due course to the police. The police officers did what they could, but consistently had to comment that regrettably, although the material was unsolicited, and although by every code of the book it was obnoxious and despicable, the matter was not necessarily capable of being followed through, because it had been sent from another State. Whilst the police authorities drew the attention of their colleagues in other States to the matter, it was not always possible, because of postal laws and other difficulties, to prevent a continuation of the material.

I see in the alterations, small though they may be, that we are considering this afternoon at least a step in the right direction. I believe, however, that the Bill does not go nearly far enough. I do not wish to suggest a complete prohibition, because I recognise how unworkable that can be. I do not want it seen or believed that I am totally against the concept expressed in this place by the Government and by the Premier at various times that the mature individual should have a right of decision on what he or she reads. However, I recognise the real danger in a

community of the passage of such material and its availability to other persons. I believe that is an area to which, if we do not do it now, we must give a great deal of attention and consideration. Certainly, I trust that the Government and members of the Government will be able to view on their merits the information and the amendments foreshadowed by the member for Coles.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I have delayed speaking in this debate until the last possible moment, because I have been extremely disappointed that members on the Government side have not had much to say about the Bill; indeed, they have had nothing to say except what was said when the Bill was introduced. I am disappointed about that. I should have thought that this was a subject of concern to everyone in the community, and that even a brief message of support such as has been given by most members on this side (certainly those who have been here) would have been called for.

Some matters, I believe, are above politics, and this is one of them. It is a matter which concerns everyone in the community; certainly, it concerns anyone who is a parent and anyone who has any degree of responsibility to the community. I repeat my disappointment at the lack of response and support shown by members opposite. I support the fundamental principle which has been set out many times, but I also believe very strongly that there is a responsibility on every person to make certain that, if he or she chooses to make use of pornographic material, other people are not offended and affected by it in any way. I refer especially to young people and the outlook of young people. The users of pornographic material must not in any way deprave or cause young people to become deviant or depraved. That is something which can occur.

Certainly, this has nothing to do with the exhibition of R films, but I sometimes wonder whether the newspapers in this town should not be classified because of some of the advertisements for R films appearing in them. Indeed, it is extremely difficult, when looking through the press, to find a satisfactory film to which one can take one's children.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in the Bill about films. The Bill relates to publications.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I am talking about the publication of advertisements in the press. My major concern is that pornography by and large involves the degradation of women. At a time when pornography was on the upsurge and when rape was on the increase (I think it was back in 1974) we looked at the legislation which subsequently became the principal Act. I asked the Attorney-General at the time (now His Honour Mr. Justice King) whether or not a study had been made of the relationship, if any, between rape and pornography. He told me then that such a study was in train. I think Mr. Claessen was investigating the matter. I asked for that report in this House only a few weeks ago. Unfortunately, although it is superficially an adequate report, it shows no sign of any investigation having been made of the possible effect of pornography on the incidence of rape. I should have thought it most important to consider whether or not such a connection existed.

I repeat that my major concern on these matters is the degradation of women. If we, as a Government, as members of Parliament, or as members of the community are concerned with women's rights, with women's emancipation, and with the dignity of women, we must be concerned about the issue of pornography.

I support the legislation. It does come some way back, but whether or not it goes far enough is another matter. I congratulate the member for Coles on the work she has

put into her consideration of this Bill. That work is the result of much discussion and assessment of community attitudes, and the amendments she has foreshadowed and the measures she proposes to take result from the distillation of much public opinion. I should be most upset, as I believe would be the community as a whole, if this House were not given an opportunity to discuss the wider implications of this Bill and ways in which it could be improved.

I sincerely trust that it is not the Government's intention to limit debate on ways in which the Bill could be improved in the best interests of the community. I shall be disappointed indeed if that is to be the case. I merely say that I support the legislation and the measures foreshadowed by the member for Coles.

I can only repeat that, to me, pornography involves degradation of women. For that reason, and because of my support for an intense interest in sex discrimination legislation and my belief in women's emancipation, I consider that we must take every possible action to make certain that discrimination against women in this way cannot occur.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I have listened with interest to the speech delivered by the member for Coles and, whilst I disagree with her quite strongly on several of the matters that she has raised, I nevertheless feel that she has made an extremely thoughtful and valuable contribution to the House and that she has initiated a debate of a standard that I would compliment her on and would want to see continued here. I think it has been a debate that has been centred seriously on the matters of policy in this area.

It was clear from her speech that, basically, she was opposed to the principles of this legislation, and I will deal with that matter at the outset. There are two ways in which we can deal with matters of publications and the community's ability to see and read those publications. The first is that we establish a standard of censorship, either through a board of censors or through establishing in the court a particular standard that it is an offence to exceed. That standard, then, is a standard beyond which one must not go in any publication, and that was the basis of the law until this legislation was introduced.

There have been propositions in the past in Australia that we should introduce a general censorship system, and, of course, in relation to imported publications there was such a system. Under it, a set of Commonwealth censors looked at material that could be classified for one reason or another, and amongst the reasons was obscenity. The censors could then prohibit the publications. The officers of various Governments in other States have made proposals from time to time. I can remember that Sir Eric Willis proposed to the Attorneys of Australia that we should have a uniform system of censorship that then applied, in effect, the Commonwealth system of censorship of imported publications to publications published within this country.

I certainly was not prepared to agree to that principle, and it was not then undertaken because South Australia was the State that stood out. We said then that we believed that the standard set by the law should be the one that we proceeded with, that there was to be an objective standard in the law, and that if any person exceeded it that person did so at his peril and could be prosecuted. However, we said that there was not to be a system by which some group put its stamp on a publication and said that something was all right or that it was all wrong and decided what the rest of the community (presumably, weaker individuals than those in the group) could or could not read.

It became clear that there were grave difficulties about continuing with the basis of a legal standard, because courts were unable, even given the legislation in this State under the Police Offences Act, to establish a standard that was sufficiently objective. It was extremely difficult to determine a particular standard that could say what was obscene and what was not. What is more, it became clear that many people in the community believed that it was quite proper to read and see things that would be classified by the law as obscene. Indeed, the trials of such books as *Lady Chatterley's Lover* or *Ulysses* made perfectly clear that what is now regarded as proper and permissible literature was, nevertheless, struck down by the legal test that was then used.

We had the extraordinary situation that a book, which today no-one would blink an eyelid at, *The Group*, was banned in Australia and in Victoria because it was alleged that the then Chief Secretary's non-existent 14-year-old daughter might have been offended by it had she read it. After much debate in Australia the view was put forward that we should allow people if they were adult to read and see what they wished—that that was not to be restricted. However, there was another principle on which we must insist, that material should not be freely available to minors without the consent of the parents involved and that material that would be offensive to some adults should not be forced on them against their will; that is, they should not be forced to see, read or hear what was offensive to them. Therefore, a system was established under which publications were controlled as to method of sale—the method of supply. That was the basis of this legislation.

True, the board could refuse classification in certain circumstances. The basis on which the board normally refuses classification is that what is depicted in the classification involves, in the making of the publication, what would be a crime in this community. If it were a crime to make it here, we should not condone that crime being committed elsewhere by allowing the publication to be sold in South Australia. Consequently, publications involving children in pornographic acts, since that would be a crime here under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, would not be classified by the board.

In the same way, some publications that are clearly publications of sadism would in themselves involve crime if they were made in South Australia, and they are not classified either. The remainder are classified on various bases on the view of the board as to community standards in order to endeavour to uphold those two other principles; that is, that matter should not be freely available to minors without the consent of the parents, and matter should not be forced upon unwilling adults if it is offensive to them.

Members opposite have suggested that we should go somehow or other in some undefined manner to a half-way house; that is, that we introduce a system of censorship that goes beyond the present refusal of classification, in relation to matters that would be crimes if the publications were made here, to some other standard. No member opposite has proposed how that standard is defined or set out, what it is you will prevent people from seeing, or on what basis you will prevent them from seeing it. Members opposite have said that some of these publications appear sick. So they do. That does not mean, however, that people cannot look at them and judge them, because members opposite have made their judgment. I do not believe it is proper for us to refuse to other adults in the community the right to make their judgment.

Mr. Russack: Perhaps the amendment will be an answer to this question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, it will not, because it does not go to that at all. I will deal with the amendment in a moment. The Bill as it is before the House contains several quite minor technical matters (in accordance with the principles of the Bill as I explained them) that have been the subject of these amendments.

The member for Coles explained the nature of these amendments quite adequately. They do not alter in any way the original principles of the legislation as I set them out. I believe these are sensible and machinery amendments in a Bill that maintains the general principle of the legislation as it has previously existed. The member for Fisher suggested that we were retreating from the principles of that legislation in some way that he did not define. That is not true. There is no alteration in the basic principle of the legislation as contained in this Bill. We are simply clearing up some administrative matters involved, and the reason for this I set out in my second reading explanation.

The Leader of the Opposition has suggested that somehow or other we should take a further step in the matter, because he considers that this material is somehow discriminating against women. I do not believe that that is correct. I think that he cannot have seen the range of material that is on sale at present. As the Minister involved, I do not see everything that comes before the board by a long way, but from time to time I see some of it, because some submissions are made to me by the Registrar of the board and my attention is drawn to some of this material. If it is suggested that this material relates only to women, I can only say that a strange selection has been seen by people involved. It involves men widely as well.

Mr. Rodda: I can give you a couple of titles involving men.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can imagine that the honourable member could, and I am sure that they could be found in any one of these places where the publications are sold.

Mr. Wilson: I am informed that they are the best sellers.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not have the honourable member's knowledge, but that could be so. From the material I have seen, I do not believe that there is anything in this matter that relates to discrimination against women. I do not think that that is right at all. I believe that, for the people concerned depicted in these publications, it is degrading, but it is degrading of both men and women and not women only.

In all these circumstances I make clear that the Government does not see a case for altering the basic principles of the legislation. It has not had put forward to it an alternative system which will cope with the difficulties to which the member for Mitcham referred and which I think I have outlined in my reply today. I do not believe that there is some satisfactory half-way house. Further arguments were raised by some Opposition members that, because of the existence of these publications, by being left in trash cans or elsewhere they get into the hands of children from time to time. Undoubtedly, some of that must take place but, if members think that this is something new in the community, I hasten to disabuse their minds.

Before this legislation was introduced, material which could have been prosecuted in the courts for obscenity and which had been forbidden by the Commonwealth Censor got into the hands of children from time to time because it was discarded. The member for Mitcham has referred to his children coming home with certain material. I can tell members that, in the old days before we had sensible licensing laws, my house at Norwood was the requisite

distance for drinking from the Norwood Town Hall. Consequently, it was a favourite parking spot, and the material my children could bring in off the street was remarkable. That is not new, and it will not change whatever we do in relation to this kind of principle.

Mr. Mathwin: You would admit that there is much more of this material about now than ever before.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I must say that that is not the evidence that has come to me, but perhaps the honourable member has lived in a more genteel district than mine. The member for Coles has forecast that she intends to move some suggested alterations to the Bill. I cannot canvass them at this stage, but I make clear that the Government has introduced a measure which is largely a machinery measure for clearing up some administrative matters under this Act, and they are not major matters concerning the principles of the Bill. The Government does not propose that its introduction of a Bill on that basis should be the subject of the means of opening up the whole legislation for debate and, consequently, if the honourable member wished to do what she outlined in her second reading speech, I can tell her that there are other means in private members' time for her to do so. That is the basis on which the Government will act in this matter.

Bill read a second time.

Mrs. ADAMSON (Coles): I move:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the Whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider new clauses relating to the composition of the board and related matters.

First, I thank the Premier for his compliments on my speech, and I add that, if the generosity of the Premier is matched by his wisdom, he will allow the amendments to be debated. It is important that my amendments should be debated because, despite the fact that the Premier claims that no-one has proposed a standard by which further tightening up of the Act can be obtained, in fact my amendments provide for a tightening up of the kind that I believe South Australians are looking for. The Premier said that the Government does not see a case for allowing this legislation to be opened up in Committee. My response is that, if the Government does not see a case for my amendments to be debated, it is stone blind.

It is absolutely essential that the principles which have been espoused on this side and which are supposed to be implicit in the Act are once again discussed in the light of present community attitudes. In support of that, I draw the attention of the Premier and the Government to the principle that has been espoused in this Act: that is, that adults are entitled to read and view what they wish and that members of the community are entitled to protection extending both to themselves and to those in their care from exposure to unsolicited material that they find offensive. The second part of that principle must be observed in South Australia but, at present, it is not being observed. I quote John Stuart Mill, whose writing Government members are on record as saying has influenced them. In the 19th century Mill said:

The only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilised community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others . . . The only part of the conduct of anyone for which he is amenable to society is that which concerns others . . .

It is, perhaps, hardly necessary to say that this doctrine is meant to apply only to human beings in the maturity of their faculties. We are not speaking of children, or of young persons below the age which the law may fix as that of manhood or womanhood. Those who are still in a state to require being taken care of by others . . .

It is essential that my amendments be debated so that

those of tender years may be taken care of by others in a way that the Government's Bill does not give effect to. It is essential that the House debate these amendments, because I believe that they provide the machinery that the Premier says we have not designed or proposed and, if he allows these amendments to be debated, he will find that the Act will be improved and the machinery will be available.

There are serious deficiencies in the Act. That has been acknowledged by the Premier, who refers to minor machinery matters. I do not describe them in those terms, and there are additional machinery matters that can be dealt with if the Committee is given the opportunity to debate the amendments. Constituents of Government and Opposition members are anxiously awaiting debate on the amendments I have put on notice. It is extraordinary that such an important matter to the people of South Australia is never reported on annually to Parliament and thereby to the people of South Australia as it should be.

I challenge the Premier to open the debate and allow members on both sides to exercise their right of voting in accordance with their conscience and obligations to their constituents by voting on the amendments that will bring pornography in South Australia under a much tighter form of control, which is long overdue and which South Australians are wanting and waiting for. I urge the House to support the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (17)—Mrs. Adamson (teller), Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (26)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, Klunder, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 9 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Bill taken through Committee without amendment.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mrs. ADAMSON (Coles): I deeply regret the Government's action in refusing to allow the amendments to be debated, and most South Australians would also regret the Government's action. I give notice that I will not let the matter rest here. There is an option available to me which I shall certainly take and, when I do, Government members will be obliged to exercise their responsibility to vote in accordance with what they believe. We will then see whether Government members want to see children in this State protected from pornography and its devastating effects on the community.

Bill read a third time and passed.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS

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

INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION JURISDICTION (TEMPORARY PROVISIONS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LAND AND BUSINESS AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

EIGHT MILE CREEK SETTLEMENT (DRAINAGE MAINTENANCE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from November 24. Page 1021.)

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): This Bill represents the culmination of, I think, almost two years of negotiation between Eight Mile Creek residents, the committee appointed by the Minister of Lands, and the Minister of Works and the Minister of Lands themselves. There is no doubt that the comments made by the Minister of Works in his second reading explanation were correct; he said that the various recommendations made by the committee were eagerly sought by the ratepayers themselves. They welcome the introduction of this Bill. The only area for concern was that at the time of introducing the Bill the Minister was not willing to do any more than give an undertaking to the Eight Mile Creek ratepayers that the Government would not at any time increase the proposed maximum rate to an extent that the difference between that maximum and the maximum specified in the South-Eastern Drainage Act would exceed the current differential of four-tenths of one cent.

I believe that during earlier negotiations the Minister and members of the committee of the South-Eastern Drainage Board had given a promise to the Eight Mile Creek residents that it would not be an undertaking but that that clause would, in fact, be written into the legislation. I believe that the Minister approved that clause being included with the proposed amendments, and the Parliamentary Counsel had earlier been instructed to put that into the legislation. So, I was somewhat surprised to see that left out. With that in mind, I contacted the Parliamentary Counsel and expressed my intention to move an amendment today, and I was pleasantly surprised to see that the Minister of Works had prepared an identical amendment; this precludes any argument at this stage. I appreciate the Minister's action in putting that clause into the legislation. It will give Eight Mile Creek residents intense pleasure to see it go through so easily.

The broader implications, apart from settling the rate, are that, whereas formerly there was the risk of rates escalating rapidly over the next two or three years from about \$200 payable annually to about \$1 000 payable annually, that has now been completely set aside, and property values have no doubt stabilised in the Eight Mile Creek area as a result of this Bill. As the Minister said in his second reading explanation, these people are dairy farmers, and there is no alternative land use, because of the difficult conditions experienced during winter, when the ground is waterlogged. The excessive water restricts the acreage useable during winter months. There is very little they can do, other than to use the land for dairy farming. Therefore, their profitability over the last two or three years has been extremely marginal. The Eight Mile Creek residents are very pleased that at last this Bill has been brought forward.

I considered one or two other issues; for example, some degree of retrospectivity for this Bill: I know that it is not usual for a Bill to be made retrospective, and there are many good reasons for not making Bills retrospective, but it seemed to me that there was a strong case for making this Bill retrospective for the last two years. However, it was pointed out that the Minister had already exercised his powers under the existing Act and, with the full approval of Cabinet, the preceding two years rates have been reduced. So a retrospectivity clause is entirely unnecessary. The question of whether to introduce voting rights for Eight Mile Creek settlers into the legislation was another question that I considered, but I am assured that the relevant place to introduce these voting rights is the South-Eastern Drainage Act, and that there is no risk of the settlers being excluded from voting rights, because they will automatically be given voting papers annually when the elections are called on.

I am extremely pleased to be able to support the Bill, which has been brought forward after considerable negotiations. I share the Minister's concern; he is at last prepared to see the Eight Mile Creek people well and truly looked after in connection with their rates. My own reasons for wishing to move an identical amendment to that of the Minister stemmed from a cynical approach. Being relatively new to politics, I was wondering what were the implications behind the Ministerial assurance that something would be done. I checked and found that a Ministerial assurance in connection with Burnside road closures (*Hansard*, page 2868, December 8, 1976) had, in fact, not been carried out, and the road closures took place. Indeed, the roads are still closed, in spite of the Ministerial assurance. I very much appreciate that the Minister, having made a promise, has kept it. The promise is incorporated where it ought to be: in the legislation.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I, too, support the Bill. The question of Eight Mile Creek drainage has been before this House previously. As the member for Mount Gambier said, the Minister used his powers to alleviate the high charges that the Eight Mile Creek people were worried about last year. Those people have waited for this Bill for a long time. It fixes the rate within the guidelines. The Minister said:

I have given an undertaking to the Eight Mile Creek ratepayers that the Government will not at any time increase the proposed maximum rate to an extent that the difference between that maximum and the maximum specified in the South-Eastern Drainage Act would exceed the current differential of four-tenths of one cent. This undertaking also arises out of a recommendation made by the committee.

I believe an amendment is on file to implement that. I have had experience of Ministers giving undertakings and assurances about other legislation and when administrations have decided to take some action the Minister's undertaking has got into the Bill but not into the Act. I was associated with a Minister's assurance in 1968 that was upheld in the course of another matter. Minister's undertakings do give a discretion to a tribunal or administration in an appeal. It is my Party's policy to abolish drainage rates, but I do not want to make a big issue of this. It is like roads and railways, which make a large contribution that all the South-East and the State share in, because of the productivity arising from their existence.

We are seeing our most precious commodity (the one we have least of) running into the sea. It is a fine line between when to let it go and when to stop it. Those of us in the wet areas yesterday were wondering whether 40 days and 40 nights of rain was starting. Water that cannot

be retained runs into the sea, but the Eight Mile Creek area is a swamp and if that water did not run into the sea the dairy industry as we know it could not continue to make the contribution it does to industry. This type of legislation limits the guidelines of the annual accounts or overhead of these people. In these days of high inflation and costs it is proper that they should know what they will have to pay, not just next year but in the years that follow. The Bill does that, and achieves what the spokesman and representatives of the Eight Mile Creek area have been negotiating for, and for a long time. I commend the Government for bringing this Bill down in its present form. I think it is proper that the ratepayers at Eight Mile Creek should have the right to vote on the South-Eastern Drainage Board, which is very much a part of the South-Eastern scene. The landholders elect two members to the board and we have been faithfully served by those board members over the years.

Drainage is not much different at Eight Mile Creek than it is at Reedy Creek, or other areas throughout the region. It is proper that they too, should have some say about who will sit on that board. This Bill is the climax to what landholders have been waiting for for a long time, and I thank the Minister for his part in having this Bill brought to fruition. I am sure that the amnesty he gave those people, and the relief from the large bills in the past two years, will be more than rewarded when this Bill comes into operation. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Declaration of rate, etc."

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

Page 2, after line 27—Insert the following subsection:

(6) The maximum rate prescribed by subsection (2) of this section shall not at any time be increased to such an extent that it exceeds the maximum rate prescribed at that time by the South-Eastern Drainage Act, 1931-1974, by more than four-tenths of one cent.

The purpose of this amendment is, as the member for Mount Gambier has canvassed, to implement the undertaking given by myself, as Minister, to the settlers. They were not satisfied with that, but I point out to the member for Mount Gambier, the member for Victoria and to the settlers that this can be changed just as easily as an undertaking, except of course it is subject to Parliament. It was, I suppose, the professionals rather than myself who said that it was not necessary, but I was not going to set out to try to convince the settlers in Eight Mile Creek that that was the case; I could not see that I should waste the time of the House trying to convince them if they were not to be convinced. Whether it be tidy draftsmanship or not, the amendment is inserted and the settlers have the assurance that it would have to be subject to a further amendment to the Act, which would have to come before Parliament before it could be changed.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (6 to 11) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 24. Page 1022.)

Dr. EASTICK (Light): First, let me say that this Bill will be supported. It breaks down into two areas. The first has been aired in this House recently by questions, when the

Minister was specifically asked for an increase in the period during which interim development control might continue to accommodate those councils that wanted to prepare their regulations to fit into necessary changes to the Planning and Development Act, which necessary changes are currently the subject of an inquiry by Mr. Hart. That is rather a simplistic comment on the situation; it is recognised that Mr. Hart's terms of reference are not necessarily wide enough for all the changes that are believed to be necessary to be made to the Planning and Development Act, but to come to grips with the matter it was necessary to have an inquiry. From questioning in this place, it has become apparent that Mr. Hart has made considerable progress. It is to be hoped that he will finish on time the task he was set, and I hope the Minister will indicate that the time schedule is being observed and that a report, on which we can base the further development of this State, will soon be available not only to the Government but also to members.

I appreciate that Mr. Hart, to gain the greatest benefit from those who have comments to make on various aspects of the Act, is doing a tour and visiting the councils and people who have put forward their thoughts on their home territory. This is appreciated by many councils. The discourse that has taken place has been mutually beneficial, and it has been possible for Mr. Hart to see on the spot some of the difficulties that beset various councils. From the exercise I believe only good can come.

The preparation of the necessary documents for the regulations under the Planning and Development Act is necessarily long. It is particular to the particular council area and, whilst there may well be, as there has been, a basic pattern for the development, it has still required much local knowledge to be put into the compilation of the final regulations so that at the time of their gazetting it is a practical document for the area it seeks to support.

It is a subject that has been costly to local government and one where the normal method of obtaining Loan funds for the purpose has not been covered in the past. I am not certain at this moment whether council's ability to raise funds has been extended to that area now, but in some instances a council has seen fit to put aside some money each year towards the eventual cost of the preparation of its regulations, and the necessary legal aspects of that exercise. Because of the cost, there has been a delay in many instances which has meant a need to extend the time, to increase the period during which the council can exercise the interim development control factors for eight years instead of five years. The provisions of clause 2 will be acceptable to all Parties; they have certainly been acceptable to those persons to whom I have made representations. When presenting the Bill to the House, the Minister said:

It is unlikely that all councils will be in a position to meet the present deadlines that arise from the expiration of interim development control in their respective areas.

He went on to say:

Moreover, there may well be changes substantially as a result of the inquiry.

I believe the Government has shown some wisdom in making certain that no council is stampeded into completing the task before it, prior to being able to assess the alterations resulting from the inquiry. The other point was made that it will not inhibit any council taking earlier action if it so desires. I cannot imagine that many councils will want to take the more rapid course available to them, but it is important to stress that a council will not be denied the opportunity to complete the exercise if it sees a particular need in its own area.

Turning now to the second part of the Bill, it is

interesting to note that in the original presentation of this legislation in 1967, there was no need, in the belief of those who compiled the Bill, to provide for plans of subdivision of land in prescribed localities in metropolitan areas. However, clause 19 of the 1972 amending measure introduced the concept of a new section 45a. We are now asked to accept the repeal of section 45a and the introduction of a new section 45a. It is apparent from reading the Bill that it is a much more concise method of consideration; it not only incorporates the position of a subdivision but, more particularly, picks up what one would have to claim was a defect in the previous legislation—the position of the resubdivision. At present, prior to the passage of this Bill, a certain course of action has had to be followed for any new subdivision but, although the factors that eventually decided the fate of a resubdivision were controlled by other parts of the Act, there was no requirement that plans submitted under the guise of or as a resubdivision had to undergo the same type of inquiry as that provided for subdivisions.

It brought about, as I am led to believe, some fairly anomalous situations in the community, some parcels of land adjacent to others having to follow one kind of inquiry, through the State Planning Authority and the Director, and other parcels, that happened to be resubdivisions, having to follow a different course of action. That being the case, many difficulties were experienced by people associated with those measures. Some could not understand why they were required to follow a lengthy course of decision before the Director whereas others did not have to follow that course.

This Bill clears up completely that situation. New section 45a certainly cuts out much of the gobbledegook that appeared in the original section 45a, with all its subsections, etc.

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

Dr. EASTICK: New section 45a removes much of the gobbledegook associated with the original provision, and rationalises the situation, requiring subdivisions and resubdivisions to be considered in the context of the development plan. There can be no argument there. It is also obvious that, as sections 26 and 27, dealing with appeals, apply to the total context of the Act, there is no need to include such provisions in new section 45a.

I should like to know why we are addressing ourselves to this measure at this time, because—

Mr. Tonkin: That's a good question.

Dr. EASTICK: I wonder whether it has been introduced as a means of rezoning as industrial land some of the area not suitable for housing because of the noise emanating from the flight path at Edinburgh Air Base. I completely agree that there should be a restriction on building in that case. Too often, people will build or move into an area, even though a problem exists, and then seek to remove that problem. We have seen it in relation to the Adelaide Airport, where the noise factor is complained of by many people who, having built houses in the area, then want the airport moved so that they can enjoy living in those houses. If the situation existing at North Salisbury is the reason why this measure has been introduced at this time, we should like to hear about it.

When I asked the Minister whether any interim action as regards planning and development would result from the discussions Mr. Hart had been having with certain people throughout the State and whether it would be taken now or not until such time as there was a complete redrafting of the Bill, I do not think I am incorrectly stating the Minister's answer, namely, that there would be

no interim reports and that it was hoped that the amended Bill would cover the whole situation. That day cannot come too soon for the people of South Australia. I appreciate the magnitude of the problem. We do not want to be rushing into amending the Act in such a way that it will create many new problems, but there needs to be a complete appreciation of planning and development in South Australia, and I should like to know the reason for the apparent "*ad hocery*" about this second part of the Bill.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: In relation to the second part, one or two councils have run out of interim development control.

Dr. EASTICK: There is no argument about the first part: it is the second part that the Opposition would like to know the reason for on this occasion. New section 45a provides:

Where a person makes application to the Director for the approval of a plan of subdivision or a plan of resubdivision and the Director is of the opinion that the plan of subdivision or plan of resubdivision, as the case may be, does not conform to the purposes, aims and objectives of the authorised development plan applicable to that land or the planning regulations (if any) relating to that plan, the Director shall refuse to approve of the plan of subdivision or the plan of resubdivision, as the case may be.

Opposition members have expressed the opinion many times that the mandatory "shall" is somewhat abhorrent. As it involves the Director of such an important department, "may" would appear to be a better word, allowing him to use discretion. If the plan of subdivision or resubdivision submitted were contrary to the plan for the area, no discretion would probably be permitted: it is a case of either black or white, with no grey area in between, and that may be the reason for including "shall" on this occasion. However, if it is possible to provide for a discretion, it should be provided in this case, as it involves such an important officer as the Director of Planning, and we suggest a change from "shall" to "may". I highlight that matter now, rather than in Committee, so that if the Minister can indicate that there is no particular reason for retaining "shall" we can consider moving such an amendment.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill and the remarks made by the member for Light. However, there are certain provisions in the Bill on which I should like the Minister to give further explanation. Clauses 1 and 2 are in order, the main provision in clause 2 extending the period from five years to eight years. As that provision would not involve hardship, it is a good one, and I support it.

The problem as I see it, until the Minister gives a further explanation, is clause 3, which repeals section 45a of the Act and inserts a new section 45a that will no doubt save much time. It will be based mainly on the old Metropolitan Development Plan of about 1962, which needs to be updated. There have been different thoughts about that plan as a result of what has happened since its inception. I refer, for instance, to the Morphettville bus depot, the construction of which would never have been permitted under the earlier Metropolitan Development Plan. However, the Government decided to sidestep that issue.

I should like to know the reasons for this matter, to which the member for Light referred. Section 45a contains five subsections, and subsection (5) thereof contains two paragraphs, all of which are to be repealed. Subsection (4) provides that there shall be a right of appeal to the board against a decision of the Director and the board may, before determining the appeal, review the matters contained in the authority's report. Therefore, the right of

appeal under section 45a is being removed by clause 3. I should like the Minister to explain this situation and say why he wants that right of appeal removed from the Act. I support what the member for Light has said regarding this matter. He referred to a number of possible reasons for this and I, too, ask the reasons for it.

When one considers the situation that is developing in this State, one may see the development of cluster housing here. In draft No. 3 of the *Residential Design Guide for South Australia*, the new book that has been issued by the department relating to cluster housing, a full explanation of cluster housing, how it should come about, and the criteria relating to it, are given. I understand from this booklet that cluster housing will override zoning. If a developer wanted to erect cluster housing in, say, Springfield, or in any other R1 area, the only criteria would be those in this code and, provided those criteria were adhered to, the zoning regulations would not apply.

I ask the Minister whether there is any connection between this small Bill, containing only three clauses, and a greater plan for cluster housing development in this State. I should be interested to hear the Minister's reply on that matter.

I support what the member for Light said regarding the words "the Director shall" in new section 45a instead of "the Director may" in relation to his refusing to approve a plan of subdivision or resubdivision. I ask the Minister to explain why "shall" and not "may" has been included. Other than the matters to which I have referred, and provided I receive some explanations from the Minister, I support the Bill.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister for Planning): Briefly, "shall" was used instead of "may" because it was considered that it was important to limit the extent of appeals. If the Director is given a discretion, an appeal can automatically arise as to why the Director has or has not exercised his discretion. That would open up considerably the range of argument. The view was accepted by the Government that in these circumstances, if someone came along with a proposal which was to be acceptable to the community but which was in conflict with the development plan or planning regulations, the development plan should be modified by a supplementary development plan or the planning regulations should be altered. Such alterations lead to a period for public objection, and everyone would have the right to have considered his views regarding whether or not a certain change should occur.

In relation to subdivisional proposals, it is worth noting that the Planning Appeal Board has taken the view, for example, in the hills face zone, that granting a right of subdivision does not necessarily involve granting the right to build. The implication from the board, in reversing in some cases the refusal to subdivide, has been that if the subdivided land is sold and the Director of Planning or the State Planning Authority subsequently refuses the right to build, that refusal would be upheld by the Planning Appeal Board.

It is partly that type of situation that creates confusion and difficulty, which we also wish to avoid. The greater the discretion that is put into any legislative provision, the more we open up the appeal provisions and end up with planning decisions being determined by lawyers rather than in the way the community wants the area to develop, anyway.

Dr. Eastick: As seen through the eyes of a politician.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The planning regulations, and the Metropolitan Development Plan, the normal procedure for a supplementary plan or a change in the regulations, involve a council's putting up a proposition.

In nearly all cases, the procedure at the Government level for getting Executive Council approval is fairly automatic. Certainly, checks are made to ensure that the provisions of the Act are being followed, because some regulations have been declared invalid on the ground that a council has not followed all the procedures laid down in the Act. So, a legal rigmarole has to be followed through by the Government.

If the preparation of plans and development plans is to mean anything, the Government must be in a position to refuse subdivisions and resubdivisions that are contrary to the expressed development plan. If objection is then taken, the community is free, through its council representatives or through the State Planning Authority, to put in an amended plan.

Mr. Evans: But it's not as simple as that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is not a simple matter, but it can be done and it is done. Who is to determine what the process of preparing the development plan means and whether we are all wasting our time? If someone prepares a development plan and neither the Director, the council, nor anyone can refuse a subdivision if it is contrary to the plan, what is the point?

Mr. Evans: I am not saying that. I am just saying that I realise it is difficult to get effective community opinion.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is true, but the basic provision of altering a development plan to a supplementary plan, or altering the planning regulations, is to allow a period for objections and to allow those objections to be considered. In our kind of community, probably that is the best we can do, because then the people who are likely to be adversely affected by any change can voice their point of view and have it effectively considered.

Dr. Eastick: It doesn't permit of a dictatorial decision.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No. The appeal right remains under section 27. Any developer who had a plan of subdivision refused because, in the opinion of the Director, it was contrary to the development plan or the planning regulations, would have a right of appeal against that decision. The right of appeal that applies generally in the Act under section 27 is not taken away by the amendments. The right of the developer is protected, and we consider that the rights of the community are protected.

Let us say that we have a development plan for Hahndorf which is directed at preserving historic buildings. We do not have that kind of effective development plan at present but, having provided that development plan, surely, if proposals are put forward which clearly are contrary to the development plan or the planning regulations, they should be refused and the developer should be protected by having the right to go on appeal to make sure that the refusal has been given correctly. We are never going to protect effectively historic towns such as Hahndorf, Burra, and other historic towns or historic areas of towns unless we have a planning law with effective teeth.

Serious problems have arisen because the conditions that can be considered by the Director of Planning in refusing a subdivision, for example, are different from those that can be considered by the Planning Appeal Board. In some cases the system almost encourages appeals; it is almost a lawyer's paradise. It is putting out extra legal fees because of the nature of the construction.

Dr. Eastick: Lawyers don't work like that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Where the system can be worked to an applicant's benefit, normally he will use a lawyer, and the lawyer will charge fees. I believe that the Planning And Development Act in some respects has assisted legal incomes very considerably. However, the

basic proposition is simply that, if the making of a development plan, a supplementary development plan, or the establishment of what are planning regulations (and that is a special term) is to mean anything, any subdivisions or resubdivisions that are put forward contrary to those plans or regulations should be refused. If that creates difficulties within the community and those are difficulties that should be overcome, then a supplementary development plan is the appropriate means of tackling the problem.

The flight path at Edinburgh is a problem and, if we had had effective development planning in the first place, and the proper designation of that flight path and also of areas, we would have avoided some of the difficulties we have now got into.

Dr. Eastick: It has no direct application.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It has no direct application to that situation, because applications that have come in prior to the passage of this amendment have to be determined under the old law and not under this law. I agree completely with the honourable member that, in view of the history of people building close to quarries or near airports and then complaining bitterly about the conditions they experience, it is vital that, to the extent that we can in further planning, we ensure that that sort of thing does not happen. That again is why it is important in planning to make sure that industrial zones and heavy industrial zones are effectively shielded from the residential areas. Having done all those things, if we are to have them as part of the plan, we must be able to enforce it.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Authorised development plans."

Dr. EASTICK: I thank the Minister for the information he gave in closing the second reading debate. To put the matter totally into perspective, I believe, from the answer given, that there is no single specific reason why this measure is being considered at present. I say that, having full regard to the period that amended development plans take to prepare and be submitted, and in the knowledge of the Minister's most recent statement that any application currently before the authorities will proceed on the basis of the prior legislation, not that which we will create.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister for Planning): Any application that occurs before the passage of this legislation is governed by the previous law. I would think that, if any general problem has convinced us of the necessity for this provision, it is the contemplation of development plans relating to country townships and the extent to which planning agencies, local government, and so on, want to confine an area of the township. If rural zoning, for example, establishes a township area and a rural living or a primary industry area, it would be silly, if a plan for subdivision came along, after that development plan had been supported by the local community, that proposed to subdivide an area that was described as rural, and no-one had any power to refuse the subdivision.

That would not matter if people generally did not accept that if they have a piece of land they have a right to build. Broadly speaking, in England no subdivision control exists; everyone accepts that if land is owned without the appropriate planning approval nothing can be done with it, so the title to a piece of land does not give the right to do anything. In our kind of situation, however, all sorts of people who buy an allotment of a normal size, say, 60 ft. by 120 ft., assume that they have a right to build a house, and difficulties arise within our community as a consequence.

People have allotments in the hills face zone and in the watershed areas where special regulations over-ride some previous rights. Members representing those areas would be aware of some of the difficulties. Under present law, outside the metropolitan planning area, or in that area in a part that is not prescribed, if an appeal goes to the Planning Appeal Board it has to consider the development plan but the Director does not and that seems to be an illogical situation.

Dr. EASTICK: The Minister seems to have said that this new measure will effectively offset ribbon development that has occurred around several country towns, especially those close together. Although that development was highly desirable at the time, it has now become obvious that it is a blight on aesthetics and a major problem for organisations that have to provide facilities for such development.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's correct.

Mr. MATHWIN: I again refer the Minister to the *Residential Design Guide for South Australia*, Draft 3. Part of the introduction to this guide states:

Residential development has so far been controlled by means of regulations. In particular planning, development and building regulations are relevant. These regulations have been designed to prevent unsatisfactory development which may have an adverse effect on the lives of the occupants, or their neighbours. Often it has been necessary to apply strict controls and strict enforcement to protect the interests of the community at large. However, stricter controls can be self-defeating and an effort should be made to encourage the best rather than discourage the worst.

It is for this reason that this design guide has been prepared. The guide is presented with a number of clearly stated objectives and is intended to assist developers with the preparation of new proposals for residential developments in such a way that desirable objectives are achieved whilst maintaining the economic viability of the whole. Similarly it is intended that the guide will assist development and planning authorities to evaluate those proposals. In this way the variety and flexibility of residential accommodation can be increased without necessarily incurring cost increases.

It would seem that future development through the Housing Trust and Land Commission will be for cluster housing. However, zoning regulations would not apply as cluster housing development would over-ride zoning regulations. Does the Government intend to introduce legislation in regard to this matter?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The points raised with respect to cluster housing and the *Residential Design Guide* have nothing to do with this legislation. Under strata title legislation, approval has to be obtained from the council and the Director of Planning before development can occur, and that is checked against the development plan. If we have legislation for cluster development, the same procedure would occur. At present any cluster development has to be done virtually under the strata title provisions in the Real Property Act, but we are now considering, and hope to introduce soon, special legislation to govern cluster-type development. The problem of strata title development is that the title cannot be obtained until the whole thing is completed, and that means that financial charges for development are significant. Cluster development will involve the possibility of staging a development so that the title can be obtained to part of it and that can be sold before the total development is completed. However, that sort of thing is a long way from the matter we are discussing.

Mr. EVANS: The Liberal Party supports the idea of cluster housing, and there should be legislation to cover it. Also, we should amend the strata title legislation to give

the opportunity for staging in order to take away the burden of capital investment being held up. I know that the Adelaide City Council has contacted the Minister in that regard.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It cannot be done effectively concerning vertical development but it could be done with the horizontal type.

Mr. Evans: Two storeys, on a surveyor's certificate?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is difficult. What would happen if the company doing the job went broke?

Mr. Evans: It would be the same in any case.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is sad for the people involved. If the bottom floors on the Round House had been completed and sold, the purchasers would feel hard done by if they received title, moved in before the completion of the whole building, and then discovered that the builder went broke and the building was not completed.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SAVINGS BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from November 16. Page 832.)

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the Leader of the Opposition to begin the debate on this Bill, I point out that the Bill deals only with the power of the Savings Bank of South Australia to accept commercial bodies as customers, and I do not intend to allow debate on any extraneous matter. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I must say that you have caught me by surprise, and I am wondering whether I should not seek leave to continue my remarks so that I could read the explanation again in order to see what it is that you are proposing I should not debate.

Mr. Keneally: I'm sure you're not reflecting.

Mr. TONKIN: No, I am grateful for your advice in this matter, Mr. Speaker. As with much other legislation that comes before this House, when taken on its face value it is extremely reasonable and difficult to oppose. For that reason, being an eminently reasonable man and representing an eminently reasonable Opposition, I do not intend to oppose the Bill. However, I think—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you—

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

Mr. TONKIN: It is necessary to discuss one or two matters covered by the Bill, which represents something of a breakthrough, inasmuch as it widens the powers of trustees. In other words, it removes the limitations on trustees and enables the bank to lend money to commercial bodies, by definition, as well as to individuals. In his second reading explanation, the Premier indicated that this has proved an embarrassment in the past inasmuch as customers, who are by reason of being natural persons, form partnerships or have gone into business, and have taken on the business name and have been significantly disadvantaged because they have no longer been able to open accounts with the Savings Bank of South Australia.

Similarly, the bank has not been able to keep these people as customers, and the bank, too, has been disadvantaged. I agree that that situation is undesirable

from both the point of view of the bank and of those people who wish to continue with it and who are now legislatively ineligible.

I have been in touch with several trading banks in this State and have obtained their strong opinion that the passage of this legislation will put the Savings Bank of South Australia on a similar footing to that of the average trading bank. I refer to the following comment made by one bank on this matter:

It virtually opens up to the business community the ability to conduct accounts with the Savings Bank and as far as can be seen to borrow money. To protect—
and they are quoting from the Bill—

or extend the business of the bank, or to provide a facility not readily available to that body from other sources, seems to mean an "open go".

I agree with that. Another bank stated:

The amendment seems to make it a trading bank. It would be in direct competition with the trading banks having a far wider scope of lending than any other savings bank.

That is the cardinal point: this Bill gives the bank powers much wider than those of any other savings bank. Such powers are more appropriate for a trading bank. That comment continues:

But it does make amalgamation easier.

Another comment states:

Virtually as far as can be seen it makes it effective as a trading bank as well as a savings bank.

Another bank stated:

We have lost one account not because they want to go but because they are dominated by nominees.

That refers to a situation involving a semi-government authority. The member for Hanson has on the Notice Paper several questions (I understand that some questions have already been answered) about the requirement that the Government is now putting on its departments and statutory authorities to bank with the State's banking facilities. It seems that this Bill goes a long way towards achieving what has been set down in the platform and policy of the Australian Labor Party, whose platform states:

TRADING-SAVINGS BANK OF S.A.

Expansion of the State banking system to provide for the amalgamation of the State Bank and the Savings Bank of S.A. and placed under the control of a governor to be developed along the following lines.

- (a) A State-wide trading bank handling the ordinary business of the community.
- (b) A savings bank performing the ordinary functions of such a bank.
- (c) A hire-purchase department, providing finance for the purchase of farm implements, industrial equipment, motor cars, and domestic appliances at reasonable rates of interest. Interest to be payable only on balance of loan outstanding at the end of each month.
- (d) A credit foncier system for the purpose of providing advances to home builders and primary producers.
- (e) All public instrumentalities to bank with the State banking system.

As with other legislation that comes into this House from time to time, on the surface and taken by itself, this Bill is eminently reasonable. However, we must bear in mind the policy and platform to which I have just referred as well as other matters that have been brought to the attention of this House in the past: I refer to the events of February, 1976, in relation to the disclosure by the Government of its consideration of the establishment of a State banking corporation to include the amalgamation of the State Bank

and the Savings Bank of South Australia, a State Government insurance office and a State finance company. One cannot help but reflect on the events of those times and think that the Bill does prepare the ground adequately for an amalgamation of the State Bank with the Savings Bank.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader is starting to stray from the Bill.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes. I will put it this way: this Bill prepares the ground adequately for the amalgamation of the Savings Bank with the State Bank, because it is the Savings Bank that this Bill refers to. Often one places together the pieces of a jigsaw and the last few pieces cause some conjecture because, although only a few pieces remain to be put in place to complete the jigsaw, the overall picture still does not make sense. Yet suddenly, with the placing into position of one or two last pieces, the picture takes on meaning and makes sense.

This Bill is one part of a jigsaw which through its passage (and it will pass), will fit into the overall picture of a State banking corporation. Perhaps in 12 months (perhaps sooner or a little later) it will be said, "After we passed the legislation in November, 1977, the Savings Bank of South Australia took on the character of a trading bank." Indeed, that is what this legislation does. It might be further stated, "As it has taken on the character of a trading bank, there is no real reason why it should continue to exist in isolation. It would be so much more practical for facilities, which are owned by the Savings Bank of South Australia now to be brought together and rationalised with other facilities available through the State Bank."

This Bill is a clear and blatant first step towards the amalgamation of the two banks; I do not believe that any one can deny that. On the surface it seems a reasonable proposal. Certainly, I do not intend to oppose it but I make a clear warning to the people of South Australia that the policy and platform of the Labor Party, which has been published year after year for several years on this matter, is about to be taken one step further. If that is what the people of South Australia want (and they voted for it at the last election) that is what they are going to get.

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

REGIONAL CULTURAL CENTRES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from November 24. Page 1020.)

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I have pleasure in supporting this Bill. As members will recall, section 13 of the principal Act gives regional cultural centre trusts the power to borrow money, but there is no provision in that Act for them to invest the money. In his second reading explanation of the original legislation and in subsequent speeches in Committee, the Premier announced that regional cultural centre trusts would be able to borrow up to \$800 000 a year and that it would therefore be possible for a trust to accumulate, say, \$1 600 000 in a short time. Obviously, it may not be possible for a trust to spend such a sum immediately after borrowing it, and this commonsense Bill provides that, if a trust has borrowed money, it should be able to invest it. Even if a trust invests only on the short-term money market, the money will accrue interest. I therefore support the Bill.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I, too, support the Bill. We need

to be conscious of the type of regional cultural centre that is built. Leaving aside the arts field, I wish to raise a point that worries me. At Whyalla and Port Lincoln the viewpoint has been put to me that, if a massive complex is built, the community has to support it through rates and taxes and, if the complex is not a viable proposition, it may turn out to be a burden on the community and not appreciated by the community, resulting in an "anti" feeling from the community. The viewpoint was put to me at Whyalla and Port Lincoln that, if half a cultural centre is a theatre for the performing arts, its capacity should be between 200 and 240 people—not more than perhaps 300 people. In other words, it should be about the size of the type of small theatre that is in London. In Whyalla and Port Lincoln, people interested in this field emphasised that regional cultural centres need not be massive complexes that place burdens on local communities and the State. This Bill gives regional cultural centre trusts the opportunity to raise money and invest money; that is good, but we need to be cautious as to how far we go and as to the type of complex we build.

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

LETTERS TO MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

Mr. TONKIN: It has come to my attention that several candidates for Federal Parliament and members of Federal Parliament in Perth and in South Australia have received letters which, on being opened, are found to contain a photograph of an elephant and, when that card is opened, a photograph of what appears to be Satan, with white powder enclosed, which has the effect of burning fingers and causing considerable discomfort and pain. I understand that this is not dangerous, but it causes quite severe burning of the fingers. In case such letters are sent to members of State Parliament or anyone else connected with the Federal election campaign on either side, I think some publicity should be given to the matter so that everyone can be on the lookout for such letters, which should be treated with extreme care and handed over immediately to the police.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I thank the Leader for raising this matter, and I agree with him that it is a subject that we should bring to the attention of anyone who might receive letters of this kind, so that the appropriate action, as the Leader has described it, can be taken.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I wish to raise two matters, and I hope the Minister in charge of the House will refer the first of these matters to the Minister of Health. I wish to raise the case of a person who was admitted to Flinders Medical Centre on Saturday evening, October 29. He was directed to the hospital by his local general practitioner, who believed that he had had a heart attack. He was taken to the hospital some time after 9.30 p.m. by ambulance. His name is Braidwood Dean Evans. Because he happens to

have the name "Evans" does not mean that he is closely related to me, although he is distantly. I believe his case needs assessing. He was quickly taken from the ambulance into what one could call the emergency section of the medical centre. He was placed in the hands of a male nurse who took the necessary first steps in testing his blood pressure, temperature and those areas that perhaps could be tested immediately to assess the situation. Half an hour later a young doctor came to examine him and said that he (the young doctor) needed another opinion.

Three hours later the second doctor arrived to give an opinion and said there was nothing wrong with him and at 3.10 a.m., Sunday, October 30, it was suggested he should go home. He was placed in a taxi, but not before he was told that he should wait for a letter to be written. Thinking the letter would take only a few moments he waited, but the letter took three quarters of an hour before it was produced by the second doctor for the patient to take back to his local G.P. He was then placed in a cab and sent home to Upper Sturt. He arrived home some time after 4.30 a.m. Sunday morning. He notified his own G.P. on the Sunday evening that he had the letter and that he had been sent home. His G.P. was irate and hostile about the treatment he had received. The patient was told that he should ring the medical centre on the Monday and ask for an appointment to have a further check.

He phoned on the Monday morning and was told that he would have to wait until November 19, nearly three weeks away, before he could have the further check. His G.P. was quite upset about that and referred him to a specialist on the Tuesday morning. The specialist carried out the necessary tests and said there was no doubt that he had suffered a heart attack and that he must go immediately from North Terrace, where he saw the specialist, to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. He asked if he could be directed to the Stirling Hospital, because of its convenience, and because he had problems in relation to his family, so he was allowed to go back to the Stirling Hospital.

I make this complaint hoping that the Minister of Health will take the matter up in another place. I intended to do so today by way of question, but we did not have sufficient Question Time for me to ask it. If it was only an isolated case I would not be so concerned, except to get a report from the Minister, but I am told that this happens quite often, that patients are taken in, looked at quickly, and then sent home at any any hour of the morning in a taxi. Their families are not expecting them and they arrive home. Imagine, 4.30 on a Sunday morning being sent out of a medical centre after a general practitioner had sent you there with a suspicion of a heart attack and the doctor at the hospital says, "Go home" at that hour of the morning.

One can see that it is quite ridiculous. The patient is quite upset about the matter. It could be a matter of life and death. There is no doubt that he could have had another attack while waiting for an appointment three weeks after the first attack. In fact, when the specialist saw him two days after he had been sent home he ordered him immediately into hospital, because that is how serious he thought the situation was. The patient was in hospital for nearly a fortnight. I hope that we can have this matter followed through so that the Flinders Medical Centre staff realise they are dealing with human beings and that sometimes it is better to be a little more cautious than to send a patient home under those conditions after such a minor investigation of the problem.

The other matter I raise is in relation to question 161 that was not answered today. I received the following reply from the Premier:

It is considered that the work required to obtain this

information is beyond what would be reasonable and it is therefore proposed not to supply an answer.

Dr. Eastick: That wasn't the only one.

Mr. EVANS: No. I thank the member for Light for that comment. I pick this particular question because I believe part of it could have been answered if the Government was genuine.

If we are trying to protect some people, I believe we should stop trying to do that. The first question I asked was:

What are the names of the Parliamentarians who have had the service of Ministerial cars during the past four fiscal years?

How difficult is it to answer a question about all the people who have had Parliamentary cars in the past four years? That part was not difficult, but it was not answered. The next question was:

How many kilometres has each member's car travelled for each of the past four fiscal years?

If that is not possible to answer, well, I will accept it; I think it is possible to be answered. The log-books will show it. If it is too much work for the Government, that one perhaps we can accept. My next question was:

What were the total wages paid to each of the drivers for each of the cars in the past four fiscal years?

If that sort of detail is not available on Government files, what are we doing in this Parliament, if we can't be answerable to the people? Look at Canberra, for one example. Every year we ask how much Ministerial cars cost, how much aeroplane flights cost for individual members, and the answers are given. We ask questions in this Parliament but what happens? It is the sort of question that should be asked every year; we should not be ashamed of it. The drivers would not be ashamed of it—they are working under award conditions. Some members use cars more than other members do because of pressure of work. The next question I asked was:

What percentage of the total wages paid to drivers in the Parliamentary car fleet for those four years was overtime?

Let us be honest; if we cannot say that, where do we stand as a Parliament? If we cannot be told as a Parliament representing the people how much overtime was paid to the drivers of Parliamentary cars, how honest are we? That information should not be held back. Then I asked:

Are members of Parliament who are not allocated cars entitled to a car when representing, at any function, a member who has been allocated a car?

Mr. Speaker, you and I know that often on the Government side, if a member on the back bench is representing a Minister who has been allocated a car, that back-bencher receives a car to go to an official function to represent the Minister. Why cannot that question be answered? When Mr. Hall was Premier, I attended functions in a car when I represented Mr. Hall at those functions. I remember a function at the Ozone Theatre one wet night and I asked for a car and was given a car. If it is not the case, it is not the case. If it is the case, make it available to every person who happens to be allocated a car so that he can pass it on to somebody representing him. It is nothing to be ashamed of. If it is the rule we are working under, let us admit it. The next question I asked was:

Has consideration been given to having a pool of cars available for Ministerial and Parliamentary use in lieu of individual allocation and, if so, what was the result of these considerations?

That could have been answered but it was not. The last question was:

Has consideration been given to using taxis after 5.30 p.m. for those members allocated individual cars in lieu of

employing drivers at penalty rates for a minimum of three hours whenever called out after normal working hours?

Why could not that be answered? We all know that some nights it is costing, in this place, \$40 or thereabouts to pick members up to come back from tea and take them home again after Parliament rises, when taxis would cost \$8 or \$10, at the maximum. What is wrong with saying, "We are trying to cut down on some costs"? At least the drivers will be able to stay at home with their families—

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

Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier): I wish to speak on a favourite sport currently being practised by the Fraser Government—union bashing. Union bashing comes in many forms. We have the one which is perhaps the most used by Fraser at the moment—"Who is running the country?" We had the case during the Victorian power dispute of Fraser and Hamer trying desperately hard to prolong the dispute in an attempt to gain maximum political mileage. We all know what happened when the electors of Victoria had an opportunity to judge those tactics in the Greensborough by-election. It was a complete rejection by the constituents of the electorate of the Fraser and Hamer Governments and a vindication of the power workers in their struggle for better conditions and wages. It was all very good stuff.

I turn now to another form of union-bashing which is more subtle and which surprises me because, in most cases, the Fraser Government cannot be subtle, but must go in boots and all. It is a more subtle form of union-bashing than the one to which I have just referred. It uses the powers of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act amendments which were rushed through the Federal Parliament in 1976 and which were passed purely and simply to harass and threaten responsible trade unions. The trade union with which I am mainly concerned is the Amalgamated Metal Workers and Shipwrights Union. The harassment of that union involved the recent election of its State Secretary. The Fraser Government is forcing union members to vote on the position of State Secretary, even though its members had not complained over the past six months, when the original ballot took place, of the conduct of the ballot when it took place. I quote from a report in today's *News* under the heading "Fraser hits out on unions". Apart from the usual rubbish that Mr. Fraser is reported to have said about the Australian Labor Party in the first part of the report, we got a report on Mr. Fraser putting forward Liberal Party policy on trade unions. The report states:

We have shown ourselves a Government prepared to take a firm and fair stand—

note the words "fair stand"—

to protect the public. We have passed laws protecting individual unionists and given responsible rank-and-file unionists the chance to make their voices heard. Secret postal ballots for union elections are now compulsory. We are also protecting individuals against being forced to join unions against their will. Mr. Fraser said the Government's policy had the support of "responsible unionists".

I take this opportunity this evening in the time remaining for me to point out that the responsible members of the metal workers union are not saying that Mr. Fraser is on their side. They are completely against the harassment by Mr. Fraser.

Mr. Whitten: And Tony Street.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Mr. Fraser has acted against the union. He went on to say:

It protected the rights of individual unionists and the general public.

All typical Fraser stuff! I will now give the history of the harassment of the A.M.W.S.U., from September, 1976, until the present day. In September, 1976, the ballot for State Secretary was commenced in South Australia, completely legal under the provisions of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act but, prior to the commencement of the ballot, the Fraser Government rushed through measures that changed the Act 17 days before the ballot was to commence. The point is that, in rushing through these amendments to the Act, no time was given for any individual union in Australia to change its rules to comply with the Act. The A.M.W.S.U. went ahead with its ballot, which was a well-run one, and about which there were no complaints. Although on March 31, 1977, the Minister (Tony Street) contacted the union and said that complaints had been received about the conduct of the ballot, the union had received no complaints from any member.

The only complaint received was that from the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Mr. Street, who, I assure members, is not a member of the Amalgamated Metal Workers and Shipwrights Union. I am a member of that union and I know that, if there had been one complaint, or if anything had been wrong with the ballot, the returning officer would have conducted an inquiry.

We had arbitration inspectors calling in at the union offices, threatening union officials and demanding to see their books and records. I make the point that members opposite agree with that kind of invasion of privacy but, when the privacy of their own people is invaded, members opposite are up in arms. If a worker's privacy is invaded, they are never up in arms and shouting all the time. The only difference between those arbitration inspectors going into the offices of the A.M.W.S.U. in March this year and the type of tactics used in Nazi Germany in the 1930's is that the arbitration inspectors did not wear jack-boots or call at 4 a.m.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The members for Glenelg, Price and Eyre are all out or order.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Representatives of the trade unions went to Mr. Fraser and made the point that the ballot was conducted under the union's rules, which were registered under the Act. The amendments to the Act did not give them time to change the method of the ballot. In the six months that have passed, there have been no complaints from any union member, although Mr. Street has complained. When introducing the legislation on May 17, 1977, Mr. Street gave an undertaking to the Australian Council of Trade Unions that the Industrial Relations Bureau would have the same powers as the arbitration inspectorate, no more and no less, and that those powers would be used according to the same processes as they have been used until now. I am sure that this House will agree that Mr. Street used his arbitration inspectors in an area completely removed from that in which arbitration inspectors have been used in the past. That is the whole point.

Finally, I refer to the statements made by both candidates involved in the first ballot. Both Mr. J. L. Scott and Mr. M. J. Applebee condemned the Fraser Government's interference in the union's internal affairs. Mr. Applebee made it clear that he did not wish to be a candidate in the re-election.

Mr. Whitten: But he is forced to now.

Mr. HEMMINGS: That is so. We now have a situation in which the union to which I have referred is being forced to conduct an election again, which is costing it money. The only reason why the A.M.W.S.U. is complying with the terms of the Fraser Government's insistence that it

conduct another election is that, if the union fights this matter in the High Court (and I am sure that if it did so it would win), it will take money, which can be better spent to get better conditions for trade unionists and to fight for better working conditions for metal workers in South Australia.

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

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): Having listened this evening to the spokesman for Mr. John Halfpenny, I remind the House of one or two matters in which, I am sure, the people of this State will be interested. We have in South Australia one senior Australian Labor Party member of the Federal Parliament, a gentleman by the name of Mr. Clyde Cameron.

Mr. Whitten: A fine gentleman.

Mr. GUNN: I am pleased that the member for Price said that, as it will reinforce what he has said about Mr. Whitlam. The *Advertiser* of February 25, 1977, contains an article headed, "Labor leadership fight revived", as follows:

A letter from a former Minister has sparked off a new leadership row in the Labor Party. Written by Mr. Clyde Cameron, the letter says there is no room in the Labor Party "for a leader who is weighed down by an insane obsession with pride and power". Copies of the letter addressed to the Caucus secretary (Dr. Jenkins, MHR) were circulating among Labor MPs yesterday. Caucus members regarded it as the beginning of a campaign to unseat Mr. Whitlam as leader.

The article continues:

Mr. Cameron makes specific references to "secret meetings of the Executive Council", the dismissal of Ministers, economic decisions made without Cabinet consultation, and "extravagant junkets overseas" . . .

In such circumstances, he suggests, a Labor Prime Minister should be compelled to advise all Executive Council members of the nature of the business to be considered and invite them to attend the meeting.

That is a nice criticism of the man who aspires to be Prime Minister, the man Mr. Cameron so damningly condemned for his actions. I commend this article to members opposite. If they read it, I am sure they will sleep better.

Some other information has been provided to me, and I am sure members would be pleased to hear some of the quotations. The first is by Sir Jack Egerton, who was quoted in the *Australian* on July 28, 1976, as saying that he could never trust Whitlam again, nor could Australia. Jim Cairns was quoted as having said that the first thing the Party had to do was to get rid of Mr. Whitlam as its Leader. In the *Age* of December 22, 1975, Mr. Cameron said the electorate had made it clear that it would not support the Labor Party led by Mr. Whitlam. Let us see what another distinguished member of the Labor Party had to say. Mr. Beasley, from Western Australia, made the following comment:

E.G.W. simply stands for Edward Gough Whitlam: it does not stand for "eminently greater wisdom".

Frank Crean said:

The Leader is the captain of the team, but he is not the chairman of selectors.

Mr. Keneally: It is interesting that our people can say what they believe about—

Mr. GUNN: I have more quotations for the honourable member for Stuart. He should not get excited, although I know he is embarrassed by what I am saying. Let us hear some more quotations in relation to the other notable Leader, the man who has been Acting Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hawke. This is a most interesting

document.

Mr. Whitten: Those are blank pages. You're making it up, Graham.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GUNN: I am not making it up.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre has the floor.

Mr. GUNN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the manner in which you have been protecting me, but I am not particularly perturbed about members opposite. I would have been most disappointed if I had not been able to refer to these quotations. Referring to Mr. Hawke, Senator Wriedt said in the *Sydney Sun* on February 13, 1976, that he was sick of what Mr. Hawke said and that most members of the Parliamentary Labor Party felt the same way. Senator Wriedt also said on the same date that Mr. Hawke should stop trying to act like a politician and get on with union business.

That is the gentleman who has been going around asking Liberal members of Parliament whether they would let him know when a seat came up. That is the gentleman who has been acting Leader of the Opposition. Senator Wriedt has been telling him that he is not wanted in the Labor Party, and there seems to be an interesting conflict there. I should like to compare policies offered by the Labor Party to people in country areas of this State with the responsible policies put forward by Mr. Fraser and Mr. Anthony. We should get things in their proper perspective. The policies being offered by the Federal Government to people in country areas would never have been possible were it not for the economic management of the Fraser Government, which has created a situation in which it can offer to people living in country areas the concessions which they deserve and which were taken away from them by the Labor Party and Mr. Whitlam who had such a hatred of people living in country areas.

Mr. Whitten: What about the repeater station on Eyre Peninsula?

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member should read the press statement. Television stations are to be established in the northern parts of this State, by 1978-79 in the Streaky Bay area, and by 1980 there will be one at Oodnadatta. The member for Price should be the last person to talk about facilities in country areas, because he belongs to a Party, and was Secretary of the Labor Party in 1972 when Mr. Whitlam came to power, and then that Party carried out a vendetta of hatred against country people. That Party increased petrol prices and increased telephone charges. However, policies to be put into effect by the next Fraser Government will assist country people, and will provide jobs in country areas, particularly for those people living in the north of Australia. The Labor Party will leave uranium in the ground, because that is its policy, but we will get it out, creating jobs, assisting people living in the country, and providing energy for overseas countries.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. I cannot hear what the honourable member is saying, although he is speaking loudly.

Mr. GUNN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry that you have not heard what I have said, but I am sure you will read it tomorrow. In the *Stock and Station Journal* last week Senator Wriedt has claimed credit for introducing the income equalisation deposit scheme. He must have been reading *Alice in Wonderland*. The I.A.C. report was in the hands of the Whitlam Government, which did not act on it. It was the Fraser Government that acted on it. If in 1973 the Whitlam Government had acted on it, people

now suffering from severe drought conditions would be in a much better financial position. Senator Wriedt refers to a guaranteed price for wool, but we recall Mr. Whitlam's action when he torpedoed the wool market. When he told Japanese and overseas buyers that we would reduce the floor price for wool, he completely destroyed the wool market. The other enlightened policies of Mr. Fraser and Mr. Anthony will bring back a system of fuel equalisation

which will assist my constituents in Coober Pedy whose price for fuel has increased by 12c a gallon.

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

Motion carried.

At 9 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, November 30, at 2 p.m.