

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, February 28, 1978

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

DEATH OF THE HON. F. J. POTTER

The **Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer)**: By leave and without notice, I move:

That this House expresses its regret at the recent death of the Hon. F. J. Potter, former President of the Legislative Council, and places on record its appreciation of his long and meritorious service; and as a mark of respect to the memory of the former member, the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

The Hon. Frank Potter gave long service to the Parliament and to the people of South Australia. He was admitted to the bar in 1948, elected to the Legislative Council in 1959, and has been a member of the Council since 1959. Apart from his work in the Council, he was President of the National Marriage Guidance Council of Australia and President of the Marriage Guidance Council of South Australia over a long period. He did much work and gave much help to many people in difficulty in South Australia, and he was elected President of the Legislative Council, in which position he gave distinguished service to the people of this State.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): By leave, I support the motion. Frank Potter was a man whom one was proud to know. He gave loyal and valuable service in this Parliament as a member of the Upper House, latterly as its President. His legal and academic training served him well both in his professional life and in his most significant community work, as the Premier has said, in the field of marriage guidance. He was both the State and a Federal President of the Marriage Guidance Council.

He was first elected on March 7, 1959, as the member representing the Central No. 2 District. He served on the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation from June, 1963, and was Chairman of that committee from 1968 to 1970. He was Secretary of the Upper House Liberal Party, and was elected President of the Upper House on August 5, 1975.

Frank Potter was an indefatigable member of the Liberal Party, always active in electorate and branch affairs, and enjoyed enormous respect from all sections of the Party. He was equally indefatigable as a member of this Parliament and in his service to his electorate. He discharged his duties as President of the Council with diligence, concern and dignity in spite of the most difficult circumstances at times. It is tragic that he should have succumbed so soon after what seemed to be a most satisfactory recovery from his earlier heart attack.

Frank Potter's love of music was well known; he often officiated at the piano at social functions, including functions in this House. It must be a great comfort to his wife and children to know that his last day with them was spent as a family day in an atmosphere of great contentment.

Frank had expressed a wish that a State funeral should not be held for him, and I understand his funeral will be private. However, I am sure that the thoughts and sympathy of all South Australians whose lives have been touched in any way by the life of Frank Potter will be with his wife Nan and the family during the weeks to come.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support what has been said by the Premier and particularly the Leader of the Opposition. Frank Potter and I were colleagues for a long time as members of Parliament and even before that in the old Liberal and Country League. Indeed, we fought the same preselection on one occasion before I became member for Mitcham, and it was not long before he himself became a member of the Legislative Council, as the Leader of the Opposition has said. Even before that we had been together in the profession for some years. He practised and continued to practise after he became a member of Parliament. On one occasion I think he even gave me a brief. I have therefore known him and his family for a long time, and I was shocked and saddened, amidst all the flurry of the last few days, to learn of his sudden death.

I said we had been colleagues in the same Party for a long time, and so we were. He lived in the District of Mitcham and was an active member of the Party in that district for 10 years or more after I became the member. He was, when it was still part of the L.C.L., an active member of the Liberal Movement for a time, and we valued him in that organisation. Despite the fact that latterly we had not been in the same Party, I think I can say (and it is perhaps one of the few members of my former Party about whom I can say it) I never had an angry word with Frank Potter. Despite what happened to us politically—that our paths should have diverged—we retained our personal friendship and, indeed, affection for each other. I certainly offer my sympathy to Nan, his wife (I have already sent her a message), and to his family at their sudden bereavement, especially as it came so unexpectedly and at such an early age.

The SPEAKER: I am sure all members on both sides of the House were shocked to hear of the death of the President of the Legislative Council, the Hon. Frank Jacques Potter. He was a quiet and unobtrusive member in all the years that I knew him. Having served on committees and also having been on Parliamentary trips with him during his service of 20 years to Parliament, I always found him to be a gentleman. I, like the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition, express my condolences to his family and relatives.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 2.10 to 2.29 p.m.]

QUESTIONS

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

HANG GLIDING

In reply to **Mr. SLATER** (February 9).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department is aware of the safety problems involved with hang gliding. An investigation of the safety measures applied by the South Australian Hang Gliding Association was carried out in February, 1977. This investigation was followed up by an inspection of the popular flying sites in South Australia by representatives of the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department and the Transport Department. The results of the investigation

indicated that, in South Australia, hang gliding appears to be well organised and conducted by a responsible group. There is no doubt that a danger element is involved, but the South Australian Hang Gliding Association is aware of it and has taken many precautions, including: presence of safety officers at flight sites during popular flying times; pre-flight check-ups of kites; rating of fliers; training of novices; accident reporting system; and strict application of air regulation rules.

It is appropriate at this time for the sport to continue to be self-regulating. It is pointed out that hang gliders are subject to the Australian Transport Department Air Navigation Orders, section 95.8, as they are defined as non-power-driven aircraft.

COUNCIL RATES

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. What rating method has been adopted by each of the local government authorities in South Australia?
2. Has there been any report of rating anomalies since the provision in the Act to permit commercial rating and, if so, what are the details?
3. As a result of representations made to the Government, is it intended to amend the Act to alleviate any such anomalies?

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

1. List attached.
2. Complaints have been received from electors in four council areas where differential rates have been declared. The complaints have generally related to the land use assigned to the property where the council is using land use as its criteria for rating.
3. The Local Government Act Amendment Bill to be introduced into the House in this session does not contain amendments to the rating provisions.

THE SCHEDULE

Name of City:	Method of Assessment
Adelaide.....	Annual Value
Brighton.....	Annual Value
Burnside.....	Annual Value
Campbelltown.....	Annual Value
Elizabeth.....	Annual Value
Enfield.....	Annual Value
Glenelg.....	Annual Value
Henley and Grange.....	Annual Value
Kensington and Norwood ..	Annual Value
*Marion.....	Land Value
*Mitcham.....	Annual Value
Mount Gambier.....	Land Value
Noarlunga.....	Annual Value
Payneham.....	Annual Value
*Port Adelaide.....	Annual Value
*Port Augusta.....	Land Value
*Port Lincoln.....	Land Value
*Port Pirie.....	Land Value
Prospect.....	Annual Value
Salisbury.....	Annual Value
*Tea Tree Gully.....	Land Value
Unley.....	Annual Value
West Torrens.....	Land Value
Woodville.....	Annual Value
Whyalla.....	Land Value
Name of Municipal Corporation (Town):	
Gawler.....	Land Value
Hindmarsh.....	Land Value
Jamestown.....	Annual Value
Moonta.....	Land Value
Naracoorte.....	Annual Value

Name of Municipal Corporation (Town):	Method of Assessment
Peterborough.....	Annual Value
Renmark.....	Land Value
St. Peters.....	Annual Value
Thebarton.....	Annual Value
Walkerville.....	Annual Value
Walleroo.....	Annual Value
Name of District Council:	
Angaston.....	Annual Value
*Balaklava.....	Annual Value
*Barmera.....	Land Value
Barossa.....	Annual Value
*Beachport.....	Land Value
*Berri.....	Annual Value
*Blyth.....	Annual Value
Brown's Well.....	Land Value
Burra Burra.....	Land Value
*Bute.....	Annual Value
*Carrieton.....	Land Value
Central Yorke Peninsula ..	Annual Value
Clare.....	Annual Value
Clinton.....	Annual Value
*Cleve.....	Land Value
Coonalpyn Downs.....	Annual Value
*Crystal Brook.....	Annual Value
Dudley.....	Annual Value
East Murray.....	Land Value
*East Torrens.....	Annual Value
Elliston.....	Annual Value
*Eudunda.....	Annual Value
*Franklin Harbor.....	Land Value
Georgetown.....	Annual Value
*Gladstone.....	Annual Value
*Gumeracha.....	Annual Value and Land Value
*Hallett.....	Annual Value
Hawker.....	Annual Value
*Jamestown.....	Land Value
*Kadina.....	Annual Value
*Kanyaka-Quorn.....	Land Value
*Kapunda.....	Land Value
Karoonda.....	Annual Value
Kimba.....	Land Value
*Kingscote.....	Land Value
*Lacepede.....	Annual Value
*Lameroo.....	Annual Value
*Laura.....	Land Value
*Le Hunte.....	Annual Value and Land Value
*Light.....	Annual Value
Lucindale.....	Annual Value
*Loxton.....	Land Value
Mallala.....	Annual Value
*Mannum.....	Annual Value
Meadows.....	Annual Value
*Meningie.....	Annual Value
*Millicent.....	Annual Value
*Minlaton.....	Annual Value and Land Value
*Morgan.....	Annual Value
*Mount Barker.....	Annual Value
Mount Gambier.....	Annual Value
*Mount Pleasant.....	Land Value
*Munno Para.....	Annual Value
*Murray Bridge.....	Annual Value
*Murat Bay.....	Land Value
Naracoorte.....	Annual Value
*Onkaparinga.....	Annual Value
*Orroroo.....	Land Value

Name of District Council:	Method of Assessment
*Owen	Annual Value
Paringa	Annual Value
Peake	Annual Value
*Penola	Annual Value
Peterborough	Land Value
*Pinnaroo	Annual Value
Pirie	Annual Value
*Port Broughton	Annual Value
Port Elliot and Goolwa	Annual Value
*Port Germein	Land Value
*Port MacDonnell	Annual Value
*Port Wakefield	Annual Value
*Redhill	Land Value and Annual Value
Ridley	Annual Value
*Riverton	Annual Value
*Robe	Annual Value
Robertstown	Annual Value
Saddleworth and Auburn	Annual Value
*Snowtown	Annual Value
*Spalding	Annual Value
Stirling	Annual Value
*Strathalbyn	Annual Value
Tanunda	Annual Value
*Tatiara	Annual Value
Truro	Annual Value
*Tumby Bay	Annual Value
*Victor Harbor	Land Value
*Waikerie	Annual Value
Warooka	Annual Value
*Willunga	Annual Value
*Wilmington	Land Value
Yankalilla	Annual Value
Yorke town	Annual Value

* Indicates use of Differential Rating.

MONARTO DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. How many people are currently employed by the Monarto Development Commission?
2. Is it anticipated that there will be further reductions of staff over the next six months and, if so, what scope is there for alternate employment?
3. At what figure will the Monarto Development Commission staff be stabilised to provide for future developmental projects on the site and for continuing maintenance of existing projects associated with the Monarto growth centre?
4. Are there any plans for major development at Monarto over the next five years and if so, what are they?

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

1. There are 29 persons presently employed by the Monarto Development Commission.
2. A number of the commission's employees are applying for positions in Government service. It is not intended to replace any of those employees who successfully obtain positions.
3. This is under consideration.
4. No. However, the situation is being kept under constant review. The availability of the site and the planning work completed offer an opportunity for a quick start to be made on any urban or industrial development which may prove to be desirable.

HUNTING

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): In each of the last three years:

- (a) how many hunting permits have been issued; and

(b) has any estimate been made of the number of huntsmen in South Australia and if so, what is it and, if not, why not?

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

(a) February 1, 1975, to January 31, 1976—21 726. February 1, 1976, to January 31, 1977—18 931. February 1, 1977, to January 31, 1978—22 169.

(b) No. The relationship between the number of registered firearms and the number of actively participating hunters is not known.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): In each of the last five years, what has been the increase in—

- (a) the staff of the National Parks and Wildlife Service of the Environment Department;
- (b) the number of parks and reserves administered by the division; and
- (c) the total area of land under the control of the division?

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

(a) 1972-1973	6
1973-1974	3
1974-1975	41
1975-1976	4
1976-1977	1
(b) 1972-1973	6
1973-1974	9
1974-1975	2
1975-1976	9
1976-1977	8
(c) 1972-1973	4 392 ha.
1973-1974	10 153 ha.
1974-1975	694 ha.
1975-1976	38 924 ha.
1976-1977	281 100 ha.

ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Have any new positions been created in the Environment Department since Mr. Dempsey was appointed as Director and, if so—

- (a) what are they;
- (b) why have they been created;
- (c) have any of them, and which, yet been filled and by whom; and
- (d) what is the estimated annual cost of these new positions?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

- (a) Senior Scientific Officer
Ranger Grade I
Assistant Ranger
Technical Officers (2)
Director, Co-ordination and Policy
Ranger Grade I (3)
Ranger Grade II
Project Officers (9)
Office Assistant
Senior Policy Officer
Ranger Grade I
Clerk (CO-3)
Office Assistant
Senior Co-ordination Officer
Scientific Officer Grade II
Clerk (CO-1)
Assistant Project Officers (3)
Office Assistants (2)
Clerk (CO-1)

- (b) To enable the department to effectively carry out the Government's policies of the environment.
- (c) No.
- (d) \$400 000 approximately.

- (j) 5
- (k) 140
- (l) 9 131
- (m) 4 063
- (n) 6 307
- (o) This is the Kingscote ranger residence.
- (p) 8
- (q) 91
- (r) 373
- (s) 8 648
- (t) 2 665
- (u) 272
- (v) 1 416

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. What is the length of service of each of the senior officers in the National Parks and Wildlife Service who have resigned over the last two years?
2. What is the salary attached to each new position in this service created over the last six months?

2. Not readily available, but it is estimated that the number of visitors is increasing by approximately 16 per cent a year.

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

1. No senior officers in the National Parks and Wildlife Service have resigned over the last two years.

2. Position	Salary
	\$
Ranger Grade II (2)	10 107
Ranger Grade I (3)	9 584

3.

	Professional	Administrative	Ancillary
(a)	Nil	3	26
(b)	"	1	1
(c)	"	Nil	2
(d)	"	2	Nil
(e)	"	10	56
(f)	"	2	7
(g)	"	1	1
(h)	"	1	1
(i)	"	3	2
(j)	"	Nil	2
(k)	"	"	Nil
(l)	"	1	1
(m)	"	2	Nil
		at Loxton	
(n)	"	1	5
(o)	"	1	5
(p)	"	Nil	1
(q)	"	"	1
(r)	"	1	4
(s)	"	2	Nil
(t)	"	1	"
(u)	"	2	8
(v)	"	2	6

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. What is the area in hectares of each of the following:
 - (a) Belair Recreation Park;
 - (b) Bool Lagoon Game Reserve;
 - (c) Brownhill Creek Recreation Park;
 - (d) Canunda National Park;
 - (e) Central Region Adelaide;
 - (f) Cleland Conservation Park;
 - (g) Coorong National Park;
 - (h) Flinders Chase National Park;
 - (i) Flinders Ranges National Park;
 - (j) Fort Glanville Conservation Park;
 - (k) Horsnell Gully Conservation Park;
 - (l) Innes National Park;
 - (m) Katarapko Game Reserve;
 - (n) Kelly Hill Conservation Park;
 - (o) Kingscote-Brownlow Beach Estate;
 - (p) Kingston Park Recreation Park;
 - (q) Loftia Recreation Park;
 - (r) Morialta Conservation Park;
 - (s) Mount Remarkable National Park;
 - (t) Murray's Lagoon Conservation Park;
 - (u) Naracoorte Caves Conservation Park; and
 - (v) Para Wirra Recreation Park?

4. (a) \$11 154
- (b) \$10 047
- (c) \$11 154
- (d) Vacant \$10 107
- (e) \$14 534
- (f) \$10 584
- (g) \$10 584
- (h) \$10 584
- (i) \$10 584
- (j) \$10 645
- (k) Nil
- (l) \$10 107
- (m) \$10 342
- (n) \$9 584
- (o) —
- (p) \$11 154
- (q) \$11 154
- (r) \$10 645
- (s) \$10 342
- (t) \$9 584
- (u) \$10 107
- (v) \$10 594

2. How many people have visited each of the above on an annual basis over the past three years?
3. How many professional, administrative, and ancillary staff, respectively, are employed at each of the above?
4. What is the salary of the senior officer in each case?
5. What are the responsibilities of the senior officer in each case?
6. What was the annual budget for 1976-77 in each case?

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

1. (a) 835
- (b) 2 690
- (c) 52
- (d) 9 086
- (e) 6 506
- (f) 789
- (g) 37 001
- (h) 59 003
- (i) 78 426

5. Administration and management of a park or parks in a district, fauna management, supervision of staff and visitor service.

6. The annual budget is not currently identified to specific parks. Direct costs are segregated to parks and regions while service costs, e.g. planning, administration, fire protection, etc., are costed by function.

ENVIRONMENT DIRECTOR

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. How many applications for the position of Director of Environment were received following the removal of Dr. Inglis from that position?
2. How many applicants were from South Australia and how many from interstate?
3. What positions has Mr. Dempsey held in either Federal or State Governments during the last 10 years and in what years were these positions held?
4. What practical park management experience has Mr. Dempsey had and where was this experience obtained?

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

1. 20.
2. 11 applicants were from South Australia and 6 from interstate.
3. 1972-1974, Adviser to the Minister for Urban and Regional Development; 1974-1975, Senior Adviser to the Minister for Urban and Regional Development; 1975-1977, Executive Assistant to the Premier of South Australia.
4. None.

HORWOOD BAGSHAW

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Has the Minister now investigated the substance of my question in the House of Assembly on November 23, 1977, concerning Horwood Bagshaw Limited and, if so, will the Minister now answer my question?
2. Has such a professional consultant or consultants been carrying out such work?
3. Why has the Minister taken so long to answer my question?

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

1. Yes. No consultants were engaged by the Government or undertook work for the Government of the nature described and during the period referred to.
2. See 1.
3. The matter needed to be investigated thoroughly.

NEAPTR

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Will the Minister make a statement on how, if at all, the Government intends to open up the process of making decisions concerning the North-East Area Public Transport Review, to ensure full public participation and, if so, when and will the statement be made in the House and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Extensive public participation has already taken place as an essential component of the North-East Area Public Transport Review and the responses to the study team's alternative proposals will be taken into account in any decisions on the improvement to the existing system, such as the provision of a new radial tramway or busway. In accordance with Government policy, an environmental impact statement will be required for any major proposal at which time there will be an opportunity for further public involvement in the decision.

HOUSING

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. Has Graham Charles Bethune been appointed under contract as adviser to the Director-General of the

Department of Housing and Urban Affairs and, if so:

- (a) what are his qualifications;
 - (b) what previous positions has he held;
 - (c) what is the period of the contract;
 - (d) what are the financial conditions of the contract; and
 - (e) what areas of activity does his advice to the Director-General encompass?
2. Was the position advertised and, if so:
 - (a) how many applications were received from persons within the South Australian Public Service;
 - (b) how many applications were received from outside the South Australian Public Service, but from residents of South Australia; and
 - (c) how many were received from persons living outside the State of South Australia?

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

1. Mr. Bethune is under contract to the Government to:
 - (1) Assess the roles of the various sectors of the housing industry in an attempt to bring together programmes being pursued by the various sectors of the building industry, the finance bodies, and the public authorities and relate these to the planning policies and distribution of existing and new housing stock.
 - (2) To assess the relevance and accuracy of available statistics to the housing industry and set up the best possible monitoring system.
 - (3) Assist the Director-General of the Department of Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs with the preparation of submissions on housing matters.
 - (4) Represent the Director-General of Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs on housing issues where required.
 - (5) Provide advice and undertake work on other issues related to the activity of the department.
 - (a) Bachelor of Economics (First Class Honours).
 - (b) 1971-73: Research Officer, Senior Research Officer, Econometric Applications Section, Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra.
1973-74: Project Officer, Resource Allocation Division, Department of Urban and Regional Development, Canberra.
1974-77: Ph.D. Student, Australian National University, thesis topic Urban Home Ownership in Australia: some aspects of housing demand and policy.
 - (c) Two years.
 - (d) Salary at A0-1 level (\$16 780) plus sick and recreation leave the same as an officer of the Public Service.
 - (e) See 1.
2. No.

CLELAND NATIONAL PARK

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Have trees acquired for planting in the Cleland National Park been allowed to die before planting for lack of watering and, if so:

- (a) how many trees;
- (b) what was their value; and
- (c) how was it that they were allowed to die?

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

- (a) Approximately 300.
- (b) Approximately \$120.
- (c) Insufficient watering during the hot weather over the Christmas to New Year period.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Has an investigation into industrial unrest during the past month or so at Cleland National Park, been carried out and, if so:

- (a) why;
- (b) by whom;
- (c) has a report yet been made and what are its contents; and
- (d) what action, if any, has been taken as a result?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is a car park being built near the main entrance to the Cleland National Park and, if so:

- (a) how much money has been spent on it to date;
- (b) how has it been spent;
- (c) how many men have been engaged on the project and for how long; and
- (d) have three unsuccessful attempts already been made to build it, what were those attempts, and why did they fail?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. The existing car park and picnic area near the fauna compound of the Cleland Conservation Park is being reconstructed.

- (a) Approximately \$27 000 to February 17, 1978.
- (b) Labour costs \$22 000; materials and equipment \$5 000.
- (c) Between four and 24 men, depending on the stage of the work. Site survey commenced early in September, 1977, and construction commenced early December, 1977.
- (d) No.

MESSAGE PARLOURS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Are any of the massage parlours now operating in Adelaide brothels and, if so, what action, if any, does the Government propose to take with regard to them?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The Police Department believes that many massage parlours in Adelaide are operating as brothels. Since July 1, 1977, police have arrested or reported 49 persons for offences relating to keeping a brothel or prostitution in massage parlours. A total of 66 charges has been laid against these persons for the following offences:

Receive money paid in a brothel in respect of prostitution	47
Keep or manage brothel	19
	66

The Government intends to maintain continuing policing activity to detect the type of offences specified above.

GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

- 1. Does the Government still own the land on which stands the burnt-out shell of the Murray Hill Building?
- 2. Does the Government agree that this structure is unsightly and if so, what action, if any, does it propose to take to remove it and when?

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

- 1. Yes.

- 2. Yes. There are no current proposals to demolish the building. Plans for the future development of the site are still under consideration.

FIREARM REGISTRATIONS

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

- 1. How many firearms other than hand guns have been registered in South Australia over the last five years?
- 2. What is the total number of firearms other than hand guns registered in South Australia at the present time?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Without extensive and exhaustive counting of record cards, it is not possible to provide precise figures in respect to either question.

- 1. There have been approximately 115 000 firearms other than hand guns registered in South Australia over the last five years (1/1/73 to 31/12/77).
- 2. The total number of firearms other than hand guns registered in South Australia is approximately 300 000. (Recorded in the Firearms Section.)

TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

- 1. What now is the reason for the delay in establishing pedestrian-activated traffic lights at the junction of Marion Road and Galway Avenue, Netley?
- 2. When will the lights be installed?

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

- 1. The heavy work programme of the contractor installing the traffic signals has led to a slight delay over the previously advised installation date of late March, 1978.
- 2. Early April, 1978.

DENTAL TREATMENT

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

- 1. In which country areas is a "limited service" in dental treatment being provided for age pensioners?
- 2. If Murray Bridge is not included in one of these country areas will the Minister take the necessary steps to have school dental services provide dental treatment for age pensioners in Murray Bridge and if not, why not?

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

- 1. Renmark, Kingscote, Port Augusta and Port Lincoln.
- 2. It would not be possible for the Regional Dental Officer, Murray Bridge, to undertake pensioner dental work as he is fully committed on the School Dental Programme.

BIRRALEE REPATRIATION HOSPITAL

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

- 1. Are any Government departments and/or statutory authorities still interested in purchasing the Birralee Repatriation Hospital at Belair and, if so, which departments or authorities are still interested?
- 2. When will a decision be made as to whether or not these departments or authorities will purchase the property?
- 3. Will the local residents or local State member of Parliament be consulted before a final decision is made and, if not, why not?

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

1. Yes, the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board.
2. A decision will be made when a valuation has been finalised and a price negotiated.
3. No. Local government will be consulted in accordance with normal procedure.

PUBLIC SERVICE

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. What is the anticipated growth rate for the Public Service in the financial year 1977-78?
2. How many public servants retired in 1977?
3. How many public servants were replaced in 1977?
4. How many new positions have been created in the Public Service since July, 1977?
5. How many people have joined the Public Service since July, 1977?
6. What is the projected growth rate of the Public Service for the next two years?

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

1. About 3.5 per cent.
2. 150.
3. 1 015.
4. 558. This figure takes into account planned expansion, new offices created to absorb temporary assistance now required on a permanent basis, those created to absorb other Government employees (for example, weekly paid) into the Public Service, and redundant positions abolished or due to be abolished.
5. 1 980 from July 1, 1977, to February 24, 1978.
6. The projected growth rate of the Public Service for the next two years has not been determined. The making of this decision is part of the annual budget procedure.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice):

1. What treatment was undertaken at Government House to arrest salt damp?
2. Was this treatment successful and, if not, what other measures are contemplated to treat salt damp at Government House?

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

1. The dry cell treatment.
2. The treatment was partially successful. No other specific measures are currently under consideration.

MITCHELL PARK LAND

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Were two blocks of vacant land at Mitchell Park, owned by the Government, sold at auction on November 22, 1977, and, if so; (a) at what price each; and (b) when had these blocks been purchased, for what purpose and at what price?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows: The Lands Department, which is responsible for the auctioning or disposal of Government properties, has no record or information of any land at Mitchell Park being offered at auction on November 22, 1977.

MARIHUANA

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is the Government aware that books entitled *How to Grow Marihuana Hydroponically*, *Marihuana Potency* and

Marihuana Growers Guide are available for sale in at least one bookshop in Adelaide?

2. What action, if any, does the Government propose to take with regard to the sale of such books?

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

1. No.
2. Copies of the publications will be obtained if possible and will be referred to the Classification of Publications Board.

RESERVOIRS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has the Committee of Inquiry into the Recreational Use of Reservoirs yet reported to the Government and if so—

- (a) when;
- (b) what are the contents of the report; and
- (c) what is the answer to each term of reference?

2. If the committee has not reported, when is it expected that the committee will report and why has the report not yet been made?

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

1. No.
2. The committee of inquiry has been asked to report by June 30, 1978.

LAND SALES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Of the land bought by the Housing Trust from the Land Commission, as set out by the Minister in his answer of February 14 to my Question on Notice, how much, if any, had previously been bought by the Land Commission from the Housing Trust and at what price for each parcel of land?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The 270 allotments bought at Craigmore from the South Australian Land Commission form part of a large subdivision comprising land formerly owned by the South Australian Housing Trust and an extensive area bought by the Land Commission from other owners. That part sold by the trust to the Land Commission amounted to 133.05 hectares and the sale price was \$937 000.

EDUCATION SERVICES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What action, if any, does the Government propose to take with regard to the proposals of the South Australian Institute of Teachers presented to the Minister on Tuesday, February 21, aimed at improving the standard of education services in South Australia?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: This matter is currently under consideration.

BOTTLE DEPOSITS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Has the Government reconsidered a deposit on beer and wine bottles and, if so, what were the findings?
2. If there has been no review of Government policy, will the Minister request a review in consultation with KESAB?

3. Will the Government consider encouraging the banning of beer and wine bottles from metropolitan swimming beaches and, if not, why not?

4. Will the Government finance a special programme discouraging bottles on metropolitan beaches?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member should refer to the reply of the Minister for the Environment to a question on bottle deposits in *Hansard* of February 22, 1978.

RESERVOIRS

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. What are the names and occupations of the members conducting the inquiry into the use of our reservoirs for recreational purposes?

2. Is there a member representing the interests of recreational fishermen?

3. What are the terms of reference of the committee of inquiry?

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

1. Dr. J. Melville, retired; Mr. C. W. Bonython, conservationist; Mrs. W. Ey, Lecturer in Physical Education; Mr. J. R. Sheridan, retired; and Dr. P. S. Woodruff, retired.

2. No.

3. (1) To consider present policy and practice relating to public access to and recreational use of public water supply reservoirs and reservoir reserves in South Australia.

(2) To consider appropriate interstate and overseas policies and practices.

(3) To examine and report on—

(a) the need and demand for recreational use of reservoirs and reservoir reserves in South Australia;

(b) the types of public recreation which might be permitted within reservoir reserves;

(c) the impact of recreational use of reservoir reserves and reservoirs on water quality and the land and water environments with particular reference to people and native flora and fauna;

(d) the controls, manpower resources, facilities, costs, and legislative and other requirements for managing possible recreational activities within reservoir reserves.

(4) To make recommendations regarding future policy with respect to public access to and recreational use of public water supply reservoirs and reservoir reserves in South Australia.

LOTTERY FEES

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. What was the total revenue received in the year 1976-77 from—

(a) small lottery licence fees; and

(b) all other lottery licence fees?

2. How many lotteries failed to be completed to such a degree that the licence was cancelled and it was necessary to return moneys to ticket holders?

3. Is it intended to increase the charge for lotteries?

4. How many prosecutions were there in the year 1976-77 for illegal lotteries?

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

1. (a) \$648 338.

(b) Not applicable, as small lotteries cover all other lottery licence fees.

2. Two during 1976-77, bringing the total to five since the inception of the lottery regulations on April 1, 1971.

3. It is not intended to increase the charge for lotteries;

however, proposals are currently being considered to merge the minor and annual lottery licences to provide greater flexibility to associations conducting lotteries for a 12-month period.

4. Nil.

PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT REPORT

Mr. EVANS (on notice): Is the inquiry into control of private development in South Australia complete and:

(a) if so, when will the report be made public; and

(b) if not, when is it expected to be completed?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows: No.

(a) not applicable.

(b) A report in draft form is nearing completion. It is hoped that the final report will be available for consideration by the Minister in June of this year. Consideration will then be given to publishing the report.

ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

Mr. TONKIN: Can the Minister for the Environment say whether a petition critical of the present management and administration of the Environment Department has been circulated or promoted within the department by Mr. Bruce Muirden, the Minister's Press Secretary; what action the Minister has taken to improve the seething discontent in the department, of which this is obvious evidence; and whether Mr. Muirden will be transferred or sacked as a result of his actions? The appointment of Mr. Dempsey, who came from the office of the previous Federal Labor Minister for Urban and Regional Development to the Premier's Office and from there to the position of Director of Environment, has caused extreme dissatisfaction within the department. So extreme has this dissatisfaction become that Mr. Muirden, the only Press Secretary in the department since its formation in 1970, has been reported as having circulated a petition protesting at Mr. Dempsey's style of management. This is generally seen in the community as remarkable and convincing evidence of the crisis now confronting the Environment Department, and Mr. Muirden's future is now subject to questions which should be resolved. More importantly, the community wishes to know what action the Minister intends taking to resolve the present untenable situation in his department.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As usual, the Leader of the Opposition made a number of statements that he cannot support. He talks of an untenable situation within the department, and of the seething discontent within the department about the appointment of the permanent head. He cannot substantiate either of those statements; I challenge him to do so. It is not good enough for the Leader of the Opposition to make a general, sweeping statement of that nature. I learnt last Thursday (and, indeed, I was shocked to learn) that my Press Secretary, Mr. Bruce Muirden, who was a Ministerial appointment, I might add, and who does not belong to the Environment Department had, in fact, drawn up and circulated a petition about the permanent head of the department, Mr. Dempsey. I was shocked because I considered that an act of gross disloyalty to me, an act that I was not prepared to tolerate, or let pass lightly. I know that Mr. Muirden did this because I asked him the direct question and he confirmed that he did it.

Mr. Mathwin: He was a political appointment, too?

Mr. Goldsworthy: Will you do with him what you did with Mr. Salisbury?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is probably what the Deputy Leader would have done with him, but that is not quite the case. I am not aware of the contents of the petition itself, except that I believe it was to do with the style of management of the permanent head, who, I might add, was appointed on December 15 and, with Christmas intervening, I should think has had hardly a chance to show to the department a style of management.

Mr. Chapman: It shows they don't like him, obviously.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member is obviously delighted about that and will do anything he can to inflame the situation.

The SPEAKER: Order! Recently the honourable member for Alexandra spoke in the House about Question Time. He is now interjecting, and this reduces the opportunity for honourable members to ask questions.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: What is more, I do not believe that Mr. Muirden is adequately equipped, in any way, to judge the special qualifications of a permanent head, and I have said that publicly. Mr. Muirden admitted to me that he had done this. Whether it was entirely of his own volition or, in fact, in concert with other people, I am not aware. Members opposite are always labelling the Government with witch hunting, but I did not propose to launch any witch hunt on this matter. I was satisfied with the answer given to me by Mr. Muirden that he had in fact drawn up the document and caused it to be circulated. It is interesting to note that the petition was, in fact, destroyed by members of the staff, of their own choice, shortly after it was circulated.

Mr. Mathwin: They should have made it—

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Glenelg to order. That is the fourth time he has interjected during Question Time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I told Mr. Muirden that, in the light of this event, he could no longer work for me and, indeed, he could not expect to do so. That does not mean to say that he will not continue to be employed in the service of the Government.

Mr. Millhouse: Well, that's a strange business, isn't it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: There are many strange things as far as the member for Mitcham is concerned and I suppose this is the next thing he will investigate. Mr. Muirden's future employment is currently under consideration.

Mr. Millhouse: Aren't you strong enough to sack him?

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Mitcham to order.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not need to be told what to do by the member for Mitcham. Indeed, recent events have demonstrated to me that I would not want to be advised by him, and I would not want to talk to him.

Mr. Millhouse: Answer my question, anyway.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not have to answer the question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: No, you can't.

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

Mr. Goldsworthy: Sackings aren't popular.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member has little compassion or feeling. This man has served the Government well for seven years, and I do not see why I should fly into a tantrum because of one lapse, and do what the honourable member suggests, or what the

member for Mitcham in his Christian charity would suggest. I say frankly that I believe he should be given an opportunity. I have feeling and compassion for this man and so does the Government and, by God, the Government will never suffer for that in spite of what the Deputy Leader says, and in spite of the attitude of, I was going to say, the obnoxious member for Mitcham, but perhaps that is a little hard.

In relation to the Environment Department, any time in any department when there is likely to be any change of direction or course people get concerned about their future. I have tried several times to allay the fears of people in this department as to their future, and I have explained to them that this department will not only increase in influence but will also increase in size, and that I hope it will go in better directions than it has gone in the past. That is my sincere desire, and I am working towards it with one of the most competent people at present in the Government service—the Director of the Environment Department, Mr. Rob Dempsey. As the Premier explained in the House last week in reply to a question, he has (as the Leader of the Opposition has said) admirable qualities and qualifications to do this job. The Leader said that, and if he believes that he did not say it he should check back to December 16, the day after the appointment was announced, when he said that Mr. Dempsey had admirable qualifications, but then added that it was a job for the boys and the gravy-train bit to which he refers now and again.

Any time there is a change of direction or course, people feel threatened, but Opposition members are trying to exploit the situation at present to the detriment of people in the department and the department itself. That in itself is a disgraceful act. The member for Mitcham can smile, but he could smile about many things. I am confident of the future of this department and of the people working in it. There is some discontent, but I guess that, if we look at any Government department, that would apply. Probably in any department there are people saying that there is not sufficient money to do all they want to do, and they would have less, too, if we listened to the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues. I say clearly and categorically that I have every confidence in the permanent head of this department and in the job he will do, and I am certain that within the next six to 12 months the department will be convinced of that fact, if people will give him that time and a fair go, and that the department as a whole will be better because of his appointment.

UNIVERSITY ENTRY

Mr. KLUNDER: Will the Minister of Education inquire into the possibility of university faculties publishing the adjusted examination marks that were required for entry into those faculties by matriculating students? At present, if a student selects faculties whose entry requirements are higher than his examination agglomerate, he misses out. The problem is that entry requirements are not known to the student, who may therefore, purely by accident, pick a number of faculties for which his total does not qualify him, whilst missing out on a number of others for which his total would qualify him. This problem is further complicated by the fact that it is possible, for instance, to study economics through the arts faculty or through the economics faculty. However, if one happens to pick the faculty with the higher entrance requirement, one may not get to study economics at all.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will take up the matter with the Chairman of the Public Examinations Board and bring back a report to the House.

ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

Mr. WOTTON: Can the Minister for the Environment say whether, in view of the crisis situation that is now all too obvious in the Environment Department, he will review the appointment of Mr. Dempsey as its Director and institute an inquiry into what effect this appointment and the transfer of other senior officers has had on the morale and management of the department? Since the appointment of Mr. Dempsey over the heads of well-qualified South Australian public servants, and despite the Minister's blusterings in the House this afternoon, more discontent has erupted in the department than ever before in its history. I am informed that the situation has now reached crisis proportions with the Minister having completely gagged and intimidated staff members of his department. Because of the Government's avowed support for industrial democracy in Government departments, will the Minister now consider the clearly expressed views of staff members?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No.

YETTO PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. DRURY: Can the Minister of Education say when the Yetto primary school at Morphett Vale will be built and whether its design will incorporate facilities for handicapped people? Some time ago a constituent, who has a pre-school-age daughter who is a paraplegic, approached me about this matter. As she lives close to what I believe is to be the proposed Yetto primary school site, I promised her that I would ascertain details of its intended construction.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: For the information of those who are not familiar with the area, Yetto was a siding on the old Willunga line when it operated. For some years, the Education Department has had two sites in the area: one the Yetto primary school site, which is immediately north of Doctors Road, Morphett Vale; and the other, Yetto East, is to the east of States Road and abuts the southern boundary of a housing subdivision, which local people call Thrusgrove Estate because that was the name originally given to the area by the developer. As a result of our study of population trends and schools recently built, it is now believed that the Yetto East site should be developed before the Yetto site. On present indications, the chances are that Yetto East primary school, if that is the name that will eventually adhere to it, will be open for the 1982 school year. However, that prediction is subject to revision, depending on the development of population in the area.

Originally, when the Yetto primary school had been talked about, it was thought that it would be developed rather earlier, but, in view of the construction of schools such as those at Morphett Vale West and Morphett Vale South and the additional facilities that have been provided at Morphett Vale East Primary School and Hackham East Primary School, that may not be necessary.

The honourable member also raises the matter of facilities for physically handicapped children at the school. He may be aware that the Reynella East Primary School, which is to be built soon in the honourable member's area, will incorporate facilities for handicapped children although, obviously, in view of the time table just announced, there has been no detailed planning for the Yetto East School. I have no doubt that the Facilities Branch of the department could, at the later school, take advantage of having had the opportunity to see how well the facilities have worked at the Reynella East School.

HOUSING TRUST APPOINTMENT

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister for Planning say why he ignored all submissions put forward by women's groups in replacing Mrs. W. A. Sarkissian on the board of the South Australian Housing Trust? Submissions were put to the Minister regarding the replacement, dozens of women were consulted, and nine nominations to fill the vacancy were put forward. The Minister proceeded to appoint Mrs. P. I. Brown, his former research assistant, to the board. Mrs. Sarkissian has described the Minister's action as arrogant and insensitive. In view of the great deal of effort which women's groups had obviously put into their submissions, the appointment of a former member of the Minister's own staff seems strange and could be interpreted as further evidence of the Government's putting its friends into Government positions in South Australia.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Any submissions that were received were given due consideration. Since the appointment of Mrs. Brown, I have had letters from those who made submissions suggesting that Mrs. Brown was a suitable appointment; indeed, one letter that I received suggested that the appointment was more suitable than the submissions that had been made. It is also a fact that the submissions were organised by Mrs. Sarkissian, and I am not aware of any principle of Government or anything else that allows an ex-member of a board to claim a right to determine her successor, as Mrs. Sarkissian attempted to do on this occasion. That kind of action is not acceptable, because she had an opportunity to come to see me if she had wanted to.

Mrs. Brown is a law graduate of Adelaide University. On completion of her law degree, she worked for a year with the International Law Research Institute in Paris and then for a further year with the Foreign Affairs Department of the Zambian Government before coming back to South Australia to a tutorship in politics at Adelaide University. She worked for me for six years, and during that time she gained knowledge of the activities of the Housing Trust. She did a course that was instituted by the Housing Trust. She is now a permanent appointee within the Education Department; she is a competent person, well able to carry out her responsibilities as a member of the South Australian Housing Trust Board. I am sure that those members of the women's movement who know Mrs. Brown, and most of them would, would have complete confidence in her ability to carry out the job.

FISH BAIT

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Fisheries to arrange for the Agriculture and Fisheries Department to say where amateur fishermen can obtain fish bait of a particular kind close to the metropolitan area? My question results from a recent warning by the Director of Agriculture and Fisheries to the effect that people who were digging tube worms at the aquatic reserve at the Barker Inlet were committing an offence and were liable to a considerable fine. The Director also pointed out that an excessive amount of digging had taken place in the area that was likely to cause considerable damage. I think most people would agree with the need to protect this reserve. If the tube worms were available in other areas and the fishermen knew where they were, they would be better able to comply with the department's request. I hope that

departmental officers have done sufficient research into this matter to be able to offer the community advice on it.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to obtain a report from my colleague for the honourable member and to let him have it as soon as possible.

SCHOOL POLITICAL PARTIES

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Education say whether he has been approached by representatives of any political Party for the purpose of permitting the introduction of junior branches of such an organisation into any of this State's high schools, and state what attitude he has expressed or will express to such an approach? In speaking of representatives, I include members of Parliament, not only the members of the organisations behind the political Parties. I base my question on a belief that already one northern high school has made moves to undertake the creation of such a junior branch, simultaneous with the distribution of a book outlining the background of the Labor Party that has been forwarded to State high schools for the purpose of introduction into school libraries.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Quite some time ago, I was approached by the State Secretary of the Labor Party about a booklet that was being prepared about the Labor Party and was questioned about its suitability for use in schools. I said that it was a matter for each school to determine for itself, that I saw no reason why it should not go into the schools, but that it was a matter for the Party to make its separate contact with each school about the matter. I have no further information about this matter. I see it as being no different from the fact that I recall that a school at which I once taught had a book that contained a good deal of biographical information about Sir Robert Menzies.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I see no difference at all.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Education has the floor.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: However, that is my contact with this matter. I am aware that a book has been prepared, and it may be that it is in some school libraries, quite properly, at the decision of the particular school. No approaches have been made to me for the formation of branches or junior branches.

ANSTEY HILL

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Works obtain for me a report on the progress made to date on the Anstey Hill water treatment plant, together with any other relevant information?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to do that. I understand that the work is on schedule and, from memory, that the plant is about to come on stream in about mid-1979. I shall obtain a report and let the honourable member have it.

SEAFORTH HOME

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say when it is expected that alterations to the premises known as Seaforth Home, at Somerton, will be commenced or completed? Is the work to be done shortly to enable people, especially aged people, who are using the facilities to have treatment by a chiroprapist and to take

advantage of the help offered by local hairdressers? Some time ago, plans were submitted for the redesigning of the wet area, or the ablutions area, of what was formerly the kindergarten at Seaforth Home. I understand that the redevelopment can be carried out at a reasonable cost. On my many visits to the home, I have noticed that no progress has been made recently. As the need is obvious for the services for people there and as the offers have been made to provide those services, can the Minister give any information about the situation?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I shall obtain a report for the honourable member.

PORT LINCOLN ROADS

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Minister of Transport explain to the House the construction programme for the new western approach to the city of Port Lincoln? The Minister's announcement yesterday of further sealing and upgrading of portions of both Bratten Way and Flinders Highway near Port Lincoln has been welcomed most enthusiastically. The Flinders Highway upgrading is part of the development of the new western approach to Port Lincoln. As construction of the Dublin Street bridge is quite advanced, local residents are anxious to know when the realignment and construction of the approach road within the city limits will commence.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall discuss with the Commissioner of Highways the points raised by the honourable member and bring down the information he requires.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICES

Mrs. ADAMSON: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to clarify the respective responsibilities of the Fire Brigade and Country Fire Services in outlying suburbs, and the means by which residents are informed of which organisation should be contacted in the event of a fire? At Athelstone at the weekend a fire was lit, presumably by children, in a creek area. The residents immediately contacted the C.F.S. and were told that it was not the responsibility of that organisation but of the Fire Brigade. The residents contacted the Fire Brigade, but when Fire Brigade officers saw the fire in the creek they said that they could not put it out because it was the responsibility of the C.F.S. Meanwhile, residents had to try to save houses threatened by the fire.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Can the honourable member name the creek?

Mrs. Adamson: The creek that runs down Black Hill behind Quondong Avenue.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As long as the creek is identified, I shall be pleased to present the question to the Minister. It seems that this is a serious situation, which should be rectified. I shall have the matter looked at for the honourable member and let her know the outcome.

MURRAY RIVER

Mr. ARNOLD: In view of the exceedingly dry year and the substantial rains that have fallen in southern Queensland, and if a substantially increased flow in the Darling River is expected, will the Minister of Works consider allowing the 10 per cent additional water usage to all divertees in South Australia who may exceed their limit, whether or not they have applied for it? I am

informed that the 10 per cent for which divertees can apply is not available to irrigators operating under the Lands Department. Since many of them are now metered and are in exactly the same situation as others, we find that many divertees are now facing a critical situation, because some months still remain before the end of June. If an increased flow in the Darling River is expected, which will come through to South Australia, will the Minister consider extending that 10 per cent across the board to any divertees in South Australia who may need it?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Certainly, I shall consider the matter. I shall have my officers examine the proposition put forward by the honourable member to see whether or not something can be done, and I shall let him know as soon as possible.

BEACH LITTER

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister for the Environment recommend to the Government a special grant to KESAB to finance a programme to discourage littering on metropolitan beaches? My question is supplementary to Question on Notice No. 389 and also to the question asked by the member for Henley Beach in this House on February 22. The Minister did not answer my Question on Notice, but referred in the reply to the question asked by the member for Henley Beach. Whilst I accept the reply, it did not cover the exact information I was seeking. I have had many complaints from constituents about broken glass on beaches, especially at West Beach and in the areas north and south of the West Beach caravan park, which are not visited frequently by many people. The introduction of the Echo beer bottle is causing a problem within the community. I have had complaints over the weekend of these bottles being used as weapons in brawls. That situation arose on Friday night in the Henley Square, and also on Sunday afternoon at the Henley Beach oval during several brawls. Parents and other people who visit the beach are worried by the amount of broken glass and beer bottles. Will the Minister look further at the problem to see whether a special grant to an organisation such as KESAB could be beneficial in introducing a programme of banning beer and wine bottles from recreation areas?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall look at the problem.

BUS FARES

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Transport say, in view of the varied statements about bus and public transport fare rises, whether the Government has it in mind to raise fares on public transport in the metropolitan area? We appreciated the outcry by the unions when the Government proposed an increase back in 1973, and the subsequent slight increase in 1974, but an announcement was made on February 23 that taxes might rise and on February 24, the next day, the news was that taxes were not yet to rise. The announcement was regarding a reported statement by the Premier. On February 26, the position firmed up again with a suggestion that there was likely to be a rise. In view of the varied statements of the Premier, presumably on behalf of the Government, can the Minister clarify the situation, especially regarding bus and rail fares?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not think the Premier at any stage has said that bus fares are likely to rise, as has been suggested by the honourable member. In fact, a newspaper reporter saw fit to write his article on the basis that fares might rise. I suppose this was as good a guess as

saying that they might not; he had a 50 per cent chance of being right. The situation in relation to bus and rail fares is fairly clear. For some considerable time, the Government has maintained the view that bus, tram, and rail fares should be as low as possible, as part of its effort to try to induce people to use public transport.

Mr. Gunn: Are you prepared to say there won't be a rise in fares?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the member for Eyre kept quiet for a moment he might learn something.

Mr. Gunn: You were deliberately skirting around the question.

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

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Government has followed a clear, straight path on this matter in the past. What will happen in the future will be decided by Cabinet. If and when a decision is taken to increase the fares, a public announcement will be made, but at this time no consideration has been given to increases.

MACOS COURSE

Mr. ALLISON: Can the Minister of Education assure the House that the South Australian Education Department has undertaken an evaluation of the appropriateness to South Australian students, and the effectiveness, of the social studies course known as MACOS (Man, a Course of Study)? This was developed in the United States in 1970 by the National Science Foundation pre-college science education programme and later adopted by a number of Australian State Education Departments, including South Australia's, where I believe about 80 schools are using units of the MACOS course.

It has been brought to my notice that there has been increasing complaint in South Australia (I have received correspondence and telephone calls about the matter), New Zealand, Victoria, and Queensland (where I understand the course may be withdrawn) and also at Federal level, the Minister for Education, Senator Carrick, being asked a question only last Thursday. It has also been brought to my notice that in the United States, where this course originated, in November, 1975, a report prepared for the Committee on Science and Technology for the House of Representatives stated:

In response to protests, regarding certain other (National Science Federation) funded curricula now coming into use, the U.S. House of Representatives recently voted to delete funding of N.S.F. curriculum implementation for FY (Federal year) 1976 with the understanding that a special review group would be appointed to advise the House.

I will make the whole of this correspondence available to the Minister as it is far too lengthy to read in the House. I would like the Minister's assurance that, in fact, an assessment has been undertaken and an evaluation made in South Australia in the light of these increasing complaints.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am not aware of complaints that have occurred in South Australia. I am aware that some very strange things have happened in Queensland recently. In specific answer to the question, I can say that my department is well aware of the contents of the MACOS course, which it monitors. As Minister of Education, I do not see myself as the censor of what is properly a professional decision about what happens in schools. There has been much of what I believe to be very soundly based criticism of the decision of the Queensland Government when it recently ordered the two courses,

including the MACOS course, to be withdrawn from schools. I am given to understand that the Queensland Premier in fact said of some teachers, "These people do not seem to understand what we want taught in schools." I am utterly appalled that a statement like that should be made. It is for professional teachers, in proper consultation with the community, and in particular with the parents through their representative bodies (the school councils), to develop these sorts of material. Naturally, my department examines closely all such material, but the final decision is not a political one: it is not a Government decision but a professional decision. I thank the honourable member for this question. I close my remarks by quoting from Mr. Doug Campbell, President of the Queensland Council of State School Organisations, who was reported as follows:

Education in the State [Queensland] faced a bleak future if minority groups succeeded in removing every new innovation from the schools . . . "Do they want us to go back to the dark days when we read the same page in the school reader over and over?" he said. "It's disgraceful that neither our organisation, representing thousands of parents, nor the Queensland Teachers' Union was consulted on Man—A Course of Study before its removal."

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

TEA TREE GULLY (GOLDEN GROVE) DEVELOPMENT BILL

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

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister for Planning) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the development of a certain area within the municipality of the City of Tea Tree Gully; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the Minister to move the second reading of this Bill, I wish to point out that I propose to allow the Bill as a whole and the report of the Select Committee to be debated on the motion "that the report be noted" to be moved after the Select Committee has reported to the House on a future day.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to facilitate the development, within the municipality of the City of Tea Tree Gully, of a large area of land zoned in 1962 for future urban development. The land is a discrete area partially surrounded by natural features and bounded on the south by the existing Tea Tree Gully development. It will house between 25 000 and 30 000 people. The land is entirely in public ownership and almost entirely owned by the South Australian Land Commission. It is, therefore, a unique opportunity, and a responsibility, to ensure that this very attractive site is developed with proper regard for its special qualities, and in a manner which ensures that the new community so created provides the most effective environment for its residents. The development will be integrated with the existing developed area of Tea Tree Gully, recognising the council's and Government's commitment to the developing regional centre at Modbury.

The present system for controlling development is a

system designed to deal with a multiplicity of ownerships and *ad hoc* development initiatives. Furthermore, it is a system which covers fully developed areas, those which are partially developed and broad acres. In more recent years it has been increasingly criticised as being too rigid, negative and time consuming, particularly in relation to the development of broad acres.

The ownership of approximately 1 400 hectares by a public corporation, the South Australian Land Commission, within the jurisdiction of one municipality has provided the opportunity to obtain a commitment from the State Government and the City of Tea Tree Gully to establish a joint committee to manage the total development in the public interest but without the straitjacket imposed by the existing development control system. The joint committee established by this Bill will have the basic functions of devising development schemes and supervising the overall development.

The measure provides for the progressive formulation of development schemes for the area and for the implementation of development directions and controls. The broad framework in which the development controls are exercised is to be the Planning and Development Act. The functions normally carried out by the local council, the State Planning Authority and the Director of Planning, under the Planning and Development Act, are vested in the Development Committee. However, in order to take full advantage of the scale of the proposed development and the fact that the land is broad acres, it is necessary to modify the application of the Planning and Development Act. It is the modifications of the Planning and Development Act which provide for more flexible subdivision and land use controls.

The Development Committee has a membership of four, of whom two shall be persons nominated by the council. Where there is an equality of votes on the Development Committee, provision is made for the decision to be made by the Minister.

The Bill also vests the South Australian Land Commission with additional powers to enable it to discharge its special responsibilities in relation to the scheme, under the overall supervision of the Development Committee. Arrangements are made in the Bill for land, as it is developed, to pass from the control of the Development Committee and to be subject to normal planning processes. It is the intention of the Government and the Tea Tree Gully council that over the next two decades the development schemes and the joint management arrangements established by this legislation will create an integrated community development involving, throughout, effective co-operative arrangements between the private and public sectors and the State and local governments.

The Bill has the support of the Tea Tree Gully council (and it was officially approved by the council last evening), but is, in the terms of the appropriate Standing Orders a hybrid Bill and will therefore be referred to a Select Committee of this House.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 recognises that the measure is essentially intended to deal with initial development and that progressively the "planning" management of the area will revert to normal appropriate bodies. Clause 3 is formal. Clause 4 sets out the definitions necessary for the

purposes of the measure. Clause 5 provides for its application to the South Australian Land Commission as the primary agency for development but makes it clear that the measure does not otherwise bind the Crown.

Clause 6 when read in conjunction with the schedules to the measure establishes the primary development area, and makes provision for its expansion subject to the limitations set out in subclauses (3) and (4). Clause 7 provides for, as it were, the return of land subject to the scheme to the normal planning processes. Clause 8 formally constitutes the Tea Tree Gully (Golden Grove) Development Committee and sets out its membership and provides for the remuneration of members.

Clause 9 is formal but the attention of members is drawn to subclause (5), which, in a manner similar to that provided in relation to the City of Adelaide Planning Commission, resolves a tied decision of the committee. Clause 10 is generally formal and self-explanatory and amongst other things enables the committee to use the services of officers or employees of the specified bodies.

Clause 11 is formal. Clause 12 provides a limited power of delegation to the committee. Clause 13 is intended to ensure that the very substantial investment of public funds in the project will not be put in hazard by a substantial failure of the committee to perform its duties. Clause 14 is one of the crucial clauses of the measure and limits the exercise of present powers and functions of the State Planning Authority and the relevant council in relation to the development areas. This limitation is necessary to ensure that no duplication occurs in the exercise of planning controls in the area.

Clause 15 empowers the committee to prepare draft development schemes and ensures that interested persons will have an opportunity to make representations in relation to the schemes. It is commended to members' particular attention. Clause 16 has the effect of incorporating the approved development schemes progressively into the Metropolitan Development Plan, thus paving the way for an ultimate resumption of ordinary planning controls and at the same time emphasising the integration of the proposed controls with the general planning systems.

Clause 17 authorises the committee to set out guidelines establishing more precisely the development proposals relating to neighbourhoods or even particular sites. Clause 18 has much the same purpose as is proposed in clause 14 and is intended to resolve possible overlapping and conflicting development controls once a development scheme is in operation. Clause 19 appears on the face of it to be somewhat complex but merely, in quite specific terms, modifies the application of section 41 of the Planning and Development Act by vesting in the committee interim development control under that section and by making it clear by the insertion of proposed subsection (7) in that section the parameters within which that interim development control will be exercised.

Clause 20 again is of some complexity but in essence modifies Part VI of the Planning and Development Act which encompasses subdivision controls. The effect of the modification is to vest in the committee exclusive power to consider subdivision proposed against the basic framework of the development scheme. Clause 21 provides a general power to the Land Commission to play its special part in the development proposed.

Clause 22 empowers the Minister to give general directions to the commission in relation to its activities under this measure in order to ensure that in its co-ordinating and other roles it is responsive to State Government policy in the matter. Clause 23 modifies the application of the Land Commission Act, 1973, as

amended, to remove certain limitations on the power of the Land Commission which would otherwise preclude its participation in the scheme. Specifically under its Act the commission is bound "not to conduct its business with a view to making a profit" and to provide land for people without "large financial resources". Adherence to these limitations by the commission would preclude the fulfilment of the primary object of the scheme which is to create "an integrated community development serving a wide variety of housing and other needs".

A further limitation on the commission's power to lease land is proposed to be modified by this clause. At present, the commission may not grant a lease of land, of less than one-fifth a hectare, for a period greater than 10 years. It is proposed that this limitation will be modified to ensure that it will only apply to leases for residential purposes. This will enable long term leases to be granted by the commission for community facilities. In addition, the financial provisions of the Land Commission Act are proposed to be modified to ensure that there will be no impediment to the use of its funds for the purposes of the scheme.

Clause 24 is formal. Clause 25 provides a more expeditious method for road closure and vests the closed roads in the commission. A power of this nature is proposed to ensure the systematic development of the area. Clause 26 provides a "dispensing power" in the usual form in relation to other Acts or enactments which may prevent the carrying of development schemes.

Clause 27 is formal and, in addition, extends by six months the period within which prosecutions may be brought for breaches of the measure. This conforms to the corresponding provisions in the Planning and Development Act. Clause 28 provides an appropriate regulation-making power.

I would point out to members that this measure is, in the terms of the appropriate Standing Orders, a hybrid Bill and will, in due course, be referred to a Select Committee of this House.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill's being referred to a Select Committee. In his second reading explanation the Minister states:

In more recent years it has been increasingly criticised as being too rigid, negative and time consuming, particularly in relation to the development of broad acres.

The Minister was referring to the difficulties that developers have in negotiating with all the Government departments in setting out to plan or create a subdivision in which a community can live. That criticism is as valid in relation to the private sector trying to develop or create an area as it is in relation to a Government department. Although at this stage we are moving to help a major Government agency in having this Bill referred to a Select Committee to see whether legislation can be enacted to enable the Land Commission, in co-operation and conjunction with the council of that area, to undertake a major development, we need to consider the overall planning problems that confront the private sector. I support the Bill and look forward to a favourable report being received from the Select Committee that will give the opportunity for the 25 000 to 30 000 people to live in a good environment in the Golden Grove and Tea Tree Gully areas.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Evans, Hudson, Klunder, and Wotton; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on Tuesday, March 14.

LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This short Bill amends the Land Settlement Act to prevent its demise. Under section 2a, the principal Act is expressed to expire on December 31, 1977. As the Land Settlement Committee still has certain functions in relation to the Rural Advances Guarantee Act and may in future be asked to consider other matters pertaining to land settlement, it seems appropriate to extend the operation of the Act until it appears that it is no longer required. Accordingly, this Bill repeals section 2a of the principal Act. The amendment has been deemed to come into operation retrospectively in view of the fact that section 2a refers to December 31, 1977.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the Act shall be deemed to have come into operation on December 31, 1977. Clause 3 repeals section 2a of the principal Act.

Mr. CHAPMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

Adjourned debate on the question:

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

(Continued from February 23. Page 1790.)

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I raise an issue relevant to education, and also immediately relevant to the question I asked today concerning MACOS, a course of study in use in South Australian schools. On November 3, 1977, we had a rather complacent remark made by the member for Newland, who said, among other things, that there had been some very pleasing developments, in, for instance, the MACOS course in social studies. He was referring to developments in South Australian education. Following that remark many people have taken him up on it and have also contacted me regarding what they consider to be the undesirability of the MACOS course for students in their schools. These people included teachers and parents.

My attention has been drawn to a report made to the Committee on Science and Technology of the United States House of Representatives in November, 1975. In that report the Chairman, Olin E. Teague states:

During the committee's review of the National Science Foundation fiscal year 1976 budget request a number of concerns were expressed about an introductory anthropology course entitled "Man—A Course of Study," or "MACOS". The course entitled had been developed as part of the foundations Pre-college Science Education Program and is in use in 5th grade classrooms throughout the country.

Among many paragraphs in that report, I have singled out two or three particularly relevant ones, as follows:

A number of citizens and members of Congress had

contacted myself and other members of the committee to indicate their distress about MACOS. They were primarily concerned about two aspects of the course: (1) the contents of the course and its suitability for children in the 10-12 years age group, and (2) whether the National Science Foundation should continue to fund implementation activities for MACOS, or whether a point had been reached where Federal funding should be discontinued.

In March, 1975, the Chairman of that committee asked the Comptroller-General of the General Accounting Office to conduct a complete investigation of several facets, as follows:

(1) the development, evaluation and implementation of the National Science Foundation-supported MACOS, (2) the foundation's policies and procedures for developing, evaluating and implementing science education projects administered by its Division of Precollege Education in Science, (3) identification of the foundation's policies and procedures for disposition of royalty income that may result from its science education projects and (4) the relationships between the foundation and the project's developer (Educational Development Centre) and the publishers (Curriculum Development Associates Inc.).

I will refer to those points later, because they are relevant to what has happened in Australia. The report continues:

After three years of pilot-testing in a hundred schools across the country, MACOS went into full commercial production in 1970, with especially favorable assistance by the N.S.F. It reportedly has been used in at least 1 700 schools in 47 States and several other English-speaking countries. Meanwhile, voices of protest, which were raised even while MACOS was in its pilot-testing period and when the course contained elements that were taken out before the 1970 commercial edition appeared, grew to sufficient levels to receive notice in the press and on television and in the Halls of Congress . . .

In response to protests, chiefly regarding MACOS, the U.S. House of Representatives recently voted to delete funding of N.S.F. curriculum implementation for funding year 1976 with the understanding that a special review group would be appointed to advise the House.

That review group was appointed and, at the time of publication of this report, there were 31 reports available that were published simultaneously with this report. In New Zealand (and I quoted this to the Minister), considerable objection had been raised by Mr. P. Clements, Chairman of the Concerned Parents Association in Christchurch, who took it on himself to approach the Congress of the United States for further information.

In a long letter, Mr. George H. Archibald, Administrative Assistant to Congressman Eldon Rudd of Arizona, sets out his qualifications to comment on Mr. Clements's inquiry, as follows:

As the principal staff person in the U.S. Congress involved in the investigation leading to eventual termination of all further U.S. Government funds for this questionable programme, I am pleased for the opportunity to correct some gross errors of fact contained in Mr. Gandar's letter.

Mr. Gandar is the New Zealand Minister of Education whose letter was forwarded to Mr. Archibald. Mr. Archibald then explains several points of view, only a few of which I will include in this debate as we are running short of time. However, the letter continues as follows:

The failure of both the National Science Foundation and Education Development Centre, the developer of MACOS, to adequately evaluate the programme led the General Accounting Office to make this highly critical statement in its summary of findings—

The House will bear in mind that I simply asked the

Minister to assure the House that the evaluation in South Australia had been adequate. I asked no more than that; I did not ask the Minister to withdraw the course. Therefore the rest of the Minister's comments were not relevant to the question. Several different appraisals by psychologists, psychiatrists and educationists in the United States exist in relation to this matter. I told the Minister that I would make available to him this entire correspondence, and I will still do so. In the interests of justice, I believe that at least some of the comments made in the letter should be placed in *Hansard* because of the Minister's apparent complacency and also because of the pleasure of the member for Newland that the MACOS course was part of South Australia's education system.

Among the critics of the course, Dorothy D. Randall of Boston said to Congressman John B. Conlan in June, 1975 (and, incidentally Dr. Randall was a university classmate of Dr. Jerome Bruner, the principal architect of the MACOS curriculum):

It is also fairly obvious that the climate of opinion today among most behavioural scientists and educators is that it is both justified and desirable to change or mould children's social attitudes, "free" them from traditional ways of thinking which are considered "prejudiced" or "stereotyped" and viewed, behaviouristically, as the more or less superficial learned products of cultural patterns.

She in no way agrees with that philosophy of the modern educational psychologist and she states at great length why. It is worth quoting that, in the appraisal of the MACOS system, fewer than 2 000 schools in the United States out of 109 000 schools use the MACOS system; that is fewer than 1 per cent of all United States schools. The gentleman who wrote this letter said that a special deal was attached to the production of MACOS material following the failure of MACOS producers to interest the 50 major publishers in the United States. He said that they were now trying to find new markets in Australia and New Zealand because objections to MACOS in the United States had made the programme impossible to sell now that taxpayer support had finally been terminated by the Congress. He continued:

I can understand, therefore, the intense desire of Mrs. Frances Link of Curriculum Development Associates to see the start of MACOS in your country [New Zealand]. She has an ideological, as well as a commercial interest in seeing that new markets are found for MACOS.

That is only part of the background to the criticism. The major criticism is that the material has been adjudged by many people to be unsuitable for students in New Zealand, Victoria, Queensland and South Australia.

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Mr. Speaker, I am glad that, after all, you did not give me the call last Thursday and that I now have the opportunity to speak in this grievance debate, in the light of events that have occurred outside the House in the meantime. Members may or may not be surprised to hear that I have had a difficult and distressing few days since the House last met. I say that not to ask for sympathy from members, because I know that I would not get it, whether or not I deserve it. On that I make no judgment. I do not regret the actions that I took last Thursday over a matter which was not raised in the House and which I do not intend to raise in the House today. It is a matter that cannot be raised in the House unless Standing Orders are suspended. Although, I believe that I was promised that that would happen, that promise was subsequently cancelled by the Premier.

I say deliberately that I do not regret having raised the

matter. Nothing that I did not know previously has come out publicly since, and much that I do know has not come out. I must leave my actions to speak for themselves and simply say that I would not have taken them if I had not felt that I should. I regret that the Premier found himself obliged to make public the subject that I discussed with him privately before lunch on Thursday. By doing that he started a chain of events which has received wide publicity throughout Australia and for which, ironically, he has now sought to blame me.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now starting to move away from what should be before the House. The honourable member knows Standing Orders, and he knows what Erskine May says about this matter. I hope that the honourable member will keep within the bounds prescribed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am glad that the Premier has now come into the House. He has done so no doubt because he heard me on the blower. I give you the assurance, Mr. Speaker, that I do not intend to embarrass you by trying to raise a matter that is outside Standing Orders, so you can relax, if I may suggest that with respect.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: The Premier might not—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Minister believes that I should say it again, I will.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have already said this, and you did not pull me up, so in case the Premier did not hear me I will say it again. I very much regret that the Premier found himself obliged to make public the subject that I discussed with him in private before lunch on Thursday. It is that that started a chain of events that led to such wide publicity for the matter throughout Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has gone wide enough. I believe he has made his point.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have felt over this matter politically very much alone. I have had much reaction to what has happened, more reaction on this matter than on any other topic that I can remember in my political career, which is now quite long. During Question Time I spent some time totting up to date the results of the reactions that I have had. I cannot include talkback programmes, because I just do not know what has happened on them, but I understand that they have been apparently very strongly against me. However, I am not quite sure how accurate a guide to public opinion that reaction is. Leaving aside talkback programmes, the responses I have had today have been much more favourable towards my actions than those I received yesterday.

Of the telegrams and letters I have had, more have been against me than in favour of me. Of the telephone calls that I have had (they have been to my district office, to my home and to my chambers) far more have been favourable than unfavourable.

Mr. Dean Brown: Since you said you were not going to pursue it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, all told. The letters and telegrams I have had from interstate have been far more strongly against me than for me.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not intend to allow the honourable member to continue in this way.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The full total is: 78 in favour and 73 against.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not intend to allow the honourable member to continue in this way. He is right off the matter before the Chair.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If I may rise on a point of order, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, under what Standing Order do you

say I cannot continue?

The SPEAKER: I have been listening intently to the honourable member and he is getting close to the provisions of Standing Order 150.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I point out that I have not used Her Majesty's name or the name of the Governor irreverently in debate, or for the purpose of influencing the House in its deliberations. I have not mentioned any particular subject matter at all.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What were these telephone calls about?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps in answer to the member for Henley Beach, I may simply say that the total was 78 in my favour and 73 against me.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Most people aren't prepared even to speak to you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That has not been my experience. I have found that as time has gone on the support for what I did has increased. I do not propose to say any more than I have or even to take my full time in this debate. The real question remains as to whether or not this matter is closed. I do not know whether it is closed or whether it will go on but I say again, as I said before (and I say it now in the presence of the Premier), that I do not regret the actions that I took on Thursday. What I do regret is that through the Premier's action in making public the subject matter of our discussion the matter has taken the course it has.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I have been appalled at the honourable member's actions during the whole of this matter. This afternoon's episode has simply deepened my contempt. I should tell the House how events transpired, without dealing with the subject matter about which the honourable member has been concerned. On Wednesday night of last week I was approached in my office by Mr. Cockburn of the *Advertiser*. He asked me some questions directly about that matter.

Mr. Dean Brown: What matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows perfectly well that I cannot advert to it. We were informed from the *Advertiser* office that night that its story had been prepared but had been killed that evening because the member for Mitcham had not at that stage been able to raise the matter under privilege in this House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I rise on a point or order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The point of order is that the Premier is now adverting directly to this matter. Not only that, but what he says is utterly and entirely untrue.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That evening in the House the honourable member was unable to speak in the adjournment debate.

Mr. Millhouse: I did not even attempt to speak in the adjournment debate.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have warned the member for Mitcham once today, and I warn him again.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There was no adjournment debate.

Mr. Millhouse: I did not even attempt to speak in the adjournment debate.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: Even if there had been one I had no intention of speaking in it. I did not put my name down. The Premier had better get his facts right, if he's coming in here to calumniate like this.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I was informed by the

Minister in charge of the House that the honourable member had approached him with a sheaf of notes in his hand to ask him what was going on, and to say that the Liberal Party was getting no press out of this but he had a matter about which he would get some material in the press. The next day, because I did not know what was in the story, the honourable member came to see me in my office. I asked him not to proceed, because I would have to investigate what he had come to see me about.

During the afternoon sittings, the honourable member sent a note over to me saying that the press were poised to break this matter and he believed he would have to proceed. I went over and asked him not to do so and he was seen subsequently to go outside and have a colloquy with the press outside the door of the House. Members of this House and members of my staff saw him doing so. I had said nothing to the press. I had a press conference that afternoon which was to deal with the matter of the deficit. At that press conference I was asked about the subject matter about which the member had spoken to me. I was pressed by the press reporters. They then asked whether I had discussed that with the honourable member in an interview. I said he had raised it with me. I could not deny that fact; it was obvious that they already knew it. That matter, the member now says, was my releasing information to the public.

The *Advertiser*, from the honourable member's conversations with me, had full knowledge of the matter already. What is more, when I crossed the floor to speak to him he said that the Liberal Party knew about it and that it was unprincipled enough to get in first. The member for Mitcham knows full well the kind of public obloquy he has brought upon himself, deservedly, in this matter. What he has said this afternoon is an attempt to suggest to the public that he was not responsible for what has occurred; he is responsible, together with Mr. Cockburn of the *Advertiser*. I think that they are equally to blame, and I believe that the public should blame them for what has occurred. I have risen in this debate simply because of what the member for Mitcham saw fit to say this afternoon.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PREMIER'S STATEMENT

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

Leave granted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: By intervening in this debate, the Premier has had an opportunity to say things which are completely inaccurate and which oblige me to make this explanation so that he will not get away with those inaccuracies, after I had spoken in this debate. What happened was this. I was given certain information on Wednesday afternoon. I was given an opportunity to check the facts independently of the source of my information. I took that opportunity and checked them, and satisfied myself that those facts were accurate. I had hoped that there might be an opportunity for me to speak on Wednesday evening in the grievance debate, but there was no grievance debate.

Mr. Whitten: There was.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There was a grievance debate, but I could not get into it.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You said you didn't want to.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No.

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What the Premier suggested was

that I had tried to speak on an adjournment debate, and I did not. There was no adjournment debate. I waited until 10.30 p.m. to satisfy myself that I would not get into a grievance debate that would mean anything, and the House adjourned at 11.15 p.m. I then, on Thursday morning, immediately at 9 o'clock communicated with a senior officer of the Uniting Church and arranged to see him. I saw him at 10 o'clock. After my conversation with him, I sought an interview with His Excellency the Governor, which I had at noon. After that, I came back, with His Excellency's knowledge, and sought an interview with the Premier. I had that interview with him at 12.45 p.m. I told him what I had been told. He said that he had no knowledge of it. He asked for time to check it. I said that I had proposed to raise it that afternoon unless he could persuade me that I should not raise it. He did persuade me not to raise it, by offering to allow me to raise it today, if I still wished to do so.

I had expected, between the time I spoke to him before lunch and 2 p.m., that he would communicate with me again. During that time, a number of press people spoke to me. I had not told them anything, but they knew from, I understand, a Liberal member that I had wanted to speak earlier on Wednesday evening, and they put that together with the stories which were around town. When the House met on Thursday afternoon, not having heard anything from the Premier, and having been approached over lunch three or four times (and those with whom I was sitting may remember that I was called out to the telephone repeatedly), I sent a note.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was called out and asked whether I was going to speak, and I refused to say to them as to what I was going to speak about or whether I was going to speak.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They didn't know?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know whether or not they knew. I make clear that I did not tell them even the subject about which I proposed to speak.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Did you tell Joan Bullock?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No. When the House met at 2 p.m., the Premier had not approached me. I then sent a note across to him, saying that I had had these approaches and that I would have to mention it unless he could give me some information. I do not know whether he still has the note; I do not suppose he has. I was silly enough not to take a copy of it. He would have been far wiser to reply by note, but he did not do that. He walked across the Chamber (which is an unusual procedure for him) and spoke to me at this place. That was seen from the press gallery and by everyone present, and it was known to be an unusual procedure. It was that action of his which allowed the press people to corner him after his press conference upstairs. Certainly, after he had come over to speak to me, I was called out, not by one but by half a dozen journalists, asking why he had come over to speak to me.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. He is getting away from a personal explanation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I seek leave to complete my explanation, which I have almost finished.

Leave granted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The reason I was called outside was that (I believe it was the member for Ross Smith who said that he saw me outside)—

Mr. Bannon: I saw you at an impromptu press conference.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was not.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Was it an organised one?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I suppose that we have to get what humour we can out of this distressing situation. I suppose that, from time to time, every member is called out to speak to the press about something which has gone on in the place; I certainly have been, and that is what happened on this day. They saw the Premier come over to me; they called me out, and asked me what it was all about.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: And you told them?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I did not tell them. They put two and two together (and I do not blame them in the light of all that had been said). I reiterate that I had no intention at all, after my interview with the Premier, of speaking in the House on Thursday, because I trusted him. God knows I should have known him better. I did not expect there to be, nor did I want there to be, any publicity for this matter on Thursday. What happened was that, after the Premier lost control of himself upstairs, I was invited to listen to a tape of the press conference. It was subsequently played, and everyone heard it on Thursday night, I suppose. It was not until—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —I had heard that tape—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —that I consented to say—

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —anything publicly.

The SPEAKER: Order! I name the honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have finished now.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has wilfully persisted in disobeying the authority of the Chair.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, may I apologise for my lapse? I did not mean to defy you. I have finished what I wanted to say, and I hope that you will reconsider.

The SPEAKER: I accept the honourable member's apology. At no further stage will I allow any debate on this matter, because Erskine May precludes the name of the Sovereign or the Governor being brought before the House in question or debate, except by means of a substantive motion.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1) RESUMED

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I intend to speak on an entirely different subject, which relates to the use of paddy straw or rice straw from Malaysia. Members may recall that, on the Premier's return from overseas, he made some rather grand press statements, which I will come to later. Members may also recall that I asked a question of the Premier on November 16, 1977, during which I pointed out that the project, as announced by the Premier, was totally unfeasible on technical and health grounds, and that the project would not be economical. On that occasion, the Premier offered to supply me with certain feasibility studies. I have since received those feasibility studies. However, I have found that the Premier made a gross untruth in his statement at the time.

When I rang the next day and asked for a copy of the feasibility studies, I was politely told that, unfortunately, all of the feasibility studies were overseas with the Director-General of the Economic Development Department (Mr. Bakewell), who would not be back in Australia for three weeks, so that the studies would not be available in that time. I happened to run into Mr. Bakewell a week later at a cocktail party. He had been back for at least a day or so at that stage. The Premier's statement, made through his department, was inaccurate and a gross misrepresentation of the truth.

The Premier's promise to establish a \$28 000 000 feed conversion plant in North Malaysia was obviously an ill-founded statement, as it could not be substantiated by the Government's own feasibility studies, which the Premier had at the time he made his statement. The Premier had those feasibility studies with him at the time he held his press conference at the airport. The Premier apparently made the statements in an attempt to justify his jaunt to Malaysia last year which, incidentally, was paid for by the taxpayers.

Mr. Nankivell: What jaunt was that?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The jaunt to North Malaysia, Singapore, and other places. Frankly, I think it was a three-week holiday. At a press conference when he returned last year, the Premier talked about South Australian assistance to establish a \$28 000 000 factory to convert rice straw to a high protein stock feed. He said this feed would be transported to Adelaide by ship, to help minimise the local feed shortage. The details of this announcement have been repeated by me in Parliament; the Premier, incidentally, has not denied those statements. I then challenged the Premier about the technical feasibility of this scheme, as reported on November 16, at page 829 of *Hansard*. When I challenged him, the Premier gave the following reply:

The Government has had a study, which I shall obtain for the honourable member. I point out to him, however that there are a number of aspects of this scheme with which he has not bothered to deal, and I suggest that, before he whips himself into his usual rather hysterical lather in order to try to impress other people, he should wait until the feasibility study itself is produced. I noticed that he made some quite disparaging remarks about the input from South Australian industry towards this project.

There are two feasibility studies. I have them in my possession. They were prepared for the South Australian Government. The first is entitled *Utilisation of Rice Straw in Malaysia*, by Mr. W. J. Howarth, of Amdel. The second is entitled *Production of Animal Foodstuff from Rice Straw in Malaysia, A study in two stages: Stage 1, Economic Feasibility Study*. That was produced by Professional Consultations (Australasia) Proprietary Limited. The three people who produced the report for that company were South Australians, and it was produced for the State Government.

Mr. Nankivell: What did it cost?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: We do not know the cost. They are fairly thick studies. One person was a public servant, another worked for a private consultant, and another worked for Amdel. I have read the feasibility studies in detail several times. They make no reference whatever to the importing of treated rice straw in South Australia as a stock feed, yet the whole purpose of the Premier's statement was that we would solve the drought crisis in South Australia by importing this rice straw. The studies simply outlined that paddy straw from Malaysia was to be treated with alkali and fed to cattle in North Malaysia. When this subject came up in the House, I made some sort of estimate about the sort of treatment I thought was being talked about. No technical details were given by the Premier. I gathered it might be treated with alkali, even before I had the feasibility studies. The feasibility studies have backed up what I said.

A high protein supplement was to be added to adjust the low protein content of the rice straw. The pertinent point was that I accused them of producing a low protein stock feed and said that it could not be a high protein stock feed, as the Premier had claimed, and also as the Minister of Agriculture had claimed in another place. The feasibility studies confirmed this. They stated that a high protein

concentrate would have to be fed with the rice straw. Nowhere in the feasibility studies is there any reference to importing treated rice straw into South Australia.

In fact, the cost of producing rice straw in pellet form was estimated at \$89 Malaysian a ton of dry matter in Malaysia, which is more than the cost of equivalent feed produced and sold in Australia. Who is going to import this feed from Malaysia if it is cheaper to obtain it in South Australia, and when the South Australian feed is of a higher quality?

The feasibility studies refer only to establishing a \$268 000 Malaysian processing plant. I ask members to note this. The equivalent conversion is \$100 000 Australian, not the \$28 000 000 processing plant proposed by the Premier at his airport press conference. Nowhere in these two feasibility studies can I see any reference to a \$28 000 000 processing plant. As I said at the time, I thought the Premier was suffering from jet lag. I suspect that he confused the "M" indicating Malaysian dollars with "millions of dollars". Such a fundamental mistake shows his lack of detailed examination of the feasibility studies, even though this was one of the prime purposes of his two-week or three-week visit to Malaysia.

The studies also indicate that treated rice straw would have a very low protein concentration and would need to have a protein supplement added. That is completely opposite to the Premier's claim of its being a high protein feed. Meanwhile, the Minister of Agriculture was making a fool of himself in Parliament by claiming that the treated rice straw would be fed to pigs and poultry, rather than to cattle, as outlined in the feasibility studies. In addition, he, too, claimed that it would be a high protein rather than a low protein feed.

I am not the only person who has ridiculed this project. I should like to read to the House a letter I received from the Ricegrowers' Association of Australia. On December 16, 1977, the General Secretary, Mr. Caldwell, wrote to me, as follows:

Dear Mr. Brown,

An article in the Adelaide *Advertiser* dated November 17, 1977, headed "Rice Straw Import Water Dream—M. P." has been drawn to the attention of this association.

The association unequivocally supports your opposition to the scheme, principally because of the quarantine risk that would be incurred from such imports. The rice industry of New South Wales is virtually disease free and considerable efforts are carried out to ensure that this extraordinary status is maintained. Whilst South Australia is a considerable distance from here, one would nevertheless be most concerned that some of the rice straw material could find its way to this region and be responsible for establishing exotic rice diseases.

Two other comments are pertinent from the newspaper report. Firstly, most rice straw would contain considerably less than 5.5 per cent protein, in many cases not more than 2 per cent and therefore constitutes stock feed of low quality. Secondly, if there is seen to be a demand for rice straw I can assure you that such a commodity is readily available from this region at prices considerably lower than those quoted in the article.

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

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I wish to raise a matter concerning a policy statement made by the Government prior to the recent State election. The *Advertiser* of August 30, 1977, contains the following report:

The Premier said the Government now proposed to review all penalties for criminal offences in line with the Mitchell committee's recommendations. "We propose, in conjunction

with the Police Commissioner, to seek ways of obtaining closer public co-operation in the area of law enforcement," he said.

I am concerned about vandalism. The Minister of Community Welfare is conducting an inquiry into the problems of vandalism, but the matter goes much deeper. In the community today, and especially in parts of my district, we have a problem relating to law and order, and especially to hooliganism, which is the only way I can describe the situation.

Last Friday, another brawl occurred at Henley Beach, in the Henley Square. Several young people were approached about throwing bottles and breaking bottles in the area. A Henley and Grange councillor approached them and asked them not to throw bottles. Unfortunately, he was struck in the face with a bottle and is now receiving treatment for an injury to an eye. On Sunday afternoon, the Henley Beach Rotary Club organised probably its most successful Rotafest. The Rotafest is a function at which local sporting organisations and charity groups set up stalls to raise money. The club itself raises money for two designated charities. It was a pleasant and enjoyable afternoon, a family day, until the hooligans arrived and started brawling and making mischief around the grounds.

Some members of the Rotary Club tried to contain the situation. One, a friend of mine, was unfortunately felled by a vicious blow and then kicked in the face. He is still in hospital, having had an operation for a depressed fracture of the cheekbone. Another member of the Rotary Club was assaulted. The stall on which I worked sold out of goods by about 5 o'clock and my wife and family accompanied me to inspect the other stalls. This is about when the brawling started. To say that I am disgusted would be putting it mildly. I was disgusted at the behaviour of these hooligans, who tried to disrupt this successful and wonderful function. I was disgusted, in some ways, about the handling of the whole situation. There was not a sufficient number of police present to handle or completely prevent this problem.

Mr. Mathwin: You wouldn't expect there to be, would you?

Mr. BECKER: Unfortunately, I am led to believe there was some inkling that this problem could occur during the day. I have sent a telegram to the Chief Secretary calling for a complete inquiry into the whole matter and asking to be informed of the outcome of the inquiry. About 80 members of the Henley Rotary Club have worked and planned for many months to assist many worthwhile organisations. These men and their families have worked hard to raise the money necessary to keep our amateur sporting organisations and charitable organisations functioning.

It is necessary today to organise and hold large public functions such as that to provide a means of fund raising. The men involved, and no doubt many of their supporters, feel depressed about the ugly scenes that followed late that evening. I believe it is the responsibility of the Government to ensure that any group of citizens that organises that type of function is adequately protected and given back-up support. It is the responsibility of the Government now, once and for all, to ensure that the courts hand out adequate sentences. It is a responsibility now for the Government, once and for all, to investigate this problem thoroughly and to investigate the psychological reasons why these young louts are going around terrorising the community, and to ensure that it never happens again.

It is the responsibility of this Parliament to ensure that the police are supported in protecting the people of this community and that innocent citizens are no longer

injured and that their property is no longer damaged by the actions of these few hooligans. No member of this House could do other than agree that it is the responsibility of this Parliament and of this Government to ensure that the police have the right to move on people when they want to do so or when they are suspicious of certain people who congregate in certain areas, whether it be in Henley Square, around a marquee at a fairground, or in Norwood. The police must have the backing and support to enable them to move these people on. All the trouble started because of the emotional nonsense that carries on year after year, so the police have their hands tied. Thousands of people in my district are annoyed at the way the police were treated and the way that one young policeman, when walking back from the police van, was viciously attacked from behind. It was a brutal attack, and I felt sorry for him, because if others had moved in to help him they would have been subjected to the same sort of treatment. This is what is going on. What sort of society are we getting in this community? What sort of gutless Government have we got that will stand by and allow innocent people to be brutally attacked?

Mr. Groom: Many of these people are unemployed.

Mr. BECKER: The member for Morphett should not smile about this issue. He should be ashamed of himself in supporting this Government and making stupid inane remarks in the House that this sort of thing should be allowed to continue. People who give their time voluntarily for the betterment and improvement of the community, people who are prepared to give all of their time in working for clubs such as Rotary in their community, should be allowed to do so without the interruption of hooliganism. They should be allowed to have the protection that can be offered by the Police Force. But, at the same time, the South Australian Police Force has to be backed up and supported by laws that work. It has to be given the opportunity to carry on, unhindered by a Government, its responsibility in this community. This is the whole tragedy of our society today.

Mr. Broom: You don't think—

Mr. BECKER: As the member for Morphett would know, whoever controls the streets controls the country. If he wants this sort of hooliganism to carry on, let him get up and say so. He ought to be ashamed of himself for supporting a Government that will not do anything about this.

Mrs. ADAMSON (Coles): I want to draw the attention of the House to the importance of nutrition as a factor in good health, and to alert this Parliament to the fact that nutrition has been, to a large extent, ignored by Governments. Because of changes in food technology and dietary patterns in Australia, there is a grave and increasing risk to the health of Australians as a result of the food that they are eating. I will quote from some experts who have visited Australia and some who are resident in Australia. They are trying to alert the community to this matter, but as yet have had little success, it seems, in alerting Governments to the importance of diet as a factor in good health. An article appeared in the *News* on June 30, 1977, as follows:

Cholesterol level tests of Adelaide schoolchildren are planned following the discovery that some Sydney students have levels as high as middle-aged people. The Sydney study found 10 per cent of high school students had elevated cholesterol levels—caused by eating fatty foods.

A report appeared in the *Australian* on July 28, 1977, as follows:

The Norwegian Government estimates it has saved \$4 000 000 000 in the past six years on health spending by

educating people about what they eat.

Another article, which appeared in the *Australian* on August 16, 1977, states:

Australians, sweet-toothed and overweight, are driving themselves crazy because of their diets, according to a visiting American nutrition expert. Dr. Emanuel Cheraskin, Professor of Oral Medicine at Alabama University, says Australians, like Americans, are eating a teaspoon of sugar every 30 minutes—a major contributing factor to mental illness.

A statement made by a Government food expert while calling for a national campaign to teach people what to eat was reported in the *Australian* of July 18, 1977, as follows:

She told a seminar in Brisbane that up to 80 per cent of food commercials promoted non-nutritious products, and the greatest victims of the multi-million dollar food advertising industry were children.

One has only to look at the television commercials that appear between the hours of 4 p.m. and 6 p.m. each evening to realise that the majority of these commercials deal with food and the majority of the food commercials deal with foods that have an extremely high sugar content. I refer now to an article which appeared in the *Advertiser* last year and which was written by the medical writer, Barry Hailstone, as follows:

Doctors who deal with allergies are renewing their campaign to have processed food ingredients fully labelled . . . Full ingredient labelling would help at least one in 100 people who suffered from allergy.

This is borne out by the remarks of Dr. Ben Feingold, who visited Australia last year and who was reported in the *Advertiser* of September 15, 1977, as follows:

He saw food additives as part of the general problem of environmental contamination, which had been greatly accelerated by massive technological development . . . Food additives, like other natural and synthetic compounds, were capable of inducing various reactions in individuals with the appropriate genetic profile.

The claim has been made that some additives encourage not only excitable behaviour but also criminal behaviour. All of this points to the fact that Governments must begin to take a far greater interest in food as a factor in good health, and must begin to embark on an education programme which starts with children and continues through schools and which informs young parents and also informs people living alone in retirement and whose diet pattern tends to deteriorate when they no longer have anyone to look after or cook for them.

Some of the main faults in the Australian diet are excessive calorie consumption, excessive fat consumption, excessive sugar consumption, excessive salt consumption, excessive alcohol consumption, and an insufficient amount of fibre consumption. About 60 per cent of all Australians over 50 years of age suffer from diverticulitis, a disease of the bowel caused by lack of fibre in the diet. It can be an extremely painful condition and is caused solely by improper diet.

The major health problems in Australia are indicated by the major causes of death, and almost all of them are strongly related to diet. Coronary heart disease causes 30 per cent of deaths; cancer causes 17 per cent and stroke causes 14 per cent, and these together with accidents in which alcohol is frequently a contributing factor, make up a total of two-thirds of all deaths.

It can be clearly demonstrated that, if the diet habits of Australians were to be improved, there would be a marked improvement in the quality of national health and, consequently a marked reduction in the massive health bill that Australia faces. Last year about 12 per cent of the national Budget was spent on health and, as has been

illustrated by the Norwegian experience, that figure could be cut markedly if there were positive education programmes to make people aware how important diet is and of the responsibility of individuals, and also to make Governments aware that they have a responsibility in terms of monitoring diet patterns in order to establish where deficiencies occur and then take positive action once the monitoring has indicated where the faults lie, and also to embark on a positive programme.

Much of this health planning has a relationship in other planning areas, notably urban planning and land use. A motion before this House last week relating to taxing according to land use is very much tied up with the problem of nutrition. As long as we continue to pour cement foundations over some of the best food-producing land in this State and use it for residential or industrial purposes, instead of the purpose for which nature designed it to be used, namely, food production, we can expect a deterioration in food standards in Australia as well as more costly food, as producers have to move far from their markets in order to produce the basic fresh fruit and vegetables, which should form a principal part of our diet and which in Adelaide could form the principal part of our diet, because we are so well equipped by nature to grow these foods.

Dr. Eastick: Does that include good quality potatoes?

Mrs. ADAMSON: Yes, it does, and I draw that statement to the attention of the Potato Board. I believe that the State Governments and Federal Government should be supporting the promotion of healthy dietary habits and embarking on efforts to provide nutrition education, especially to young people. They should be effectively monitoring Australian diet patterns so that planning to detect deficiencies can be soundly based. Also they should be providing necessary assistance to producers, processors, and retailers of wholesome foods, and should restrict, through legislation where necessary, the sale of food or drink that is proved to have dangerous or toxic effects.

Mr. WOTTON (Murray): I take advantage of the time available to refer, first, to several matters relating to community welfare and, secondly, to some matters in relation to my district. Several times recently (and I believe this problem has occurred in society for some time) my notice has been drawn to the real need for assistance for disadvantaged fathers where their wives are in hospital for some time, especially when it involves a single-income family. I draw to the attention of the House the contents of a letter I have received from a person who sets out the problem clearly and who has written to the Premier seeking assistance in this regard. The letter, which is self-explanatory, states:

Over the last two years my wife has spent quite a considerable time in hospital with an illness that has caused many hardships, both socially and psychologically, to both myself and my three children (all under eight years old). One of our most fundamental problems was to maintain a home for the children and to keep an income. This meant getting outside help as relations just were not available. Both myself and the hospital social worker tried on several occasions to recruit help in looking after the children in their home environment. A very considerable effort went into this task and, in view of the publicity in regard to high unemployment, I was also prompted to advertise in the press for a housekeeper, with next to negative results.

Help was recruited the majority of the time through a very worthy though very expensive Wanslea Home which provided live-ins for five days of the week. The Government did not seem to have provided any social aid at all for what

must be a number of families in the same predicament. Having spent an amount of between \$75 a week to \$125 a week for the excellent service provided by Wanslea, approaches to the Taxation Department showed that the South Australian Government did not consider tax relief to be necessary for families affected this way.

In these days of Government financial assistance to pre-schools which the Government has repeatedly stated to be establishing and subsidising in order to allow married women into our work force, there seems to be a "very considerable social injustice". For the last two years, due to the economic climate within the building industry in which I am employed, I personally have been under pressure in regard to working hours and, as a result, 9 a.m.-5 p.m. child-minding aid would have had limited value. It would certainly have required me to have given up my present employment which under the circumstances would have been financially impossible. Such items as "maternity pay" for female Government employees tend to make me wonder just what aims your [that is, the Government's] "social reform" actually have as they seem to be directed towards the double-income earners within the community rather than to be distributed evenly across the board.

I believe that that letter illustrates one of the grave problems in our welfare system at present. That is not an isolated case: it is a situation in which people find themselves many times, and I speak personally in this regard and say that I have had much the same problem. This is a matter that I ask the Government to consider seriously, and I ask that something be done soon.

In debate last week it was brought to our notice that a further amount of \$1 000 000 is required for community welfare in this State for the next 12 months. I think we are all aware of the reasons for this massive increase. That increase is understandable with labour charges as they are and with administration costs and services. I would suggest that much more use could be made of and advantage taken by the Government's becoming more involved with voluntary agencies and by using them even more than they are used now. Regarding the role of voluntary agencies in providing services, I quote from the SACOSS newsletter as follows:

The experience of voluntary agencies is that Governments prefer to establish their own service, rather than build on existing services provided by voluntary agencies. This appears to be a poor use of funds. Voluntary agencies have arisen to meet a need that the Government is not meeting. If a voluntary agency is meeting this need, they are not prepared to give up the task when Government decides to take it up, only to see priorities change and the task be lost. In relation to community development it must be stressed that the community must be the initiator; it cannot be imposed by Government. Voluntary agencies can provide services economically, and are flexible enough to meet new needs. They provide people with alternatives in service.

Regarding participation with voluntary agencies, the SACOSS newsletter of December last states:

There is a need for Government to consult voluntary agencies more. There appears to be little commitment by government to involve voluntary agencies. Voluntary agencies must be more active in demanding such involvement. At the moment there is polarisation between the government and non-government sector. There is no total welfare base. Participation by the voluntary sector at all levels is essential if this sort of base is to develop over time. A strong central base is essential for the voluntary sector—SACOSS should undertake this role.

I believe steps are being taken to accept that responsibility. The newsletter continues:

This central base can then press for voluntary sector

participation and involvement in decisions. It can undertake independent bargaining on behalf of voluntary agencies. It can act as a catalyst to assist voluntary agencies to develop new initiatives and to integrate services. It can act as clearing house to provide greater information about voluntary agencies and services already being provided by them. It can also assist in the development of new services and support to newly emerging organisations.

I do not intend taking up more time on that subject, but I again bring it to the notice of the Government to show that it should be using voluntary agencies more than it is using them now. I appreciate that the Minister of Community Welfare has considered this matter and I am sure that he appreciates that these agencies could be used by the Government and would wish that to happen.

The next matter I raise relates to what has become the desperate need for a new high school at Murray Bridge. The school council, of which I am a member, recently wrote to the Minister of Education as follows:

At a meeting of the high school council held on February 23, council members again expressed concern at the crowded condition at the school and the ever-increasing urgency for the provision of a second secondary school in this district. This matter was the subject of considerable negotiation between the Education Department and the high school council in 1973-74 with the result that approximately 20 acres of land was purchased in Murray Bridge as the site for building an additional secondary school. Since then, no further progress has been made.

The present high school was opened about six years ago and was designed to accommodate 1 000 students. Our present enrolment is 1 220 and it is only possible to cope because a series of Demac buildings have been provided. The interruption to planning at Monarto has resulted in an upsurge in development at Murray Bridge. Many regional offices are now centered here; the Housing Trust is continually expanding its operations; a new sub-division is being opened near the river-front, more private homes are being erected and caravan parks are being extended. It is expected that the situation will become critical in the early 1980's and council consider that the immediate steps should be taken to counter the expected developments. We respectfully request that the matter be thoroughly investigated and that plans be made to provide relief as soon as possible.

I reiterate the desperate need for a school in this area, which is expanding rapidly.

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

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): In his second reading explanation the Premier gave reasons for the \$26 000 000 State deficit, but he omitted to list one of the most important reasons—the serious drought condition facing country areas at this time. This drought has been devastating to many areas of the State. Until the season breaks only gloom and hard luck stories can crop up from every direction. When many areas are experiencing their fourth drought in succession and most areas of the State are probably experiencing their third drought in succession, it is rather disturbing that a Flinders University professor should fly across Eyre Peninsula and then create a headline by saying that Eyre Peninsula is a wasteland. It would be appreciated that I did not take too kindly to that comment.

I freely admit that there are vast areas of drift and that farmers in those areas are experiencing extremely difficult times, but I would remind the House that one-third of the grain produced in this State comes from that area. Such conditions are not the result of poor farming because, to

grow anything, we must have rain. Unless we get rain we cannot have growth and vegetation will therefore not grow in the country. Why is the country so heavily stocked, and why is it being farmed and grazed in such a manner? The answer to those questions lies in many economic situations and issues of that kind.

Professor Peter Schwerdtfeger, who is Professor of Meteorology at Flinders University, suggests that massive plantings of trees should cover these areas. He estimates that 1 000 000 000 trees could be planted on Eyre Peninsula. It is desirable that the Government should encourage farmers to provide their own wood lots, but the wholesale reforestation of Eyre Peninsula in this way cannot be contemplated. The Minister of Works, because he controls the Engineering and Water Supply Department, would be the first to say that existing water supplies on Eyre Peninsula would be seriously depleted. In addition, any trees planted in the area would pollute underground basins in the area. We have already experienced that sort of pollution in the southern part of the peninsula where pine forests have been planted. To add insult to injury the area has recently been visited by the Federal Leader of the Australian Labor Party, who rubbished the National Country Party. Maybe I could take some sense of pride and pleasure in thinking that he should come to South Australia and rubbish the National Country Party because, after all, I am the only National Country Party member of Parliament in this State. For the national Leader of the Labor Party to extol his virtues in my district, is perhaps an honour for me.

Mr. Millhouse: It shows the measure of your significance.

Mr. BLACKER: I thank the member for Mitcham for saying that. Another point should be made. Why did the Leader of the Federal Opposition criticise the N.C.P. for its efforts to service the needs of country people? What did the Labor Party do? It brought out the Coombs report and a green paper, everything that has led to the financial destruction of the primary producer. Every single measure introduced by the Labor Party has meant that the ability of the primary producer to provide for himself in times of drought has been taken away from him. He no longer has that staying power. He no longer has the ability to set money aside, or to provide for the future. He has had that measure of self-management to enable him to provide for the future taken away, and when the Labor Party makes comments about this area it can only be speaking with its tongue in its cheek. Less than three months ago it did not care a damn about country people; it was not interested in the country man. There were more votes in the metropolitan area, and that is where it was concentrating its resources. I believe that both major political Parties were doing just that, and in some ways I understand that, because that is where the vast majority of the vote lies. It is to be commended when any member of a political Party comes to a drought-stricken area or an area where there are problems in a genuine attempt to provide some solution of the problem, but I cannot see that the visit by the Federal Opposition Leader can in any way be interpreted in that way.

I know that the Federal Government has provided great measures for drought relief. Under the agreement with the Commonwealth, the State provides the first \$1 500 000 and from then on, provided the farmers meet the criteria set down on a joint State and Commonwealth basis, the funds are without limit. I presume the same situation applies in New South Wales, and surely Mr. Hayden would know that. The only help Mr. Hayden offered was to formulate policies for the next 12 months, such as an insurance-against-rainfall scheme which would be another

load on insurance companies and which would be of little use to the farmers concerned in the next 12 weeks or perhaps days. It seems strange that Mr. Hayden should be associated with the implementation of the disastrous Coombs report, the effects of which have been devastating to country areas.

Having had a visit to my area from the Federal Opposition Leader, I think it is quite relevant for me to say a few words about what has been done for the primary producer. I am not trying to add support to my own colleagues but I believe it should be recognised that the Party was responsible for the reintroduction of the superphosphate bounty, and I think all members will realise this is desirable. Various improvements have been made: the nitrogenous fertiliser subsidy was reintroduced, and the wool price reserve scheme was increased from 206c to 284c a kilogram. Then there have been the underwriting of assistance to dairy farmers, the increase in the first advance on wheat by 20 per cent, the increase in the super allowance, the introduction of a national brucellosis and tuberculosis eradication scheme, compensation for affected cattle, the restructuring of the Meat Board, and so on. The list is without end, and I find it disturbing that the Federal Opposition Leader should condemn the Federal Government in that way. Country people are a breed of their own. Our own Minister of Transport has said:

Country people are a breed of their own. They are much closer to the realities of hard living. They still face, even in these modern times, at least some of the hardships that men like Edward John Eyre challenged and beat. And although in those times of drought bank managers may not agree, this is not necessarily a bad thing. Living on the land, or close to it, is good training for life itself. The land is a tough taskmaster, it demands hard work, and gives no quarter, allows very few mistakes and builds the type of people Australia needs.

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

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I wish to raise the matter of Ruthven Mansions in Pulteney Street and the Government's intention to demolish those buildings. The Government has recognised in the past, as has the Adelaide City Council, the need for a growth in inner city living and a need to encourage people to live in the city and near city areas so that the people who work in the city will not have to travel far to their places of work. There is a need for low-cost accommodation within the inner city area for those persons who have to live on the average wage. Near Pulteney Street there is a considerable labour-intensive area of occupation, in particular, Adelaide University, Royal Adelaide Hospital, and the shops and businesses associated with Rundle Mall. We must think seriously before we start knocking down old buildings that could supply low-cost accommodation.

I do not deny that at present the buildings look derelict. They are not attractive and, architecturally, may not be impressive, but they do exist. The Government asked the South Australian Housing Trust to carry out a survey to see whether the buildings could be developed as low-cost accommodation for the inner city area. The Housing Trust was carrying out that research, and it had reached the stage where it thought it was possible to carry out such a conversion, possibly for much less than it would cost to build new flats. Suddenly, out of the wilderness the Government requested the Housing Trust to produce the report within 48 hours. There was no time for the Housing Trust to reach any firm conclusions within 48 hours, because it was still in the process of collating detail and carrying out the necessary research to establish what

benefits for the future the building would have as low-cost accommodation.

If the buildings are to be demolished it would be possible to build new flats on the site, but the rent for the new flats would be high because it would be an expensive project. The building would be constructed in a time when our State is facing one of the largest, if not the largest, deficit it has faced in any fiscal year. Money is an important factor not only to the Government but also to the people likely to rent the accommodation that is made available. I say that the Housing Trust was not treated fairly or reasonably in asking it to produce the report within 48 hours. I hope the Government will reconsider the situation. If it argues that it has made the right decision, it should make the Housing Trust report available to this Parliament and so to the public. The Minister could make a Ministerial statement in the normal way, or he could table the report. If it is a verbal report, he can explain that that is the information given to him and for that reason he believes the Government has made the right decision. I believe at this stage it has made the wrong decision.

Dr. Eastick: Do you believe that the demolition of the abattoirs houses that is going on at the moment is good or bad?

Mr. EVANS: I do not believe that the demolition of 10 houses by Samcor is the best course to take, either. I know that Samcor has many houses there, some of which it has made available to its employees to be upgraded. Employees have been given material and have carried out some of the work themselves and, by this method, they have obtained possession, at a reasonable rent, of a suitable home, close to work, in which they can take pride, because they have helped in the restoration. Samcor has written to me saying that it will demolish 10 of these houses. They are not in bad condition, although I know that the council has placed a condemnation order on the buildings.

Because they are condemned by the council does not mean that they could not be restored; all it means is that, at that time, the buildings were unfit for human habitation. They could be restored. The cost of work on the walls, foundations and roofing could be high, but I am sure that there are young people in the community who, although perhaps not employed by Samcor, should be given the opportunity of taking over one of these properties. They could be told, "You can have it rent free for five or ten years if you restore it to a livable standard that would be accepted by the local authority and the health authority." I believe that there are young people in the community who have the necessary initiative, ability and determination to carry out the restoration work.

Would it not be better to say in a society, in which the cost of rental or purchase housing is beyond the reach of many people, "Here is a property. If you can restore it to the required standard, it is yours for five or 10 years rent free, after which you will start paying rent"? Such a proposal would not interfere with Samcor's operations. Samcor does not need to expand more in the area in which the houses are situated. The letter from Samcor states that it will use the iron and other materials from the buildings for fencing material and for other work around its works. For this Government, which claims that it is concerned for the underprivileged, for those who do not have much money, and for those who are genuine workers, this would be a great opportunity to say to 10 young couples, "Here are 10 properties. If you want to work on and develop them, you can do so, and you will benefit from doing so." I believe that the Government and Samcor should stand condemned for allowing these properties to be

demolished. If there are insufficient applications from among Samcor's workforce for the balance of the houses it has said it would like to see restored, others should be asked to apply for them. I believe that that would be a just and proper proposal.

Another area of concern relates to the South Australian Table Tennis Association, which had the use of a property, at Parkside, which was previously a picture theatre and which suddenly was bought by a private business interest that then found that it could not use the building for the purpose for which it wanted to use it. I believe that the premises are within or just outside your district, Mr. Speaker. The company made the premises available to another business interest which, I believe, has bought the property and has offered to lease it to the association at a high figure.

The property is unsuitable, because it does not possess car-parking facilities, and it is congested at certain times of the evening when people wish to park there in order to play competitive table tennis or to practise. The association requires a more suitable building. We have spent considerable money in other areas in order to help people in the community. Table tennis is a national indoor sport, and South Australia has one of the best juniors in the world and a woman competitor who is also well up in the Australian top bracket.

As many other young people wish to participate in the sport, I say to the responsible Minister, through his colleague in this Chamber, that the association needs a new centre. The association had a home, which it has lost, and is now without a home. The Government is responsible to help it, and I hope that it will take up the challenge and assist the association in training the young to learn a good healthy sport that has world recognition and offers wonderful opportunities.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I raise a matter that concerns one of this State's major primary industries, namely, the effects that the lucerne aphid is having in important parts of the State. About 950 000 hectares is sown to lucerne, of which about 140 000 ha consists of pure lucerne stands and about 810 000 ha of mixed stands. About 700 000 ha of our lucerne crop is located in the South-East. The infiltration of this alfalfa aphid is taking place throughout our lucerne stands, and the blue-green aphid surely will follow. This problem is causing considerable concern to primary producers, who have made a large contribution to the State's economy, both in producing lucerne seed and in relation to grazing.

In the Lower South-East, in the Coonapyn Downs (once the 90-mile desert), growers have been largely successful, because of the findings by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation. The soil there is light and sandy and, by the use of trace elements and the Hunter River type of lucerne (which is a deep-rooted legume), this area has been turned into an area of high productivity. Now, all of these landholders are facing up to the ravages caused by the alfalfa aphid.

The Minister (and I give him full marks) visited the area last week and was present at a well-attended meeting at Tintinara, in the district of the member for Mallee. Lucerne growers at the meeting were able to put their case to the Minister during the day, and field operations were carried out to show him what was taking place in this most valuable industry.

Mr. Keneally: Could you do with an interjection?

Mr. RODDA: The lucerne aphid could well do with an interjection or, as one of my late colleagues used to call it, an injection.

Mr. Venning: What's been the outcome of his visit?

Mr. RODDA: We must not take the hurdles too quickly. I had the privilege of being invited last week to the affected area, together with the Federal member (Mr. Porter), and we saw for ourselves the ravages being occasioned by the pest. I was amazed at the rapidity with which the lucerne aphid has penetrated into South Australia. The pest seems to have the peculiar characteristic that, when there is no feed about or when the good Lord cannot supply it, it sprouts wings and flies away to greener pastures out of sheer starvation.

Mr. Keneally: In ever-increasing circles?

Mr. RODDA: No. I was amazed to find at the weekend that it was even invading the lucerne stands in the hallowed ground near Struan.

The question of control must be looked at. The Agriculture and Fisheries Department has set up a station to produce predators known as the wasp, and these are parasitic vectors, I am reminded. However, this will be a slow process. The alternative is spraying. It seems from what we saw last weekend that spraying is advantageous and helpful on irrigated stands. However, if we are to have the parasitic wasp, that will be killed, too, by the spray. It seems from the practicalities of the matter that once the wasp is established it will survive in the banks and in the areas not sprayed, and then spread its benign influence on the infestation after the effect of the spray has worn off. We were told that the spray seems to be effective for only up to 14 days.

Mr. Venning: How many times do you have to spray?

Mr. RODDA: The Hunter River lucerne variety has a growing period of eight months in the year.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: What is the life cycle of the insect?

Mr. RODDA: I presume the Minister is referring to the pest. It seems to be bisexual and, if he has had any experience of bisexuality, the Minister will know that all sorts of things can happen. The major thing is that they reproduce rapidly. The pest seems to be everywhere throughout the lucerne-growing areas of the State. It is probably one of the greatest problems we have had in agriculture in this country.

An aphid-resistant strain of lucerne must be developed. That can be produced, although it will take time for it to be produced in any quantity. We must also have production of the wasp, the predator that attacks the aphid, but again that will take time. The Government would help the situation if, rather than having independent graziers coming down, it ran a courier service to deliver the parasites to the infected areas, as well as running an assisted spray programme. The cost of spraying is about \$2.50 a hectare, and the spray is effective for only about 14 days, so there must be selective spraying to hold a minimum area of lucerne stands.

From my observations as a practising farmer, we are going through a bad year. With the return of normal years, it will be interesting to see the effect of the pest when plants are able to make normal growth. For the preservation of existing stands, spraying is the quick and immediate answer. We must have the production of the new cultivars, the aphid-resistant cultivars, and those strains of lucerne, and the cultivation and spreading of the aphid wasp. Those things will be essential. It will be interesting to see what other plants will be affected by the pest. Undoubtedly we will see inroads into the wonderful clover pastures that, in normal years, make such a contribution to the primary production of the area.

I shall be pleased if the Minister will study my comments and follow up his visit last week to the honourable member's district with close discussions with his officers and liaison with people in the honourable member's area.

I am sure they will give him all the co-operation he is looking for.

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

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): Mr. Speaker, you will know from the comments made in this House this afternoon, if you did not know already, that the situation in the rural areas of the State is far from being what we should like it to be. The North is an area subject to shortages of rain and naturally we look to the South-East to help us out at a time of drought. To hear the member for Victoria talk about the problems there is very distressing to the rural community, the agricultural people of the State; we are finding it difficult today to take any tricks at all.

As a country member, I am well aware of the problems of my area. I came down to the city last night through a dust storm almost from the time I left Crystal Brook until I got near to Adelaide, with my lights on. I saw the environment of the city, the Festival Theatre, the bright lights, and the people going to the Festival Theatre, and I thought, "What a contrast city life is with the country!" I am amazed that anybody would stay in the country.

We read of the Premier saying that he intends to pour more money into the Festival Theatre to overcome its financial problems. I recall the night that the Premier officially opened the Festival Theatre. He said he did not expect the patrons of the theatre to pay the way of that theatre—that is, that the general taxpayer in the State would be called upon to make up the deficit there. City people can avail themselves of the programmes there, but I have some sympathy for the country people who find it difficult to get here and who could ill afford to go to the theatre even if they were here. It grieves me considerably that the people who are supposed to be the backbone of the country, producing the wherewithal to live, should be in diabolical straits regarding their existence and activities in the country areas.

I listened to the member for Flinders this afternoon outlining the problems of the people in his area, and also to the member for Victoria. In my own area, the past year would have been one of the worst seasons on record: stock is practically nil, the country is still drifting away and it will not be until there is a change in the season that this will stop. It is hoped that when the time arrives for a change in the season (I suggest at the end of March) if it does not happen in the normal way and there is not a good break in the season, we should get in touch with none other than Bjelke-Petersen to come here and pray for rain in the State. The problem is, however, that Bjelke-Petersen does not know when to stop, but I would not mind getting him down a second time to get him to turn the tap off. We are looking for good rain and an early break in the season. Supplies of fodder are now depleted throughout the State, and rain will give a boost again to those people living in the rural areas.

The State's deficit of \$26 000 000, as outlined by the Premier, grieves me no end, when I remember his comments on the selling of our non-metropolitan railways to the Commonwealth. He talked about their being worth \$600 000 000. We know it got down to a book figure for that year of about \$10 000 000, but he still says that overall the value of the sale was worth about \$600 000 000, and we know that, when the business was negotiated to sell those non-metropolitan railways to the Commonwealth, the losses on our State railways then totalled somewhere between \$30 000 000 and \$40 000 000 a year; so if we take only the non-metropolitan lines, we could at least believe that the losses would be about \$30 000 000 a year.

Although we have disposed of our railways, the deficit is still \$26 000 000. If we had held on to the railways, that deficit would have been \$56 000 000, which would have been an all-time record.

I refer now to a report which was written by this State's Minister of Agriculture and which appeared in the *Stock Journal* last August. The Minister's wife was also a contributor to the report, part of which I should like to read. It is disturbing for me, representing a rural district, to see reports such as this of statements made by our Minister of Agriculture. The report, headed "Rural Australia: Is it worth preserving?", states:

Few urban Australians want to or can afford to preserve the present farming way of life that is largely anachronistic and benefits only a small minority of farmers who are very wealthy, according to the Minister of Agriculture.

That shows how little our present Minister knows about the present position in which the farming community finds itself. The report continues:

Writing in the . . . magazine, Mr. Chatterton and his wife and former research assistant, Lynne Arnold, also claim that what is an "economically viable agriculture" also brings out conflicting attitudes between farmers and rationalists. In pushing for what they see as a viable rural economy, farmers reinforce emotion with political muscle . . .

That is a good term. True, we have not got unions among members of the rural community, but we do have United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia, Incorporated. It is an organisation.

Mr. Keneally: It's a union.

Mr. VENNING: It is not.

Mr. Keneally: Of course it is, and it said it was going to take strike action.

Mr. VENNING: There is no compulsion for one to be a member of it. If one wants to join it, one can do so and, if one wants to join the Stockowners Association, one can do that, too. However, there is no compulsory unionism such as that which applies to the work force throughout the country and which, through its strength, forces its desires on the people. I return to the report from the *Stock Journal* written by the Minister of Agriculture, in which he condemned the rural community because, he said, it reinforced emotion with political muscle to achieve what it called "the preservation of economic justice". The report continues:

The continual, emotional slogan of farmers, their organisations and their very own political Parties is "Do we want a rural Australia; if so, then we must pay for it." Most of us would agree that we do want a rural Australia, but not necessarily as it is now. Nor do we consider that we should pay for the rural Australia of today with its incessant demand for subsidies and support.

What a lot of rubbish! I refer, for example, to the common loaf of bread, the staff of life, which is sold in most shops for 53c. In producing the commodity for that loaf of bread, the farmer must make his investment, and pay rates and taxes and succession duties on his land. There would be about 12c worth of wheat in each loaf, although the street value of that bread today is 53c. One should examine that matter and see where in our economy the problem lies. The man on the land cannot be blamed.

Mr. Keneally: If you made a loaf of bread, you could sell it for 53c.

Mr. VENNING: We are farmers and we wish to stick to producing the commodity for bread. We could do the lot, and we could eat it, too, if it came to that. I know, however, that we must think about the people who eat our commodity; we have always done so. I remember a gentleman named Jack Maycock.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time

has expired.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Services and Supply, \$400 000.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Treasurer say how many new positions have been created in this department this financial year that were not covered in the Budget?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I have not got the precise number, but I will obtain it for the Leader.

Line passed.

Corporate Affairs, \$533 000.

Mr. TONKIN: I thank the Premier for his remarks regarding the preceding line. I shall be interested to have the same information regarding this department. It is becoming clear that the State deficit, which this year will be about \$26 000 000, could have been \$36 000 000 had it not been for the control of inflation and the success of the wage indexation scheme. Obviously, there must be some reason for these tremendous increases, and the only one that really comes through is that a number of appointments have been made to the Public Service since July 1 last year that were not taken into account when the Appropriation Act (No. 2) of 1977 was considered. For that reason, I am concerned to know what has been the increase in the Public Service, and therefore in the sums allocated in each of these lines, since July 1.

We are probably dealing here with a sum of \$1 000 000 or \$2 000 000 and, rather than my getting up in relation to each line, I should like the Premier to tell me how many people have been appointed to the Public Service, how many increases have been granted, and how many new positions have been created in the Public Service since July 1. I do not want necessarily to know exactly what the positions are, although I should certainly like to know how much money is involved in each instance. In introducing this Bill, the Premier spoke at length about the probable deficit. It seems to me that it is sheer good fortune that the deficit is not bigger than it would otherwise have been had it not been for the control of inflation.

For that reason, we obviously want to know exactly what is the score relating to the Public Service. We want to know particularly what economies are being made, or being contemplated, so that the deficit can, if possible, be minimised.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get that information for the honourable member. The position as to the figures in the Public Service was, I thought, dealt with in the reply to a Question on Notice today.

Dr. Eastick: A 3.5 per cent increase.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: But the specific numbers have also been given in reply to Questions on Notice. I will undertake to get that information for the honourable member on each of these lines in the Estimates. I point out to the honourable member that this particular item is marked with an asterisk and the footnote relating to that asterisk states:

Previously provided under IV, Attorney-General and Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs—Law Department, and Department of Public and Consumer Affairs.

A number of these figures are, in fact, simple transfers from amounts that have already been passed. I have noticed that the Leader has on several occasions referred to a possible deficit of \$36 000 000. I point out to him that, if in fact we had the inflationary figure originally anticipated, there would not have been a deficit of \$36 000 000, because the inflationary figure itself would have provided increased returns to the Government. There are a number of offsets in that position and, in fact,

the difference in deficit would not have been much more than 1 per cent.

Mr. TONKIN: I thank the Premier again. He has failed to convince me totally that, despite the increase that might come through increased receipts, the deficit might not have been as great as that. I recognise that he will do anything at all to deny credit to the Federal Government—indeed, he wants to lay blame at the feet of the Federal Government at every opportunity.

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier state the time of implementation of the new Corporate Affairs Department and say whether the creation of the new laws involving white collar crime, the investigation of which is to become an integral part of the activities of that branch, is likely to be before Parliament before we complete the present session? I appreciate that an educational programme is already taking place in the community. I think the name of the gentleman who is likely to be the Director of the department is John Stuan.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No.

Dr. EASTICK: He is an officer who has undertaken much background work in the type of work the department will be undertaking, and he has reported to the Government. He is in the employ of the Government and has spoken publicly about the proposed approach by the Government to white collar crime to ensure that the public is safeguarded. I believe that, in the absence of notification by the Government of its intentions, it would be advisable for members to know whether the money being appropriated will be spent on past activities of the department or whether it is to be directed into the proposed new activity of the department.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is to cover the whole of the activities of the Corporate Affairs Department, which will incorporate parts of existing branches and existing departments. It will take on the responsibilities of the Corporate Affairs Department, similar to those of the corporate affairs commissions which exist in some other States. This will deal with company and corporate frauds and the like, as well as the whole area of the administration of corporate law. Obviously, some of this money goes to the existing activities, and some to the new activities that will be taken on. I do not anticipate that the contemplated new uniform company law provisions will be before the Parliament this session, because I do not anticipate that there will be agreement in time for that to take place. Perhaps these questions can be directed to the Attorney-General.

Dr. EASTICK: I believe that already a number of public statements have been made by the Minister's Department about the urgent need for legislation and for a department that will appropriately deal with white collar crime. I suggested to the Premier that although I believed it was a Mr. John Stuan, or a person with a similar name, who has undertaken much of this public work, I would appreciate details from the Minister about when it is intended that the new corporate affairs arrangement within the department will be effective and what legislative programme is necessary before it can be completed?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs): The Corporate Affairs Department has been set up, and Mr. John Sulan has been appointed acting head. He is working extremely well in rather difficult circumstances at the moment because the department is spread, geographically, around the city. We are proposing to bring the department branches together in the Grenfell Centre in about the middle of this year.

I make clear to the House, as I think I did previously, that the department is being set up simply as an interim step until such time as we can introduce legislation for the

establishment of a corporate affairs commission to fit in with the national proposals. I imagine that that legislation will be introduced in the near future.

I am endeavouring to get the legislation prepared for introduction during the current session. However, it is a complicated piece of legislation, as honourable members will appreciate, and we are not making the progress I had hoped, and it may therefore not be until the July session that we are able to introduce it. The scope of the legislation covers not only the establishment of the Corporate Affairs Commission but also the question of white collar crime that the honourable member was mentioning. It also contains many amendments to the Companies Act in this State that are necessary to bring that Act into line with the corporate affairs legislation in New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and Western Australia, and to provide necessary amendments to update that legislation to deal with numerous anomalies in the existing legislation which have become apparent.

Mr. ALLISON: Does the Minister foresee any difficulty about getting officers of his department trained, either nationally or internationally, in the intricacies of computer technology, bearing in mind that many corporate crimes and frauds committed now seem to involve the use of sophisticated computers? I understand that Australia generally has insufficient highly trained experts in this field.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I agree that there are few experts in this area in Australia, both those committing the frauds and those policing such matters. It may be necessary to have officers trained overseas to cope with this problem. At this stage, mercifully, the honourable member is not quite correct: most of the corporate crime committed in Australia has not involved the use of computers. I know of only one instance in which a computer was used in the commission of a fraud. Most of the references to computer crime that the honourable member would have seen have related to the United States and Europe. We have not had this problem yet but, inevitably, it is coming and we must start planning and preparing for it. Because of that, an officer of my department is undertaking specialist studies in computer technology this year.

Line passed.

Law, \$400 000.

Mr. TONKIN: I am not certain whether this is the appropriate line to refer to magistrates. Do magistrates come under the Premier's Department? Unfortunately, I would be out of order if I asked whether there was any prospect of magistrates being taken out of the Public Service and put in a separate category, would I?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, the Leader would be.

Mr. BECKER: Regarding the provision for printing and publishing *Hansard*, there is an increase of about 55 per cent. I appreciate the statement reported at page 1743 of *Hansard* that insufficient provision was made in October for trainee court and Parliamentary reporters who commenced courses this year, and that, since the costs of printing and publishing *Hansard* are above estimated costs, the provision for contingencies also needs to be increased. I should like to know how many trainee reporters have been taken on. Further, can the Minister give the reason for such a large increase in the provision for printing and publishing *Hansard*?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I have not particulars of the numbers of additional trainees with me but, if the honourable member is interested in the matter, I will be pleased to give him a copy of a report on it.

Line passed.

Treasury, \$200 000.

Mr. TONKIN: In the remission of stamp duty on the purchase of new homes, there is to be another \$200 000, and I understand that that is the provision for the conveyances accepted before December 23 and settled before March 31, so that the people concerned may qualify for the concession now applied. My question really relates to the prospect that this situation will continue and to whether any consideration has been given to continuing what I think is a well worthwhile scheme. At the most recent State election, the Liberal Party had a permanent scheme of waiving a certain proportion of the stamp duty on the purchase of a first residence.

To say that the scheme announced last year was a \$35 000 000 programme designed to assist the flagging building industry is an exaggeration inasmuch as that programme was largely in train or planned in any case. However, it made good reading at the time. Basically, there is a need to help young people, especially under the present stringent financial conditions, to purchase new dwellings. I admit that the scheme has worked well. Indeed, I congratulate the Government on introducing it, but I should be more prepared to congratulate the Government if the Government continued the scheme and made a permanent feature of it, as was planned in Liberal Party policy.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The scheme was introduced after consultation with the building industry to try to move a number of houses to purchase within a limited period. The aim was to encourage people to purchase houses during that period, because the concession would be available only for that period: that was a whole part of the strategy. The strategy would have been destroyed if we had stated that we would take off the stamp duty for ever and a day because then there would not have been the motive to move those houses during a limited period. The Government considered this matter carefully but concluded that there was no point in simply continuing a concession that meant that there was no inducement for people to purchase before a particular date. That is not to say that we are not concerned to provide facilities for people to purchase houses more easily: we are. The Minister for Planning is involved in preparing plans for finance in the housing area in a way that will be of permanent benefit and, in our view, of much longer-term benefit than a simple stamp duty remission. In those circumstances, we do not intend to continue remissions of stamp duty indefinitely but in a way which I have outlined and which will be announced shortly.

Mr. TONKIN: Has the Government considered the waiving of stamp duty payments in those rather peculiar circumstances where people with strata titles have been operating as companies and wish to transfer them to strata title management?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have seen nothing over a long period. I cannot recall the matter being raised recently. I will inquire, but I am not aware of any submission on this matter.

Dr. EASTICK: The matter has been aired here this session. Only part of the problem has been referred to by the Leader. The company title requires that every person who holds one of the company shares agree to the transfer before there can be an effective movement to strata title, and some secretaries of some of the companies holding the right to vote on a number of these shares are not keen to see the management of the whole system go from their hands. They have stated that in letters.

It also means that inhabitants would not be able to say who their next-door neighbour was. However, no lending institution will allow funds towards the purchase of a

company title unit. Also, some people who refuse to consider a transfer from company to strata title fear it will now cost something. Perhaps the Government should consider this matter. I turn to another matter. Can the Premier say how many transfers were effected and what was the nature of the houses purchased during the period when stamp duty remission was available?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

Line passed.

Lands, \$350 000.

Mr. TONKIN: Can the Premier say whether the new equipment now being used in the Lands Department has been responsible for a reduction in staff in that department?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As I cannot give the Leader a reply immediately, I will get one for him.

Line passed.

Engineering and Water Supply, \$2 017 000.

Mr. TONKIN: This amount covers, among other things, additional costs resulting from the reallocation of staff from other activities: does it mean a reallocation within the Public Service, or is it a reallocation of weekly paid staff into Public Service positions?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not aware of any significant movement of weekly paid staff to Public Service positions, but I will obtain a report from the Minister.

Mr. TONKIN: Will it be necessary to alum dose the Millbrook and Mount Bold reservoirs again, pending the installation of the full water filtration plant? Further, how successful was that exercise, and is it likely to cause further expense because of the precipitation of considerable quantities of mud resulting from that process (that process being taken three weeks before the election campaign and following a public outcry over the quality of the water)?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not had a recent report on this matter. The situation had arisen because of disturbance in the water that we had to pump from the Murray River. Water coming to us had an unusually high level of suspended solids, resulting from a disturbance upstream.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the Leader's comments about reallocation of staff. If it means a reallocation from different departments into the Engineering and Water Supply Department, Parliament should know about it, and so should the Premier. If this is occurring (and it has been mooted in the press), the Premier should have information available.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In my second reading explanation I said:

The decline in the amount of subdivisional activity has made it necessary to transfer staff usually engaged on reimbursement works—

that is, work that we do for subdivisional operators which is paid for by them and is not a charge on revenue—

to work involving dragging of sewers, maintenance of pumping stations, house connections and clearing choked sewer connections.

We have taken staff who were employed in this area from work paid for by outside people and put them on long-term work which is necessary for us to do, but on which we can properly employ them when there is a decline in subdivisional activity.

Mr. BECKER: What action has been taken to consolidate Engineering and Water Supply workshops? There seems to have been a staff reallocation: is the department saving money, and is the \$1 000 000 allocation connected with any cost-saving in the department?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot tell the honourable member what stage has been reached in the reorganisa-

tions of the workshops. I know that reorganisation is going on, particularly in relation to my own district and what has happened in the relocation on some work from the Kent Town workshops. I will ask my colleague to obtain details of it for the honourable member.

Line passed.

Public Buildings, \$600 000.

Mr. TONKIN: For some time the amount paid by the Government for rents, services, and so on, for accommodation has been considerable. This matter has been raised by the Opposition before. Can the Premier say whether any progress has been made on the new Government building that has been announced? When is it likely that we will be considering sums for the servicing of that new office block?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The new office block is going according to schedule, extremely well. If the Leader goes to the corner of Wakefield Street and Gawler Place—

Mr. Tonkin: I've seen the hole.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If he looks down the hole he will see that work is going apace.

Mr. VENNING: I am concerned about the regionalisation of the Public Buildings Department's depot away from Kadina, and next Thursday I am leading a deputation to the Minister of Works concerning that matter.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member's query is not in order on this line.

Line passed.

Education, \$3 250 000.

Mr. ALLISON: The \$3 250 000 increase in allocation to the Education Department is one of the smallest increases, 1.27 per cent. Has the Minister been particularly successful in any area of pruning in his department?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education): This figure arises from a balance between additional expenditure, which was necessary for teacher increments and other non-award increases, on the one hand, and actual savings that have occurred. There has been actual savings on the line of about \$2 000 000, an additional \$2 500 000 arising out of the difference between the salary paid to a teacher in his or her last year of teaching and the salary paid to a first-year teacher, and that amounts to \$4 500 000. Over and against that is \$7 750 000, which accounts for teacher increments, other non-award increases and additional payments to teachers resulting from an upgrading of their qualifications through receiving degrees or diplomas.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I point out to the member for Mount Gambier that not all Government departments are provided with moneys under the Supplementary Estimates. The Supplementary Estimates do not cover all Government departments; they cover those departments for which, in my view as Treasurer, it was appropriate to provide an extra appropriation. Other unders and overs are provided for within the normal public finance system, and the honourable member should not single out the amount for the Education Department and say that that contrasts with amounts provided for other departments. Many departments do not appear in the Supplementary Estimates at all.

Mr. ALLISON: I am interested in the education area because I am the Opposition spokesman in that area, and I was especially interested in this matter because the Minister has been under great pressure from both the teaching profession and the institute to provide additional teaching staff, and I was especially interested—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We've already done that far above the man-power estimate.

Mr. ALLISON: I realise that, but I wondered how we managed to work the oracle of having a 1.27 per cent

increase, which is the second lowest to the Lands Department, with a 1.13 per cent increase.

Line passed.

Further Education, \$1 200 000.

Mr. ALLISON: How effective has the self-supporting enrichment programme been in the Further Education Department?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out to the honourable member and to all honourable members that these lines are specific, and comments should be confined to the lines in the Estimates. However, I believe the honourable member's comments may be related to this line.

Mr. ALLISON: The self-supporting courses will considerably reduce salaries. Can the Minister indicate the extent of such a reduction?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It is not true to say that the enrichment courses have to be self-supporting, although it is true that there is an increase in the fees charged for such courses. What impact that will finally have on the figures depends on the current enrolment position, but I do not yet have that information for honourable members. The only specific information I sought from my department concerned enrolments, not for the enrichment area but for the apprenticeship area, which gave us problems last year. I will ascertain that information for the honourable member.

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister explain why under the further education umbrella some students undertaking full-time studies have been excluded from certain courses, such as music and gymnastics, in country areas? This seems to be an appropriate line on which to raise this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Although this is not a specific line, the Minister can answer if he wishes.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: This relates to the matter raised here last year about the future of enrichment courses and the ability of the colleges to run such courses. Two factors presently operate: one is that there has been a decline, in absolute terms, in apprenticeship course enrolments; and the other is that the increased fees will enable a greater capacity on the part of the department to make such courses available. If the honourable member provides me with specific instances I can have them investigated.

Mr. ALLISON: Has any special provision been made in the salaries and wages in connection with enrichment courses involving a high proportion of pensioners? For example, at Port Adelaide, or in an adjacent area, one or two specific classes with large numbers of pensioners have been singled out for removal from the curriculum. Whether a class is economic or not is obviously one criterion but, when there is a large number of pensioners involved, are any other criteria used to determine the establishment of a course?

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

Mr. ALLISON: Following the explanation I gave prior to the dinner adjournment, can the Minister of Education say whether special provision will be made in this line for enrichment classes that are predominantly pensioner classes?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The department is aware of the problem. In determining whether a particular class is viable at a particular college, this aspect would be taken into account, but there is no specific account taken of it in this line.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Minister assure the Committee that enrichment classes already established in country areas as well as in the metropolitan area will be

retained? Classes of the type mentioned have been conducted at Strathalbyn, Victor Harbor, and Kingscote, but advice was given that those classes would no longer be financed. For some reason, funds were found at the last minute, resulting in the classes being retained, but there was no statement about their permanency. Will this line ensure that those classes will be retained?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I cannot give a cast-iron guarantee in every instance. It will depend on the impact of the new fee structure and on the enrolments. There has been a marginal reduction in apprentice enrolments this year, enabling additional funds to be made available in the enrichment area. Some of these things have not yet been completely clarified. The enrichment area is, in a sense, a bottomless pit. What will assist is that, in the next budgetary exercise, the enrichment area will be a separate item within the departmental estimates, thereby enabling us to gauge the exact provision in the enrichment area. There will be no raids on that sum for use in vocational areas. I cannot give a cast-iron guarantee, but the additional finance is certainly helping.

Mr. GUNN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I understand there is a Standing Order prohibiting advertising or displays on the floor of the Chamber. I notice that the Premier is wearing a T-shirt associated with the Norwood Football Club. I understand that the Premier may be proud of being 100, and we can understand that he may be feeling that age, due to current happenings, but he should not be advertising that fact.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not uphold the point of order. If this rule were enforced rigidly, I would frequently have to ask honourable members to leave the Chamber.

Dr. EASTICK: The following is an extract from a letter forwarded to me from Manoora:

For a number of years we have had a class of dressmaking here at Manoora, run by the Department of Further Education. The fees have risen to \$31.20 a term, the teacher travelling to Manoora from Clare. The students who enrol at Clare receive free tuition. Why is the fee set so high for the smaller towns? Our class at Manoora has lapsed because of the extra money to pay.

The class at Manoora is recognised as a stream 6 enrichment whereas the class at Clare, which appears to be unknown to the people at Manoora, is a stream 2. Is the Minister satisfied that the variation existing between opportunities available in various districts has been adequately explained to the people? Is the misconception evident in the letter from which I have quoted occurring widely?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I thank the honourable member for drawing the matter to my attention. I do not think the matter has been sufficiently explained. The people need to understand the way in which we operate. I will take up the matter with the department.

Line passed.

Agriculture and Fisheries, \$600 000.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The Treasurer has said that the present three-year programme for controlling aphids is largely financed by State unemployment relief funds. The excellent work done at the Northfield Research Centre is a highly manual operation, involving the collection and analysis of specimens and the breeding of the trioxes wasp. Can the Minister say what is proposed from this point onwards to deal with the problem? It has been suggested that the SUR money will run out at the end of the month. Does the Government intend to maintain the programme at its present level, which is the optimum level? Further, does the Government intend to maintain the programme at its present level after the SUR funds run out? Has the Minister of Agriculture made strong representations to the

Federal Minister in charge of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation to ensure that every effort is being made to introduce the two other species of wasp which will be vital in the control of the spotted alfalfa aphid and the blue green aphid? Has every effort been made to speed up the activities of the C.S.I.R.O. to introduce these two wasps?

Can the Premier say whether the Minister of Agriculture has seriously considered the proposition put to him about 10 days ago, by growers at Tintinara, that, instead of the affected growers being required to go to Northfield to pick up the parasites, they could be delivered to certain points where the growers could collect them?

Finally, because an extensive lucerne breeding programme has been carried out at Northfield Research Centre and financed by the Australian Wool Board, a programme which I understand has been completed and has produced several new varieties of lucerne which have already been bred specifically for hard grazing and which have been proved to be resistant to spotted alfalfa aphid, does the Government intend, if funds are withdrawn by the Australian Wool Board, to continue this work? It is hoped that the new lucerne varieties will also resist other aphid infestation. Work on this programme has reached a critical stage since certain varieties have been bred to the point of commercial release.

It is fundamental, if we are to deal with this problem, that not only should we provide parasite vectors or predators and encourage the production and distribution of aphid resistant lucerne varieties but we must consider replacing the Hunter River lucerne plant with a strain that is resistant to spotted alfalfa aphid to enable the re-establishment of areas of the Upper South-East with a highly productive spotted alfalfa aphid resistant strain of lucerne. Mr. Kaehne, the lucerne breeder at the Northfield Research Centre, has told me that he has reached the termination of his present plant breeding work and it is now necessary to build up seed to enable the commercial distribution of seed, the first step being to get competent people to breed the mother seed for release for commercial production.

It will be 1980 before sufficient quantities of seed will be available for distribution to commercial producers. If anything should happen to the programme all the work in this regard could be set back. Really, my questions are threefold: will we continue the programme at its current level; have we made the utmost representation to the Commonwealth to ensure the introduction of other effective Californian wasps; and does the Government intend to maintain the lucerne breeding programme so that better strains of grazing lucerne than the Hunter River strain are released?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Regarding the first matter, I am not exactly certain of the point reached in the provision of funds for on-going work at Northfield. A periodic programme is submitted for further unemployment relief work. Funds have been allocated for spotted alfalfa aphid research at Waite Agricultural Institute. The money has been allocated for the continuation of the existing programme, monitoring and movement of population levels, the continuation of existing projects, the effectiveness of natural enemies and controlling aphid numbers.

Mr. Nankivell: I thought that was being done at Northfield.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The submission was made by the Waite Agricultural Institute. As far as I am aware, that programme is continuing. We do not expect that funds under the unemployment relief scheme will just run out. We are continuing to provide funds under that

scheme. Regarding the precise nature of the submission to the Federal Government, I will have to get a report for the honourable member from the Minister of Agriculture. I am not aware of the nature of his representations about the other two predators mentioned by the honourable member. I will also have to get a report about the distribution of the seed. Regarding vectors, I have seen a report on another matter arising from the Tintinara meeting but not on that score, so I will get a report for the honourable member.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Page 12 of the memorandum supporting the provision of this extended fund states that the Commonwealth Government has been asked to contribute \$185 000 to the fund. Apparently this request arose out of a recommendation by the Agricultural Council. What assurance does the Premier have that South Australia will receive that sum, and when is it expected that we will receive it? I do not recall, in matters raised so far, whether an indication was given that the South Australian Agriculture and Fisheries Department has determined whether aphids affect other than lucerne and medic pastures. Can the Premier obtain information from the Agriculture and Fisheries Department about whether any tests have been carried out to determine whether aphids affect subterranean, Mount Barker, Bacchus Marsh and Yarloop clovers, which constitute a large volume of the inside area pastures. The information would be useful, especially to growers in my area.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not had a reply from the Commonwealth Government yet that indicates that it is prepared to provide the money sought from it and recommended by Agricultural Council. I have no information about when I will receive a reply from the Commonwealth. I will follow up that matter to see whether I can get an indication for the honourable member. Regarding the other matters raised by the honourable member, obviously I do not have that information but I will seek it for him.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I notice in the Premier's explanation that additional casual workers have had to be employed to combat the higher incidence of fruit fly this year. On Saturday evening at a function in the Adelaide Hills concern was expressed to me that, if fruit fly infests the Hills area, the fruit industry in that part of the State and probably the whole of the State will virtually be finished because the fruit will be under restriction and could not be moved out of the State. I should like more detail about the extent of the fruit fly outbreak. I know that an outbreak occurred in the Payneham area, and that an earlier outbreak occurred in a commercial garden at Highbury, which is close to the fruitgrowing areas of the Adelaide Hills.

The fruitgrowers at that function were seeking an assurance that everything possible was being done to contain fruit fly. They expressed particular concern with regard to road blocks to prevent the entry of infected fruit into the State. I would appreciate any current information that would be of value to the growers.

Mr. Dean Brown: They were second or third-generation flies in the Payneham area. It was a well-established colony.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, and Payneham is close to their own area.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

Line passed.

Marine and Harbors, \$280 000.

Mr. CHAPMAN: This line proposes to provide funds to offset apparent increases associated with a higher level of terminal leave payments and other operating costs

involved in additional shipping movements. I point out that the major shipping involvement of the State Government is in the *Troubridge* operation. Whilst it has run at a small loss for several years, I agree that its scheduled trips have increased substantially, thus attracting higher salaries and wages.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: *Troubridge* is not chargeable to the Marine and Harbors Department, but to the Transport Department.

Mr. CHAPMAN: That is what I thought. What other shipping movements involve the Marine and Harbors Department in additional requirements?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There are movements in all the ports in South Australia from Thevenard to areas such as Port MacDonnell. In consequence, given the fact that there have been greater shipping movements involving vessels such as tankers, grain ships, and the like, that has accounted for the additional work we have had to do.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can I take it, therefore, that we will continue to appropriate more funds to cover these additional costs and not charge additional fees to the shipowners using these ports? One way or the other, one balances the account. There appears to have been no increase in wharfage charges to offset the additional costs, but simply the provision of an additional amount.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There has been an increase in wharfage charges as well as in wharfage returns. Members have complained about the increase in wharfage charges in South Australia.

Mr. Chapman: Could you check up on the situation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In order to spend the money, we must have the appropriation. We have the money, but we simply need the authorisation to pay it, and that is what this line is.

Line passed.

Minister of Marine, Miscellaneous, \$350 000; Highways, \$320 000—passed.

Minister of Transport and Minister of Local Government, Miscellaneous, \$1 500 000.

Mr. RUSSACK: I seek information concerning advances and grants to the Mitcham Dogs Home, which is to be relocated at Lonsdale. Can the Minister say what are the conditions and over what period the \$200 000 loan will be repaid?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain that detail for the honourable member.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Government proposes to assist the relocation of the Mitcham Dogs Home with a \$100 000 grant and a \$200 000 loan. What will be the overall cost? As the home's premises at Belair are to be sold, how much is the sale likely to bring?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government): I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

Line passed.

Community Welfare, \$1 000 000.

Mr. WOTTON: Can the Minister provide me with a breakdown of the \$700 000 additional provision for supporting parents?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare): This line refers to payments to sole-supporting parents, both male and female. The amount provided for the full year originally in October last was \$6 200 000. A pro rata expenditure for the period to January 31, would have been \$3 616 000, whereas, in actual fact, the expenditure from July 1 to January 30 was \$4 274 000, which is an excess expenditure for the seven months of \$657 000. The \$700 000 is to cover increased anticipated expenditure under the line financial scale. There have been increases in the number of unmarried mothers from

about 300 to 350 and in children under private care for whom guardianship rates are paid from 375 to 525.

Secondly, increases in financial assistance rates came into effect in November, 1977, following increases in Commonwealth pension and benefit rates. Such increases occur at intervals, and require additional expenditure. That sum is not known beforehand. An estimate can be made but, until the increase occurs, the State pays the same rate as does the Commonwealth.

Line passed.

South Australian Health Commission and Hospitals Department, \$11 650 000.

Mr. MATHWIN: It has been stated that the additional allocation of \$3 650 000 for the Hospitals Department is to provide for increased charges for medical and surgical supplies, drugs, laundry and domestic charges. I take it that laundering is done by the Government Group Laundry and that the cost of running that laundry has increased, either because of wage or salary increases or for other reasons. What is the situation regarding the laundry, and will this affect all Government departments? Also, what increase is expected in the cost of running the laundry?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot state the precise sum, but I will try to get that information for the honourable member. However, he will be aware that there have, inevitably, been increases in costs because of the costs of materials and wages during the past year. In consequence, the costs that are charged by one instrumentality to another inevitably rise. Of course, laundry is only a small part of the total allocation. The amount sought is to provide for increased charges for medical and surgical supplies (the honourable member ought to know how costly they are), drugs, laundry and domestic charges, repairs and maintenance, rent, administration expenses, and pathology services. So, it covers a wide area of the costs to Government.

Mr. Mathwin: It's a large sum of money.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has large hospitals, and they are costly operations. I will inquire and try to get more detailed information for the honourable member regarding laundry charges.

Mr. BECKER: Will the Premier obtain for me a breakdown of the original Budget estimate and the current estimate for all areas, including drugs, pathology and so on referred to in his statement? Like other people, I am concerned at the increased cost of our hospital services, which are vital in South Australia. I note in the Treasurer's statement that, although this concerns the State Government, the Commonwealth Government is still going to meet half the net costs incurred.

Also, will the Hospitals Department or the new Health Commission bring down a report on whether they have examined the possibility of costing out each treatment? The big problem area in hospitals at present is, unfortunately, that of evaluating the cost of various treatments, be they for heart or appendicitis operations or, say, for the removal of a cartilage. It seems that one could put a figure on each of those treatments. Governments and Parliaments may soon have to decide whether health services should be examined in the light of the cost for each treatment, or whether we will have to take a moral decision and say that a person of a certain age does not warrant such expenditure for a certain treatment that may extend his life span for only a few months. Is the Health Commission or the Hospitals Department examining this matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course, the Health Commission is examining the problem of curative medicine compared to the necessity of our putting more

funds into preventive or social medicine. I do not know that it would be particularly meaningful for us to ask for a cost for each treatment, for that would not tell us terribly much. It is difficult, if we simply average out the cost to all patients, to say, "This is the cost for each treatment," because it does not tell us where the problem areas exist in costing. Much work has been done in this area of the problems of health costs, and I will try to get a report for the honourable member on that aspect, together with the detail for which he has asked regarding the line.

Dr. EASTICK: I believe that the Premier would accept that the \$8 000 000 to be made available as an advance to the South Australian Health Commission to cover delayed Medibank reimbursements from the Commonwealth will be recovered from the Commonwealth. There is no question that that money will be forthcoming, as the Commonwealth has always honoured its obligations in the past.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I wish I was as certain as you are on that matter. I have got no assurances from the Commonwealth Government yet.

Dr. EASTICK: In saying that, the Premier gives no indication of any sum that this State has failed to receive from the Commonwealth Government on pre-committed terms or arrangements. It is all very well for him to lash out at the Federal Government and say that there is some doubt about the matter.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: If you want an example, what about A.A.P.? They welshed on that.

Dr. EASTICK: I will not go into that matter, because there is another side altogether to that story. The withdrawal from the A.A.P. and the question mark over it commenced during the Whitlam-Hayden era. I return to the point that I made originally: that this \$8 000 000 will be received from the Commonwealth Government. The Premier has said in the documents that he would advance this money only if it was absolutely necessary. This \$8 000 000 is the increased deficit that the Premier sought to bring into the political arena when he introduced this Bill a week ago. In other words, the Government is trying to tell the people that this State is going into a greater deficit because of a possible failing of the Commonwealth Government. In fact, on receipt of that \$8 000 000 from the Commonwealth Government either before June 30 or immediately thereafter, the State Government will finish up with a deficit of the same proportion as that referred to in the Budget and Loan Estimates documents last October. It becomes patently obvious that the suggestion that taxes will have to be increased is based on a false premise and on the expenditure of money that is only contra-expenditure, anyway.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I wish the honourable member were right. It gives me no great joy to forecast having to increase taxes in South Australia in order to pay for existing services. If I did not have to do that I should be very pleased about it. I wish that the honourable member were able to assure me of the situation which he outlines but which unfortunately is not in accordance with my knowledge as Treasurer. There have been very many occasions when we have been assured of money by the Commonwealth but we have not got it.

Dr. Eastick: What are they?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Let me point to the announcement made by the Commonwealth at the very time it was withdrawing from the A.A.P. It said that we would be given, under the new formula, a sum in excess of \$90 000 000 extra between the States, which would cope with these withdrawals of the Commonwealth from special funding areas. We did not get a cent of that; we were

brought back to the formula level. All this vaunted extra money was to come in revenue, yet we were put back on the old Whitlam formula, and none of that extra money came to the State. That is just one example; I can give many more.

The Commonwealth, in its Budget, did not provide for the Commonwealth to meet what were its obligations under the arrangements regarding the agreed needed funding for hospitals in South Australia this year. I complained very bitterly at the time. I attacked it. I pointed out that this was not in accordance with the arrangement that we had specifically made at Premiers' Conference, and we have had no assurances, despite those protests, that we will get this money. Therefore, I have had to provide it. I wish I could be as certain as the honourable member is that we will be covered for it. I hope we are, but at this stage of proceedings, despite constant queries and requests, I have been given no assurance at all.

Mr. WOTTON: Recently I have had contact with Flinders Medical Centre and on a number of occasions concern has been expressed about future building programmes. Concern is also expressed about the need for more equipment to be installed there. Can either the Premier or the Minister look into the matter and let me know what is required under the present plan?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member will tell me the specific equipment he is talking about, I may be able to get a report for him. The Flinders Medical Centre is one of the best equipped medical centres in the world.

Mr. Wotton: I am not disputing that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Good. I am not aware of any dismay at Flinders Medical Centre. As things stand in the capital account of the State at the moment, given the general position of hospital facilities within the State, we are not in a position to proceed with phase 4 at Flinders in the immediate future. I know there are people at Flinders who would like to see that proceed, but we have to allot our priorities overall in a sensible fashion, given the constraints that we have. If the honourable member has a certain piece of equipment or reference to it about which concern has been raised with him and lets me have details, I will let him have a reply.

Line passed.

Minister of Health, Miscellaneous, \$1 350 000—passed.

Schedule passed.

Clauses 1 to 7 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:

Page 2, line 8 (clause 4)—After "office or place" insert "under a law of the Commonwealth, a State or Territory of the Commonwealth and".

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to. The amendment gives effect to the intentions of this House and is simply an explanatory amendment. I urge the Committee to accept it.

Motion carried.

APPRENTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 5, line 10 (clause 17)—Leave out the words "five hundred dollars" and insert "two hundred and fifty dollars".

No. 2. Page 5, lines 16 to 21 (clause 18)—Leave out subsection (2) and insert in lieu thereof the following subsection:

(2) The Commission shall not give an approval under subsection (1) of this section, unless it is satisfied that if the approval is given, the opportunities for persons, not being proposed mature-age apprentices, to be apprenticed in the relevant trade will not be unduly restricted.

No. 3. Page 5, line 26 (clause 19)—Leave out the words "five hundred dollars" and insert "two hundred and fifty dollars".

No. 4. Page 5, lines 28 and 29 (clause 20)—Leave out the words "Five hundred dollars" and insert "Two hundred and fifty dollars".

No. 5. Page 5, line 37 (clause 21)—Leave out the words "Five hundred dollars" and insert "Two hundred and fifty dollars".

No. 6. Page 5, line 40 (clause 22)—Leave out the words "five hundred dollars" and insert "two hundred and fifty dollars".

No. 7. Page 6, line 6 (clause 24)—Leave out the words "two hundred dollars" and insert "one hundred dollars".

No. 8. Page 6, lines 16 and 17 (clause 26)—Leave out the words "five hundred dollars" and insert "two hundred and fifty dollars".

No. 9. Page 6, line 24 (clause 28)—Leave out the words "five hundred dollars" and insert "two hundred and fifty dollars".

Amendment No. 1:

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

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

The Legislative Council has decided to amend the Bill in two areas, the first being to reduce the maximum fine proposed in the Bill from \$500 to \$250, and the second being to delete any reference to advisory trade committees having a say in the matter of mature-age apprentices. The Legislative Council's amendments to clauses 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26 and 28 reduce the amount of the fine from \$500 to \$250.

The existing Act provides for fines of up to \$100 and, apart from the penalty for breach of section 26b (that is, clause 19 of the Bill introduced in 1970), all other penalties in the remaining clauses were last increased in 1966, soon after the introduction of decimal currency. In the debate on the second reading, I told the House that increases of similar proportions had been approved by Parliament in the past year or so in other legislation that I administer as Minister of Labour and Industry. I gave some examples in that penalties in the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act and the Shop Trading Hours Act, although not the same, compared favourably with those proposed in this Bill. In any event, as members are aware, penalties in Acts are maximum amounts and it is up to the courts to determine what is appropriate, after hearing the evidence and taking all relevant matters into account. I think the last point is very valid. All that the Act would be doing is determining a maximum penalty on which the court could operate, but, after taking and hearing the evidence, the court still has the opportunity, if it so desires, to impose an appropriate penalty much below the ceiling in the Act. I do not think that that is unfair and, as the proposition is consistent with most penalties provided in other

legislation, particularly the legislation that I administer, I oppose the Legislative Council's amendment.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I support the amendment. I had the impression while the Minister was explaining his justification that he was very defensive and unsure of his ground. I had the distinct impression that he had gone to some lengths to scrape up arguments to justify his stand. The reason for that is clear, when we look at comparable increases in costs that have occurred since 1966. The increase that the entire community takes into account is the consumer price index, as the Minister realises. In 1966, the base was established in the consumer price index, so we simply take the current consumer price index and relate it to 100 in 1966. The base in 1977 was 242. As the base in 1966 was 100, the logical increase is from \$100 to \$250. The Minister cannot argue against that. He is trying to say that, for some inexplicable reason, there is a need to impose totally different maximum penalty standards for these breaches. The Minister has given no justification for increasing, on relative terms, the penalty that should be imposed and, until he does so, we should support the amendment. I so do.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 2:

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

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

This is the main amendment made by the Legislative Council. In my view, it relates to the real strength of the administration of the proposals put forward by the Government. The Legislative Council's proposal is to leave out subclause (2) of section 26aa and insert a new subclause (2), which has the effect of taking away any reference to the part that the Government wishes the advisory trade committees to play in the opportunities for mature-age apprentices to enter specific trades. The amendments, if passed, will place the responsibility on the Apprenticeship Commission, without giving the commission any opportunity to inform its mind by seeking advice from appropriately qualified and experienced people already working in any of the trades concerned. The amendment also proposes that no approval be given to the entry of mature-age apprentices unless the Apprenticeship Commission is satisfied that opportunities for those persons other than mature-age apprentices would not be unduly restricted. The Minister of Health, when debating this amendment in another place, said:

If this amendment is agreed to, advisory trade committees will have no jurisdiction over the entry of mature-age apprentices into any trade. This is a totally unrealistic attitude to be taken by the honourable member [that is, Hon. D. Laidlaw], who prides himself on his experience in industry. Surely he must realise that all worthwhile committees (and the Apprenticeship Commission is one) must necessarily rely upon advice in areas where some specialisation is evident. It is therefore most important that the advisory trade committees which are comprised of persons actually working in the trades concerned give advice to the Apprenticeship Commission on this important matter of mature-age apprentices. It is quite unreal to cut them out in the way in which the honourable member wants.

I endorse the Minister's remarks in reply to the Hon. D. H. Laidlaw, because the section and the amendment does not assist the mature-age apprentices. In fact, it could very well act against their entry to any trade unless the Apprenticeship Commission can have the benefit of a view from the advisory trade committee for the trade concerned.

As well as that comment, it also seems to me that those in the other place do not really understand how the Apprenticeship Commission works. The amendment

requires the commission to be satisfied before it gives any approval. How can it be satisfied, unless it is in a position to inform its mind by recourse to practical and experienced people in the trade concerned? Obviously, it must rely upon the very advisory trade committees that Opposition members wish to delete. It is quite inappropriate to place responsibilities on members of the Apprenticeship Commission and not allow them to seek advice before making decisions.

I point out again that interstate experience in this matter does not show great numbers of adults moving into apprenticeships to the detriment of younger people. Surely that must be of some interest to members opposite, because, in some of the larger States, the very provisions that the Government wishes to place in the Act have been in operation for some considerable time, and surely we can benefit from the experience that has been gained over that time.

I cannot accept this amendment, because it cuts out any reference to the part that advisory trade committees must play in this very important matter of mature-age apprentices. The amendment also deprives the committee of any opportunity to advise the commission on the general question of entry into a trade by any person. I think it appropriate to remind the Committee that, in the debate on the second reading of this Bill, I gave an undertaking that the position of mature-age apprentices would be watched extremely closely in the first year of operation of the Bill. I have said that I believe that, in all things that we do, we ought to do them slowly and cautiously, with some thought to the matter.

Therefore, merely to open up the whole area of apprenticeships and at this stage to allow a flood of adult people to apply for apprenticeship training (which is what members opposite appear to be implying) would not help the current situation, which, irrespective of how we debate its cause, is drastic. I also said, and I repeat, that the Government would not tolerate the situation of refusal by trade committees for no apparent reason to allow adults to train if it occurred, but it has not occurred. I said that we would review the situation and make whatever amendments were necessary at the time. I reiterate that undertaking. I cannot see what the Opposition has to gain in moving the amendments it has moved. Surely it is not inappropriate to allow a settling-in period, particularly in the light of the undertakings that I have given. I therefore oppose the amendment.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I support the amendment. First, it is worth pointing out that it gives the safeguards to the only genuine fear one could have about this proposal to introduce mature age apprenticeships, that is, that introducing mature age apprentices may jeopardise the positions available for existing apprentices under the age of 19. The amendment safeguards that position, because the commission will decide whether or not there shall be mature age apprentices. Requiring the unanimous support of all members, no longer do we have democratic rule. I cannot accept that.

Secondly, the Minister's proposal will not guarantee mature age apprentices throughout industry. The Minister knows of trade unions that will not allow such apprentices in their trades: that is no secret. The Minister, by his original amendment to the Act, is allowing trade unions to continue that stand. He said that, if they continued to use that power, he would amend the Act in 12 months. Why give them the power which, if they use it, he will take away? That is not logical, and the Minister knows it.

The Minister is caught between certain groups at Trades Hall, and cannot do what he undertook to do through the press. The Minister argued why have an advisory committee if we take away the power of veto that stops the

introduction of mature age apprentices. The advisory committee is not there to lay down conditions, because that is the job of the Apprenticeship Commission. The committee is there to give advice to the commission as it can do under this provision.

After the recent State election the Minister gave an undertaking that South Australia, being one of the last States to do so, would remove the archaic restriction stipulating that no-one over the age of 19 could start an apprenticeship in South Australia. This incredible restriction has been criticised by trade unions, employees and employers; industry as a whole has rejected this concept. Now, after introducing legislation, the Minister is not prepared to honour his promise to provide for mature age apprentices, because he is giving any person on the advisory committee the power to veto approval within a particular trade. His undertaking has not been met. That is disgraceful, and I certainly support the Legislative Council's amendment.

Mrs. ADAMSON: I, too, support the amendment, because the Minister's arguments are totally inconsistent. He says that the Opposition would allow a flood of mature age apprentices, but then says that interstate experience indicates that barely 3 per cent of persons applying for apprenticeships are of mature age. If that is so, no harm can be done by this amendment: on the contrary, it ensures that no great harm will be done to apprentices, and its wording safeguards young people. The amendment would redress a situation that is potentially unjust, wrong, and based on thoroughly bad practice, namely, the situation arising under clause 18 (2) of the Bill.

It is extraordinary that a Labor Minister should be proposing a system of what is nothing more or less than blackballing. There is nothing to stop a malicious or cranky-minded member of the advisory committee (and I hope there is no such person on it) from preventing, through a personal whim, the appointment of a mature age apprentice in a particular trade. This situation should not be allowed, and it is intolerable that the Minister should seek to allow it by introducing legislation that makes it possible.

The Legislative Council's amendment is just, sensible and reasonable, and I should think it would be welcomed by potential apprentices, apprentices and employers. The only people who have anything to fear from it are those who may be able to exercise their power of blackballing under clause 18 (2). Members should exercise their common sense and vote for the amendment.

Mr. TONKIN: I regard this as yet another instance of a broken promise by the Government. A promise was made within a week after the recent State election, and made in response to the fact that the Liberal Party proposed that there should be mature age apprentices: it was a promise made obviously at that time with much discomfiture by the Minister, and he has now reneged on it. This situation does the Government no credit, but it is a perfect example of how this Government operates, as the people of South Australia are beginning to find out.

It makes a promise and then introduces measures or makes statements honouring that promise which amount to nothing. The Government should not waste its breath making these promises, because it does not intend to honour them. It is cheap politicking, and the people of South Australia have had enough. The more this sort of duplicity, trickery and disregard for moral values and truth is indulged in by the Government, the sooner it will be out on its ear. That cannot come too soon for me, for the Liberal Party, and I believe for an increasing number of people in this State.

This is not honest: it is absolutely dishonest, and there is

no other way to interpret it. I will give the Minister this much credit: he is obviously highly embarrassed by the whole exercise, and well he may be.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Nothing that has been said in the debate so far has influenced me to accept the amendment from another place.

Mr. Dean Brown: That's only because—

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Nothing has been said in this debate to convince me that the amendments from another place are correct, although they are supported by the member for Davenport and other honourable members opposite. I rise merely to dispute the Leader's statement that there is duplicity and dishonesty in this Bill. Both those statements are a fabrication of fact. What I said after the State election or at some stage certainly had nothing to do with any difficulty I was in at that time. In fact, I have been in little difficulty in my portfolio in the three years I have had it. Certainly, I have not been under any pressure from the other side of the House. I have stated that the Government would introduce legislation to allow adult apprentices to train in South Australia. The Liberal Party was in office for about 30 years in South Australia, but never attempted to change the position. Who is being honest or dishonest now? I accuse the Leader of being dishonest about this. The Leader talks with a forked tongue, suggesting that I am dishonest, but neither he nor any member of his Party has ever attempted to change the legislation.

Mr. Tonkin: Didn't you read my policy speech?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am talking about what has happened in this Chamber, and the Liberal Party has never made one genuine attempt to change the existing legislation.

Mr. Tonkin: Didn't you—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: This Bill is an honest attempt to break down a barrier that has existed for about 30 years. The only way that this honest attempt will fail will not involve this Chamber: it will be if members in another place do not accept the Bill when it goes back. The Government has kept its faith with the public and this Chamber in introducing a Bill that seeks to bring about real changes in the future, if the Liberals in this State allow it to do so.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Minister say when he adopted the principle of unanimous decisions involving any committee functioning under State legislation, any majority decision being inadequate? The Minister should answer this question, which involves the principle now before the Committee. The Minister is just too scared, too chicken and unable to answer the question, but I challenge him to do so.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I'm not answering the question.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: When has this Chamber adopted the principle in legislation that only a unanimous decision of a committee can be adopted? It is against the Government's policy on every other aspect but, because it is now convenient—

Mr. Tonkin: When things are different they are not the same!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: True. The Minister has thrown principle aside, and he has thrown his own beliefs and public statements aside and has introduced this measure for cheap political reasons to get him out of a spot down at Trades Hall. The Minister said he had not been convinced by what had been said this evening: we realise that he cannot change his mind, as he has instructions from Trades Hall. I challenge him to deny that he has not received instructions on this issue from Trades Hall. He has

received instructions, and we all know it.

Mr. TONKIN: I should have thought that the Minister, although he is so embarrassed to the point of being almost tongue-tied, would have at least tried to give an honest answer to the member for Davenport's question. I have been told repeatedly by proponents of Labor Party philosophy that the will of the majority must always prevail. I have been told that this is one of the fundamental differences between our philosophies. I have been told that, if 51 per cent of the population want something to be done one way, it must be done that way for everyone as far as the Labor Party is concerned.

So far as we are concerned, if the vote is in the ratio of 51:49, we will do things the way the 51 per cent want them done, but in such a way that the 49 per cent will be disadvantaged as little as possible. That is a fundamental precept of liberalism. The Minister belongs to a Party that has been proposing and living by the principle of one vote one value. The great democrat, the Premier, stands for one vote one value—the majority must always rule—but now we see what it is really worth.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Quieten down, will you!

Mr. TONKIN: If the Minister wants to go to sleep, he can go elsewhere. This is an important matter, and the Minister may find it funny, although I believe his discomfiture is the reason for his rather embarrassed hilarity. There is no question whatever that the fundamental principle that applies to all other precepts that the Labor Party sets down—that the majority rules—should be applied to this provision as suggested by the Legislative Council. The amendment provides for a majority decision and not that there should be in the hands of one person on a committee, a total and absolute black ban. Such a position is a total abrogation of the principles of democracy by the Labor Party, and it will be seen as such by the people of South Australia.

Mr. ALLISON: I am speaking on behalf of the people in the South-East who would like this Bill to be passed to allow for adult apprenticeship training, but without this unduly powerful influence being exercised by people who, by merely saying "No", can veto the whole thing. That is completely undemocratic, and reflects an act of cowardice by the Minister, who has not denied that he has received instructions from Trades Hall. He has been challenged by the shadow Minister of Labour and Industry to deny that, but the Minister has been unable or unwilling to meet the challenge, for fear of perjuring himself.

If one person can prevent adults who need apprenticeship training from getting such training, it is a gross act of injustice and completely undemocratic, and the Minister has not accepted that a simple majority decision should prevail in such a situation. Human rights are involved in this matter, and this is the sort of situation for which the Labor Party has always said it stands. It claims to stand for the working man, yet here we have working men deprived of the right to change from one line of industry to another, merely because many unionists are afraid of a possible intrusion into their own rights. It is an extremely protectionist attitude on the part of the Minister, who is simply acting for the Trades and Labor Council.

Mr. TONKIN: I repeat the challenge made by the member for Davenport: I challenge the Minister to say that he has not been instructed by Trades Hall to adopt the stand that he has adopted. He has received his instructions from Trades Hall, but I believe he should have the courage to stand up and say so, or deny it, if he wants. I challenge him to deny that he has received instructions from Trades Hall on this matter. I am certain that he has received such instructions one way or another, directly or indirectly. He can probably try to twist around this one, too.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (24)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan, Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Klunder, McRae, Olson, Payne, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright (teller).

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Simmons. No—Mr. Evans.

Majority of 6 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Amendments Nos. 3 to 9:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 3 to 9 be disagreed to.

I rely on my earlier submission regarding penalties to support my motion.

Mr. TONKIN: If the Minister is relying on anything he said earlier in defence of his motion, he is relying on a very weak reed. The penalties are far too great. Because the amendments made by the other place are more appropriate, I oppose the motion.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments was adopted:

Because the amendments adversely affect the Bill.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mrs. ADAMSON (Coles): I want to register a very strong protest at what has happened to what was once a wonderful opening to the Adelaide Festival of Arts, namely, Flower Day, and to express my disgust at the waste of public money which occurred in Adelaide last Friday. An article by Peter Ward in yesterday's *Australian* is headed "Flower rite all wrong, says Antonio". The article states:

Flower day at the Adelaide Festival was a little wilted. "Wilted" puts it mildly, because, after what was supposed to be a year's effort and the expenditure of many thousands of dollars, the chief designer of the project stomped out and left it in a state of disarray. When we compare what happened in Adelaide last Friday with what used to happen in Adelaide, when Flower Day was the province of honorary committees that worked voluntarily to make this city look truly beautiful, giving pleasure to the inhabitants, especially the old and the young, we find that under the auspices of Antonio Miralda the whole thing turned out to be a flop. Let me describe what kind of a flop it was. The article states:

Flower masks, model bees, a "ritual feast" at Pennington Gardens of fruit juices, bright yellow bread spread with honey, and cauliflowers dyed red, blue and green, set the culinary mood.

According to one of the committee members, you cannot really describe what happened; you had to be there to experience it. I quite believe that. The article also states:

There was a "giving of gifts" during which people "worked, talked together and emanated joy", as an organiser described it.

But the onlookers felt differently. The article also states:

It was not a unanimous verdict. "The flower power turned

very sour," said one observer. "It would be hard to find a more irrelevant and cloyingly twee opening to what is supposed to be a major international arts festival."

The point of the complaint is that large sums of public money were spent on this big flop. When one considers how much was spent and what sums are withheld from organisations that could well use the money, one wonders just where the festival is going, particularly where some of the fringe events are going, and what control the Government should be exercising over public money and the way it is misspent. The Artistic Director of the festival simply said, "It's sad." It is worse than sad: it is disgraceful that thousands of dollars of public money should be virtually tipped to the winds, as happened when an aircraft spilt flower petals that misfired and, instead of going where they should have gone, drifted over the Memorial Drive tennis courts. There should have been a shrouding of balloons in order to disguise some of the objects that Miralda did not like, but we could not get enough balloons. About that matter, Mr. Steel said:

He was not cross. The decision was one of sorrow rather than anger.

I do not believe that that explanation is satisfactory for the citizens of Adelaide who know that it is their money that is being wasted and misspent. There are organisations in Adelaide that would be capable of running this event, but they were not given the opportunity. In years past honorary committees, mainly women's committees, transformed Adelaide, particularly North Terrace and Victoria Square, into a bower of beauty. For some reason or other the small allocations that they required from the Government to sustain their activities were not forthcoming, yet with this festival, a sum reputed to be about \$35 000 was absolutely wasted.

The organisers should be called to account for the way in which they have failed to exercise their responsibilities. The public response to appeals for flowers grown from the 100 000 free packets of seed distributed before the festival was poor, causing a shortage of blooms. Thousands of sunflowers that were planned to be used as back-up material were found to be unsuitable. What kind of organisation is that? A man is engaged and is supposed to spend a year planning a one-day event at considerable cost to the taxpayer, but when it comes to the event the organisation is found to be lacking, to say the least.

Not enough flowers were available to decorate the Elder Park rotunda as a giant cake, and the structure had to remain unadorned, except for some strips of coloured cloth. Height and wind conditions over which, I realise, the organisers could have had no control combined to send millions of rose petals dropped from light aircraft off target and, therefore, they were unseen by many of the spectators in Elder Park. Surely if a man spends a year organising an event it is reasonable to suppose that this kind of thing could have been predicted and an alternative procedure devised for distributing rose petals, if rose petals were necessary, for this kind of display.

Long delays caused large numbers of spectators to leave the flower rite early because they were disappointed at the apparent lack of activity. Early this week I read that schoolchildren were deeply disappointed that they were made to sit in the sun for great lengths of time and that they could see no result for the time and effort they had put into bringing flowers into Adelaide, supposedly to make the city beautiful.

It is not good enough that public money should be wasted in this way. It is time that the festival organisers revised many of the fringe aspects of the festival where public money is spent. The Government should be called to account on this matter of a year's effort being thrown

away and virtually wasted. It is quite outrageous that tens of thousands of dollars of public money should be spent in an effort to organise a flower rite which, as the newspapers reported, went all wrong and which could have been done in the past by honorary committees working for the sheer love of it and doing the job far more efficiently and effectively than the temperamental, paid organisers of an event which proved last Friday to be a flop and which will do no credit whatever to the Adelaide Festival of Arts.

Mr. BANNON (Ross Smith): I will grieve this evening on the way in which the conservative elements in this community, particularly those represented by the Liberal and National Parties in State and Federal Legislatures, seem intent on reversing what is a century-long trend towards having industrial matters dealt with by the industrial tribunals that have been set up in Australia. It is a system unique to Australia. We are a pathfinder and the leader in this area at State and Federal Government levels of this method of administering industrial relations in the country. There have been problems with industrial courts regarding matters such as fines on trade unions, and so on, but the most important aspect of our industrial relations is that we, in Australia, have conceived them as being something which must be looked to by experts, by people with backgrounds in industry, and as practising trade unionists who act as commissioners; and those backgrounds are specifically recognised in our State Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act—people who, in other words, are able to apply to this extremely sensitive and delicate area their special expertise, abilities and, most important, flexibilities.

Industrial relations is always a thorny issue. There are always difficulties, because there is a basic conflict that exists at the work face. There are ways in which to try to improve it. We have talked previously in the House many times about matters, such as industrial democracy, that are aimed at resolving many of the problems at the work face. When the conflict reaches the stage where it must be resolved, first, we try to negotiate between the parties, and then bring in a neutral umpire to apply remedies that suit the field of industrial relations. If we go somewhere else and try to use the ordinary common law or civil courts, we get into enormous problems.

Some of the greatest disputes we have had in this country recently have stemmed from the action of taking industrial disputes out of the industrial arena and putting them in the civil court jurisdiction. Currently, an extremely crucial dispute is going on. It has taken on the nature of a test case. There is no coincidence, I think, either in the locality or the major party involved from the employer's side. The locality is Queensland and the company is the giant international mining company, Utah, which operates in Australia as Utah Development Corporation. It has numerous side companies, offshoots and holding companies, most of which seem designed to minimise the taxation it must pay and get around some of the laws of Australia.

Taking, first, the State of Queensland, it is a pity in a way that this dispute between Utah and the Seamen's Union is taking place there because, for many years, Queensland was the one Australian State which had a provision in its Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act that specifically prevented industrial disputes from being removed from the industrial arena. No action in tort could be taken against unions or union officials, provided that they were in pursuit of a legitimate industrial dispute or industrial objective. That meant that disputes in Queensland were handled by those who were expert, and that is something that we are trying to achieve here in

South Australia.

It is the Government's policy to amend our Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act to do just that. Previous attempts have failed; they have been defeated by the Opposition in another place. No doubt they will be vigorously resisted in this session. It is a great pity that they are, because their arguments lack rationality in this area. As I said, in Queensland this immunity from tort jurisdiction meant, in effect, that industrial disputes were confined to the industrial arena. This applied since the 1920's and it was only two years ago that the Bjelke-Petersen Government got around, finally, to reversing it.

I think Mr. Bjelke-Petersen had probably been a bit tired and annoyed by people pointing out how advanced Queensland was in this respect, so he decided it had better get back to the reactionary fold by amending the section. He has done this and as a result there has been a spate of these actions, including the one which has been taking place involving Utah.

The second thing that is no coincidence (and I am not commenting on the merits of the particular case, which would be to an extent *sub judice*, although it has been stood over in the Federal court), is that it is involving a company like Utah, a company which is of multinational scope and size and which in many ways represents the worst of those that come to help "develop" our country.

It is working in areas involving our natural assets. Its method of mining is one which involves strip mining; that is, bringing the largest possible machines to churn up the greatest possible amount of country at the cheapest possible price; to simply rip the landscape apart to produce at the greatest profit the coal that lies under it with very little consideration indeed for environmental factors and what it might leave behind. Because the company is controlled overseas it therefore requires that the vast proportion of the money it makes in this country is transmitted overseas. It is not a big employer; it employs some 3 000 Australians, which is not a large number in terms of the company's financial return. On February 11, 1978, it was reported that Utah, worldwide, had made \$158 000 000 profit in the year to December 31. Utah Mining Australia, the local member of the giant coal mining group, earned over \$16 000 000. That is a nice, handy profit. It is a very good profit even in terms of the capital employed to earn it. When one looks at the various interlocking interests and chains of companies that have been set up one sees that even that profit is probably understated considerably because there are all sorts of savings, accrued dividends, and amounts supposedly ploughed back into further development that are not stated in a year-by-year profit.

The financial benefits being gained by this company for operating in Australia are absolutely huge. Against that we are urged to accept the contribution it is making to Australia's development. I have already referred to its operation, which is mainly involved in stripping as rapidly as possible the coal that is in Queensland and transporting it overseas. It is very lucrative. It does not do very much for employment in Australia. From the point of view of local ownership it does not do much by way of returning money and profits to be used in the further development of our country in other areas. That is a great pity, but the Government of Queensland welcomes that kind of activity.

Utah, in its current dispute with the Seamen's Union, has been completely uncompromising. All the Seamen's Union has been requesting, in basic terms, has been the right of some Australian participation in the shipping of this coal; that is, Australian manned ships, not cheapjack, low-wage flag vessels registered in places like Liberia with

no proper safety standards, or maritime or wage requirements of any decency. The Seamen's Union has taken action at that level to protect the work of its members, but it is also acting, I suggest, on behalf of the country as a whole, in attempting to preserve for Australia some kind of equity in the development that is taking place. That has been resisted all along the way by this company fighting what is essentially an industrial dispute through the courts to the very High Court itself in an attempt to ensure that the Seamen's Union is broken by the dispute, and that, in turn, those unions that support it are also broken.

That company's actions are severely disruptive of our industrial relations and will be severely disruptive of our total economy. The price we are paying for giant corporations like Utah coming here with their alien methods is far too high. We should try to find the development capital from our own resources and keep it firmly in our own hands. That is the sort of thing that the Seamen's Union and unions generally are fighting for, and we in this House should give it every support.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): In 1976, when finally members of this House and of another place addressed themselves to the important issue of a country fire service and the creation of a new Country Fires Act, all members lauded the work being done by what was then known as Emergency Fire Services, and the Government indicated its genuine support for the Country Fire Service of the future, recognising, it said, that it was an important community effort in an area where there was a potentially grave danger of a tremendous loss of property, livestock and human life.

How genuine the Government and more particularly the Minister of Agriculture were in that issue is highlighted in a report headed "Fire experts quit over pay clash" in the *Advertiser* of February 23. The lead sentence of the report, by the *Advertiser's* rural affairs editor, Mr. Jim McCarter, was as follows:

The Country Fire Service has lost the services of four highly-qualified officers because it cannot offer them permanent positions at a definite salary.

Later, the report continues:

It is unable to finalise salaries and conditions for staff because of a clash with the Public Service Board on who should determine these factors.

I refer now to the Country Fires Act, section 18 of which comes under Division II, relating to officers of the board. It provides (I will read it all, because it is important):

- (1) There shall be a Director of Country Fire Services.
- (2) The Director shall be a person of wide knowledge of, and experience in, fire-fighting appointed by the board with the approval of the Minister.
- (3) The Director shall be the chief executive officer of the board.
- (4) The board may, with the approval of the Minister, appoint such other officers as it considers necessary or expedient for the proper administration of this Act.
- (5) An officer of the board is not, in his capacity as such, subject to the Public Service Act, 1967-1975.
- (6) The board may, with the approval of the Minister administering any department of the Public Service of the State, upon terms mutually arranged, make use of the services of any officer or use any plant, equipment or premises of that department.
- (7) The terms and conditions upon which the Director or any other officer holds office shall be determined by the board with the approval of the Minister.

The board, acting in good faith and on that direction, made recommendations to the Minister in relation to

staffing and to pay and conditions. It is clear, from the evidence of the *Advertiser* report to which I have referred and a report headed "Problems with fire service staff" on the front page of the February, 1978, issue of the *Farmer and Grazier*, that the Minister backed away from the support that he should have given to that responsible board and, indeed, passed the matter over to the Public Service Board. It is the intrusion of that board into this critical local matter (I say "local" in relation to country fire services) that has created the difficulty mentioned in the reports to which I have referred.

I have today received a letter from the Secretary of the Lower North Fire Fighting Association, which is affiliated with the District Councils of Balaklava, Eudunda, Freeling, Kapunda, Mallala, Mudla Wirra, Munno Para, Owen, Riverton, Saddleworth and Auburn, and Salisbury, very important areas in the Lower Mid North of the State. In that area, there is much home development, as well as normal agricultural pursuits, and the services of an effective and efficient country fire service are appreciated by all members of the community. Those services are important for the people there. The letter to which I have referred, which is a copy of one sent to the Minister of Agriculture, states:

Following a meeting of the Executive of the Lower North Fire Fighting Association, specifically called to discuss the delay in the appointment of staff to the Country Fire Service, I have been instructed to correspond with you expressing this concern, and bring to your attention the following information. The Country Fires Act, section 18, outlines the power of the Country Fire Services Board to appoint the Director and other officers of Country Fire Services. In particular, section 18 (4) states: "The board may, with the approval of the Minister appoint such other officers as it considers necessary or expedient for the proper administration of this Act." Section 18 (7) states: "The terms and conditions upon which the Director or any other officer holds office shall be determined by the board with the approval of the Minister."

The Country Fire Services Board has determined the various personnel it considers necessary for its operations. It has set the conditions of employment and salaries it considers appropriate and sought approval of its decisions from the Minister. The Country Fire Services Board sought the assistance of the Public Service Board, on your advice, and after a long delay an incomplete and unsatisfactory reply was received. The Public Service Board vetoed the decisions of the Country Fire Services Board, eliminating some positions, substituting others and reducing salaries, and presented the Country Fire Services Board with an opinion from the Crown Solicitor that it has the sole power of making these appointments and setting salaries.

That seems to be in complete conflict with the provisions of the Country Fires Act, 1976, that I have read. The letter continues:

The result of this indecision and delay is that four of the staff who had been many years with the Bushfire Research Committee have resigned and three of the five field officers with C.F.S. Headquarters, out of concern for their personal future, have had interviews for employment outside of C.F.S. The board is now in the position of not being able to cope with the work previously carried out by the Emergency Fire Service. The Country Fire Services Board passed a resolution on February 14, 1978, "That the Country Fire Services Board rejects the right of the Public Service Board to set the conditions of employment and the salaries of the employees of the Country Fire Services Board."

This inactivity in the appointment of staff to the newly-formed Country Fire Service is placing in jeopardy the efficiency of an essential service and causing the possibility of the loss of field staff of many years experience within the Emergency Fire Service. It is the opinion of the Lower North Fire Fighting Association that this matter must be resolved quickly and that appointments to the Country Fire Service must be made without further delay.

The Country Fire Services Act states that these appointments are to be made by the Country Fire Services Board with the approval of the Minister. The Country Fire Services Board has set up the positions it considers necessary and set the conditions and salaries it considers appropriate. In order that these positions may be filled, Ministerial approval is necessary.

We trust you will give this matter your urgent consideration and that approval will be forthcoming as quickly as possible to enable this important body to continue its role of administration and co-ordination of C.F.S. units throughout the State, thus maintaining the high standards of efficiency South Australia has come to expect from this important voluntary service.

The letter is signed by Mr. C. R. Hornsey, the Secretary of the Lower North Fire Fighting Association, and I completely endorse the attitude expressed in it. Earlier this evening I discussed the same matter with an executive of the Eyre Peninsula section of the Country Fire Services.

I find that that organisation's attitude is precisely the same: it is a commendable attitude and an obvious attitude by people who for years at no expense to this State have provided a community service of tremendous value to their fellow man. They are people who have accepted the changed role that is contingent on the acceptance of the new Act, and people who have gone out of their way to give the Government every assistance. The Minister of Agriculture has failed to uphold a case for these people.

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

Motion carried.

At 9.26 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, March 1, at 2 p.m.