

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, March 7, 1978

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

## DAIRY INDUSTRY ASSISTANCE (SPECIAL PROVISIONS) 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.

## PETITIONS: PETROL RESELLERS

Mr. **HARRISON** presented a petition signed by 51 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would reject any legislation that could cause petrol resellers to trade seven days a week until 9.30 p.m.

Mrs. **BYRNE** presented a similar petition signed by 34 residents of South Australia.

Mr. **WHITTEN** presented a similar petition signed by 65 residents of South Australia.

Mr. **BECKER** presented a similar petition signed by 50 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

## PETITIONS: MINORS BILL

Dr. **EASTICK** presented a petition signed by 96 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would reject any legislation that deprived parents of their rights and responsibilities in respect of the total health and welfare of their children.

Mrs. **ADAMSON** presented a similar petition signed by 200 residents of South Australia.

Mr. **BECKER** presented a similar petition signed by 93 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

## PETITION: BALHANNAH SHOPS

Mr. **WOTTON** presented a petition signed by 180 residents of Balhannah, praying that the House would urge the Minister for Planning to reject the proposal to erect a block of shops in Bridge Street, Balhannah.

Petition received.

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL VACANCY

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the minutes of the assembly of members of the two Houses for the election of a member of the Legislative Council to hold the place rendered vacant by the death of the Hon. Frank Jacques Potter.

Ordered that report be printed.

## QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following written answers to questions without notice and Questions on Notice, except Nos. 209, 362, 363, 366, 367, 369, 382 to

386, 388, 392, 396, 398 to 401, 408, 410, 411, 415, 416, 427 to 429, 435 to 439, and 441 be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

## Mr. STEPHEN WRIGHT

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

1. Did Mr. Stephen Wright have an accident when driving a land-rover motor vehicle, owned by the Government and normally used by officers of the Public Buildings Department in or about the month of July, 1977, and, if so—

- (a) where did such accident occur;
- (b) what was the precise date of such accident and at what time of the day or night did it occur;
- (c) was Mr. Wright alone in the vehicle at the time and, if not, who was with him;
- (d) for what purpose was Mr. Wright using the vehicle at the time and by whom had such use been authorised;
- (e) has it been determined what was the cause of the accident and who was responsible for it and, if so, what was that cause and who was responsible;
- (f) what damage was done to the vehicle;
- (g) has the vehicle been repaired and, if so, at what cost and who, if anyone, has paid for the repairs; and
- (h) what was Mr. Wright's position in the Premier's Department at the time?

2. Is it proposed to acquire a land-rover for use of officers of the Premier's Department and, if so, why and when?

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

1. No.
2. No.

## NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

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

1. When did the following senior officers with the National Parks and Wildlife Service resign and for what reasons did they resign:

- (a) Mr. John Smith;
- (b) Mr. Trevor Wood; and
- (c) Mr. Tim Fatchen?

2. What positions did each hold in the service?

3. Have these positions been filled and, if not, why not?

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

1. (a) Mr. John Smith resigned on December 2, 1977, to follow his profession as a forester.

(b) Mr. Trevor Wood did not resign but was promoted within the Public Service.

(c) Mr. Tim Fatchen's resignation is effective from March 13, 1978.

2. (a) Regional Superintendent (Central Region).

(b) Administrative Officer.

(c) Scientific Officer.

3. (a) No. Position is being re-advertised shortly.

(b) Yes.

(c) No. Resignation is not effective until March 13, 1978. Position to be advertised shortly.

## PREMIER'S STAFF

Mr. **DEAN BROWN** (on notice): In relation to terminal payments to K. Crease, A. Koh, and J. Templeton as

members of the Premier's staff—

(a) what was the amount of the terminal payment to each staff member;

(b) what was the itemised break-down of these amounts for each staff member;

(c) under what industrial award or conditions of employment was each staff member working immediately prior to their leaving and, on what dates did they move onto the award or conditions;

(d) did the Auditor-General question or query these terminal leave payments for any staff member and, if so, what was the nature of the questioning, what were the replies and for what staff members was it in relation to; and

(e) Will the Premier table any dockets, memoranda, or correspondence which passed between the Premier and the Auditor-General in relation to these payments and, if not, why not?

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

	\$
(a) K. Crease .....	7 008.40
A. Koh .....	5 449.18
J. Templeton .....	8 379.40
(b) K. Crease—	\$
Pro rata leave .....	2 084.80
12 weeks severance pay .....	4 923.60
	\$7 008.40
A. Koh—	\$
Pro rata leave .....	1 115.98
12 weeks severance pay .....	4 333.20
	\$5 449.18
J. Templeton—	\$
Pro rata leave .....	3 211.46
12 weeks severance pay .....	5 168.40
	\$ 8 379.86

(c) Journalist (Metropolitan Daily Newspapers) Award. It was approved in Cabinet on May 1, 1975, for the positions of Ministerial Officers Grades I, II and III to be equated with the A.J.A. award. The salary structure was approved to apply from the first pay period in March, 1975. (However, the award applied to Press Secretaries and the Research Assistant as members of the A.J.A. previously.)

(d) Yes. In regard to A. Koh and K. Crease, the question of eligibility for terminal severance pay was raised as to whether the persons concerned should not have worked out their three months notice. In answer, the Auditor-General was informed that Cabinet had decided that no member of a Minister's family should continue to work in his office, and in the case of Ms. Koh no suitable alternative was available. Her services were therefore terminated immediately.

In the case of Mr. Crease, it was pointed out to the Auditor-General that it would be most undesirable for a Ministerial officer in Mr. Crease's position to continue, when he had given notice of his intention to join the staff of a local media service. Mr. Crease's service was therefore terminated. The same principles of practice had occurred in a number of previous cases including that of Press Officer to the Leader of the Opposition.

(e) No. The Auditor-General's letter was marked confidential and the reply was accepted by the Auditor-General.

**CLELAND NATIONAL PARK**

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Were four men employed at Cleland National Park through the State Unemployment Relief Scheme, recently dismissed and, if so—

- (a) when;
- (b) why; and
- (c) have they since been reinstated, why, and where is each now working?

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

- (a) February 7, 1978.
- (b) Work force on this project was reduced by four because of shortage of funds.
- (c) Yes. On Ministerial instruction. One employee is working at Morialta, one at Hallett Cove, one at Belair, and one at Botanic Gardens.

**STATE UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF SCHEME**

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

1. How much money from the State Unemployment Relief Scheme has been allocated to the National Parks and Wildlife Division of the Environment Department?
2. How much of it has been spent?
3. How has it been spent?
4. Is the Government satisfied that none of it has been wasted?
5. If the Government is not so satisfied—
  - (a) what money has been wasted and how; and
  - (b) what action, if any, has been taken to prevent further waste?

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

1. \$762 146.
2. \$578 995.
3. Funds have been spent on the following:
 

Belair Recreation Park ..	Visitor facility, recreation area development, horse-riding trails, and golf course
Cleland .....	Development projects
Hallett Cove .....	Development projects
Morialta .....	Development projects
Para Wirra .....	Development projects
Naracoorte Caves .....	Development projects
Metropolitan Parks .....	Fire access tracks
Fort Glanville .....	Restoration
Alligator Gorge .....	Walking tracks
Beachport and Canunda ..	Improvements
Bool Lagoon .....	Waterfowl habitat
Kelly Hill Caves .....	Visitor access
Biological and visitor survey	
A.D.P. fauna permits system	
4. No.
5. (a) Minor wastage—application of labour.  
(b) Closer attention is being given to supervision.

**LABOUR FORCE**

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

1. Is the Premier satisfied that the numbers predicted for the South Australian labour force in 1986, as set out in table 4.6 on page 94 of *South Australian Development 1977*, are accurate?

2. Is the Premier satisfied that the figures in table 4.8 on page 95 of *South Australian Development 1977*, predicted for 1986, are accurate?

3. If he is satisfied with either or both, why is there a discrepancy between the figures in those two tables?

4. If he is not so satisfied, what inaccuracies are there?

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

1. The numbers given in table 4.6 as estimates of the South Australian labour force in 1986 are based on certain assumptions about future population growth and work force participation rates. The accuracy of these predictions cannot be guaranteed but are considered to represent reasonable assessments of the size of the future labour force.

2. The figures given in table 4.8 for South Australian industry sector employment in 1986 are based on extrapolations of past trends as determined from available statistics. As suggested in the text on page 94, these figures were intended to indicate only the direction of change and relative magnitude of future employment levels in the

various industry sectors assuming past trends continue. They are not precise forecasts of future employment levels.

3. Tables 4.6 and 4.8 were prepared for different purposes using different techniques. As table 4.8 was not intended as an accurate forecast, no attempt has been, or should be, made to reconcile the figures in that table with those in table 4.6.

4. See comments above.

**COUNTRY RAILWAYS**

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

1. What maintenance on the country railways has been carried out in each of the past five financial years (including this one)?

2. What has been the expenditure on such maintenance in each such year?

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

1.	To Date				
	1977-8	1976-7	1975-6	1974-5	1973-4
Sleepers placed in track (number) .....	88 564	168 836	102 743	72 401	127 229
Ballast placed in track (tonnes) .....	84 983	216 655	173 104	254 553	226 333
Track relayed (kilometres) .....	5·299	26·993	25·475	28·740	30·776
Track baseplated (kilometres) .....	13·096	37·833	26·703	33·560	32·905
2. Total Expenditure .....	\$5 263 667	9 136 266	6 634 872	6 121 172	4 999 329

**Mr. LANGCAKE**

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): What have been the duties of Mr. Langcake since his appointment as a Licensing Court magistrate?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Mr. Langcake has carried out judicial functions that are specified under the Licensing Act.

- (a) Prescribing drugs and advising of treatment methods.
- (b) Advising apiarists in hygiene management practices to complement the above.
- (c) Testing for disease-resistant strains of bees.
- (d) Prohibiting movement of bees from the infected area in the South-East to the north of the State to control further spread of the disease.

**STATE UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF SCHEME**

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Is it the policy of the Government that those employed under the State Unemployment Relief Scheme should join a trades union as a condition of their employment and, if so, why?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The Government's policy of preference to unionists applies.

**SALT DAMP**

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

1. Is the Salt Damp Research Committee still in operation?

2. What is the nature of the research being undertaken by the committee?

3. When is it anticipated that a further report by the committee will be made?

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

- 1. Yes.
- 2. A full research programme has been prepared by the Salt Damp Research Committee, and this was outlined in the committee's booklet *The Scourge of Salt Damp* published a few months ago, and available from the Public and Consumer Affairs Department and Government information outlets.

Amdel is conducting some research for the committee. It is currently looking into the possibility of reducing the saline content and permeability of building materials, and will also investigate the adequacy of various types of damp-proof courses.

In addition, it is planned to start a small research project in the Civil Engineering Department, University of Adelaide, on the matter of movement of salt damp solutes in building materials. Another project being planned involves the School of Building, Marlestone College of Further Education. Students from this school will be constructing trial monoliths to demonstrate both good and

**EUROPEAN FOUL BROOD**

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

1. Where are the other reported outbreaks of European foul brood in South Australia?

2. What action is the Agriculture and Fisheries Department now taking to assist apiarists contain and combat the disease?

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

1. Outside of the proclaimed area in South Australia there have been outbreaks of European foul brood in apiaries owned by five beekeepers located in the Victor Harbor, Oakbank, Parafield, Wirrabara and Streaky Bay districts. All of these outbreaks can be traced to contact with bees from the South-East moved prior to restrictions being imposed.

2. The following steps are taken by departmental officers to assist apiarists to contain and combat the disease:

bad building techniques. Government property at Netley is being made available for this project.

A conference on salt damp for professional and technical people in the building industry has been arranged for March 20 and 21, 1978.

3. It is anticipated that a further report will be made by the committee during the present calendar year.

#### OFF-ROAD VEHICLES

**Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Has a committee or inquiry of any type been set up to consider possible areas to be set aside for off-road vehicles and, if so—

- (a) what areas have been suggested for consideration at this stage;
- (b) when is it anticipated that a conclusion will be reached regarding such areas; and
- (c) how many areas does the Government envisage will be set aside for the use of off-road vehicles?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Yes.

- (a) Several areas have been selected for consideration. However, details will not be released until the inquiry is completed and the results are assessed.
- (b) Mid-1978.
- (c) Vide (a).

#### RUTHVEN MANSIONS

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Does the Government still own the building in Pulteney Street, known as Ruthven Mansions, and if so—

- (a) to what use, if any, has it been put in each of the last three years;
- (b) is it now proposed that it be demolished, what are the reasons for this proposal, when is demolition to be undertaken, by whom, at what estimated cost and to what new use is the site to be put; and
- (c) have any proposals for use, other than demolition, been made, what are they and which proposal, if any, is to be adopted?

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

- (a) None.
- (b) Yes. Alternative proposals prepared for the building's redevelopment as residential accommodation were considered uneconomical. Tenders for the demolition of the building have not yet been called.
- (c) Yes. This is not yet decided.

#### EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FILES

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

1. Does the Education Department maintain files and if so, what kind, on employees thought to be homosexual and, if so—

- (a) why;
- (b) upon what class or classes of employees;
- (c) for how long have such files been maintained;
- (d) what officer is responsible for their maintenance; and
- (e) is it proposed that such files continue to be maintained?

2. If files are not maintained, have such files ever been maintained, when did such practice cease, and have such files been destroyed?

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

1. The Education Department does not inquire into the sexual predilections of its employees and certainly does not maintain files of any kind on employees who may be alleged to be homosexuals. Such files have never been maintained and there is no proposal that they should be maintained.

2. See 1.

#### EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Does the Government accept the first recommendation of the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity in her first report and, if so, does the Government propose to introduce legislation to amend the Sex Discrimination Act by adding the ground of "sexual proclivity" to the proscribed grounds of discrimination, and when will it be introduced?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The Government has noted the first recommendation of the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity in her first report and has asked the Commissioner to keep the matter under review to ascertain whether discrimination of this type is increasing. Pending a further report from the Commissioner, no decision has been taken as to whether amendments should be made to the Act. In any event, it is the Government's view that the administration of the Act should be permitted a reasonable "settling in" period before significant amendments are contemplated.

#### STRATA TITLES

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Is it proposed to introduce legislation to establish the office of Strata Titles Commissioner and, if so, when and why?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Consideration is currently being given to proposals to amend the Real Property Act to improve strata titles procedures. The proposals include the establishment of an office of Strata Titles Commissioner who would arbitrate on certain matters. At this stage it is not known when legislation will be introduced.

#### JUSTICES ACT

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Does the Government still propose to introduce legislation to amend sections 165, 171 and 172 of the Justices Act, as suggested by the Honourable Mr. Justice Hogarth in *Joseph v. Davies* (judgment delivered on August 18, 1976) and, if so, when and why has no such action yet been taken?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The amendments suggested by the Hon. Mr. Justice Hogarth, as well as other suggestions in connection with appeal procedures, are currently receiving consideration.

#### MINISTERIAL CARS

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): When were a Ministerial motor car and driver first made available for the use of—

- (a) the Chairman of Committees; and
- (b) the Deputy Leader of the Opposition?

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

- (a) August 18, 1975.
- (b) October 20, 1975.

### COMMISSIONER OF POLICE

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Will the Government now make available to me a copy of the Solicitor-General's opinion concerning the power to dismiss the Commissioner of Police and, if so, when?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I have made the opinion public and will send a copy to the honourable member.

### MOTOR CAR INDUSTRY

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): What proposals, if any, has the Government to make up for the eventual loss to South Australia of the motor car manufacturing industry?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Speculative attacks upon industry in this State are as mischievous as much of the rest of the honourable member's activity.

### TOURISM

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

1. How many times was the draft copy of the Pak Poy report into the South Australian tourist industry returned to the consultants for amendment to conform to the Government's or departmental wishes and—

- (a) when was the first draft received from the consultants;
- (b) when was it paid for; and
- (c) how much State and how much Commonwealth funds were used in the payment?

2. Has the Tattersall committee's report on the South Australian Tourist Bureau been released and, if not, why not?

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

1. During the whole period of the study, there were continuing reviews of draft material between the consultants and the State/Commonwealth steering committees.

- (a) February, 1976.
- (b) Monthly progress payments were made over a 10-month period during 1975 and 1976.
- (c) The Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department contributed \$39 000 on the basis of a matching contribution from the then Commonwealth Department of Tourism and Recreation.

2. The report of the committee of inquiry into the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau, chaired by Mr. E. G. Tattersall, was prepared for use within the Government and is not available to the public. In November, 1976, I made a copy available to the member for Fisher, and indicated passages which should be kept confidential because of personal references to individuals.

### TOURIST COUNCIL

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

1. How often has the new Tourist Development Advisory Council met and—

- (a) what are the dates of the meetings;
- (b) what are the durations of the meetings;
- (c) what is the composition of that council now; and
- (d) has that council suggested that it is necessary to have a casino in an international style hotel?

2. Does the Premier still hold the view he had in 1970 that a casino is an essential ingredient to make an

international style hotel a viable venture and, if so, is it proposed to allow for a casino in the planning of an international hotel for Adelaide?

3. What stage have the negotiations reached for the commencement of building an international style hotel for Adelaide?

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

1. The South Australian Tourist Advisory Council has met on eight occasions.

(a) The dates of the meetings were:

21.12.76	4.8.77
6.4.77	15.9.77
12.5.77	9.11.77
9.6.77	8.12.77

(b) Each meeting lasted about three hours.

(c) The composition of the council is:

Mr. P. G. Pak-Poy (Chairman),  
Mr. K. Adams,  
Mr. A. D. Chenery,  
Mr. W. H. Hayes,  
Mr. N. M. Hooper,  
Mr. W. F. Isbell,  
Mr. J. T. O'Sullivan,  
Mr. J. J. Roche,  
Mr. P. Whallin.

(d) No.

2. Yes, but that is a personal view, although it is supported by views of much of the tourist industry. The Government will not introduce, by legislation, the provision for a casino unless directed by resolution of the House of Assembly to do so. Applicants who sought options to tender for the construction of an international hotel have been advised of the Government's views.

3. Although many interested parties have put forward preliminary studies no firm proposals for an international hotel have been received by the Government's international hotel committee. The last group to put forward a preliminary proposal was Goodyear Estates Limited, which withdrew from its solus position early in February this year. This group is still interested in putting forward alternative proposals, and other persons interested in the building of an international hotel have now been advised to make their submissions to the international hotel committee.

### GOVERNMENT OFFICES

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

1. Why did the Environment Department Press Secretary have an office in Ansett Gateway building?

2. What was the weekly rent paid for such office?

3. What was the cost of establishing the office?

4. Was there a lease and, if so, what were the terms?

5. Are there any other Government offices located in the Gateway building and, if so—

(a) which are they; and

(b) what is the weekly rental and terms of leases, if any?

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

1. To facilitate liaison with the Minister and departmental staff;

2. The Press Secretary's office forms a part of the overall Department for the Environment accommodation in the Ansett Centre and the costs for specific areas cannot readily be determined;

3. Refer to 2 above;

4. Refer to 2 above;

5. No. *Vide* 2.

**FOSTER PARENTS**

**Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): What back-up and professional counselling is available to foster parents, to ensure that the provisions of section 52 (c) of the Community Welfare Act are effective?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** Section 52 of the Community Welfare Act sets out the matters the Director-General shall satisfy himself about in considering any application for approval as a foster parent. (c) has to be considered in conjunction with the other provisions of the section. Following receipt of the application, applicants are interviewed in their home by a Community Welfare worker. If at all possible, all members of the household group are seen together. The Community Welfare worker makes an assessment of the applicants, having regard to all the provisions of section 52 of the Act. Particular attention is given to the applicants' qualities of warmth and compassion, their flexibility and their knowledge of human growth and development. Applicants are required to name two referees who are able to report on the above matters. A check is made with police records. Sometimes interviews are held with foster parent applicants in groups. When a child is placed with approved applicants, every effort is made to select the foster parents who appear best able to meet the child's needs. After the placement is made, the Community Welfare worker for the child assists the child and the foster parents to help ensure the success of the fostering.

**COMMUNITY COMMITTEE**

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

1. What is the function of the Community Councils for Social Development State Chairmen's Advisory Committee?

2. Has this committee any statutory authority and how often does it meet?

3. Who are the current members of this committee?

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

1. The functions of the Chairmen's Advisory Committee of the Community Councils for Social Development are to discuss the operation of community councils, to pool ideas, stimulate thinking, arrange annual conferences of community councils, the production of by-monthly newsletters and to arrange community council representation on various committees when requested, particularly by State and Federal authorities.

2. No. It meets quarterly.

3. All chairmen of community councils totalling 26. Other persons attend meetings as invited. Staff of the Community Development Branch who provide services to the councils also attend.

**COMMUNITY WELFARE HOUSES**

**Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): How many dwellings have been purchased and how many dwellings have been leased by the Government for use by community welfare staff since the establishment of Community Welfare Department centres and where are these dwellings located?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The following dwellings have been purchased by the Government for use by departmental staff since the establishment of community welfare centres at the undermentioned locations:

Lot 95 Cummins Street, Port Augusta.

- 34 Cummins Street, Port Augusta.
  - Lot 107 Cummins Street, Port Augusta.
  - Harris Crescent, Port Augusta.
  - 36 Larkin Crescent, Port Augusta.
  - 6 Naisbitt Street, Port Augusta.
  - 1 King Street, Port Augusta.
  - 1 Adey Street, Ceduna.
  - 6 Mudge Street, Ceduna.
  - 5 Tonkin Street, Ceduna.
  - 31 Digby Street, Kadina.
  - 11 Hill Crescent, Kadina.
- No dwellings in the above category have been leased.

**WELFARE FUNDS**

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

1. What was the annual amount allocated to the Community Welfare Grants Funds for the years 1972-1977?

2. Of these amounts, what moneys are appropriated to the fund by the Minister and what moneys are appropriated from any other sources?

3. What are these other sources?

4. To what bodies have the grants been allocated and for what purposes?

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

1. Year	Amount \$
1971-72 .....	187 500
1972-73 .....	261 100
1973-74 .....	323 800
1974-75 .....	344 800
1975-76 .....	600 000
1976-77 .....	640 000
1977-78 .....	950 000

The allocations up to and including the allocation for 1974-75 were shown in a different way in the Estimates. Adjustments have been made so that all the amounts shown are on the same basis.

2. All amounts were appropriated by Parliament. The figure for 1975-76 includes \$100 000 provided on an excess warrant.

3. See 2. above.

4. Lists are attached for the years 1971-72 and 1972-73. Details for the other years are shown in the department's annual reports.

Community Welfare Grants Advisory Committee:

Schedule of grants approved for the year 1971-72:

	Building	Equipment	General
	\$	\$	\$
Brighton Gardens Church of Christ .....		500	
Edwardstown Church of Christ ...	100	500	
Largs Bay R.S.L. ....		300	
Lutheran Youth Camp (Tatachilla) .....	3 000	240	
Naracoorte Youth Centre .....	5 000		
Port Pirie Y.C.W. Pekina .....	5 000	500	
Port River Sailing Club .....		500	
Salvation Army .....	5 000		
Scripture Union .....	3 000		
Seacliff Scout Group .....	700		
Service to Youth Council .....	300	100	
		350	
		495	
	1 110	400	
St. Mary Magdalenes .....	1 000		

	LIST OF COMMUNITY WELFARE GRANTS APPROVED			1972/3				
	Building	Equipment	General	Building	Equip-ment	Salary	Miscel-laneous	
	\$	\$	\$					
Burnside Hockey Club .....		275						
Barmera Congregational Church	3 500							
St. Bernard Youth Centre .....		500						
Salisbury District Youth Centre ..	2 000							
Henley Beach Girl Guides .....	500				100			
Parafield Gardens Scout and Cub Group .....	2 700							
Lions Club of Port Lincoln .....	5 000							
Riverland Zone of Lutheran Youth .....	1 900	250						
Boy Scouts Association, Port Pirie	950	500				1 000		
Youthline .....	2 500							
Union Church .....		270						
Kuitpo Valley Camp .....	1 500	500						
Wallaby Gymnasium Club .....		500						
1st Taperoo Sea Scouts .....		400						
1st Alberton Scout Group .....		400						
Stirling Community Centre .....		500						
Christies Beach Church of Christ Youth Club .....		240						
Glenelg/Marion Y.M.C.A. ....		200						
Glenunga Youth Club .....		200						
Scout Association of South Aus- tralia .....	5 000							
Northern District Branch Y.M.C.A. ....	5 000	500						
Missionaries of the Sacred Heart	1 500	250						
Karkendi Youth Centre .....		500						
Thuruna (Tumby Bay) Methodist Conference .....	800	500						
Gilles Plains Youth Group .....		500						
Lower Murray Youth Club Inc. ...	5 000							
Estonia Youth Club, North Adelaide .....	900							
Clarendon Community Centre ...		500						
Girl Guides Association (S.Y.P. Division) .....	1 000							
Port Adelaide Central Methodist Mission .....	1 000	450						
Outward Bound South Australia Inc. ....		500						
Y.M.C.A. Elizabeth .....	5 000	500						
Australian Boy Scouts Association		320						
Y.M.C.A. and District Youth Clubs .....	4 000	500						
Berri Districts Youth Club .....	2 000							
Tea Tree Gully Youth Club .....	5 000	500						
Emanon Youth Club—Port Augusta .....		500						
Famous Findon Skid Kids .....	3 500	500						
Girls Brigade (Australia) .....		400						
Boy Scouts Association .....			2 500					
Girl Guides Association .....			2 500					
Marriage Guidance Council of S.A. ....			8 000					
Service to Youth Council .....			6 400					
South Australian Council of Social Service .....			1 500					
Wanslea Incorporated .....			5 500					
Young Men's Christian Associa- tion .....			11 100					
For training youth leaders and to develop clubs and activities for children and youth. Disburse- ments made by the National Fitness Council .....			50 000					
				Adelaide Harriers	\$	\$	\$	\$
				Women's Amateur				
				Athletic Club .....		100		
				Association of Apex				
				Club Zone .....	1 000			
				Australian Association				
				for Better Hearing ...		350		
				Australian Christian Stu-				
				dents Movement .....			1 000	
				Barossa Valley Youth				
				Club .....	5 000			
				Belair Gym Club .....		175		
				Berri-Barmera Harriers				
				Amateur Athletic				
				Club .....		200		
				Blackwood United Par-				
				ish .....	750			
				Bowman Park Youth				
				Camp .....		500		
				Brighton Baptist Church		200		
				Brighton Youth Centre		500		
				Catholic Deaf Associa-				
				tion .....		100		
				Catholic Parish of Tailem				
				Bend .....		300		
				Children's Foundation of				
				S.A. ....			2 000	
				Christies Beach Surf				
				Lifesaving Club .....	1 000			
				Churches of Christ				
				Department of Christ-				
				ian Education .....	1 000		1 000	150
				Church of England Boys				
				Society .....			2 000	
				Clarendon Lutheran				
				Youth Camp .....		500		
				Congregation Union ...			1 000	
				Elizabeth Counselling				
				Centre .....	500	250		
				Elizabeth Sporting Club	2 000			
				F. W. Symons Memorial				
				St. Peters .....		500		
				Girls Brigade .....			1 500	100
				Girl Guide Association		500	2 500	
				Girl Guide Groups				
				Dover Gardens .....	1 000			
				Eden Hills .....	2 000			
				Elizabeth West .....	2 000			
				Somerton .....		200		
				Southern Yorke				
				Peninsula .....	1 000			
				Glenelg Surf Life Saving				
				Club .....	1 000			
				Henley South Youth				
				Club .....	1 250	250		
				Kadina and District				
				Youth Centre .....	2 000			
				Kangaroo Island Swim-				
				ming Club .....		750		
				Live Along Workshop ..		280		
				Lions Club of Whyalla ..	5 000			
				Loxton Amateur Basket				
				Ball Association .....	5 000			
				Loxton Harriers				
				Amateur Athletics				
				Club .....		100		

	Building	Equip-ment	Salary	Miscel-laneous		Building	Equip-ment	Salary	Miscel-laneous
	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	\$	\$
Marion United Parish . . .			1 500		St. Andrews Netball Club . . . . .		200		
Marion Youth Centre . . .	500				Taperoo Osborne Youth Centre . . . . .	1 900		1 200	
Methodist Department of Christian Education	5 000		2 000	300	Thuruna Methodist Conference Centre . . . . .	330			
Millicent Methodist Church Coffee House				150	Trinity Church Tennis Club . . . . .	1 000			
Millicent Youth Centre	3 000	250			Union Church Adelaide		500	1 000	
Millicent Youth Coffee House Board . . . . .	500	500			Unley Amateur Swimming Club . . . . .		150		
Nuriootpa War Memorial Community Centre . . . . .	5 000	500			Western Youth Centre . . . . .	5 000	500	1 250	
Outward Bound . . . . .			2 000		Woomera Youth Centre Y.M.C.A.		200		
Para Hills Brass Band . . . . .		400			Adelaide . . . . .			2 000	
Paringa District Youth Club . . . . .	1 500	200			Mount Gambier . . . . .	1 000	500	2 500	125
Pinnaroo Basketball Club . . . . .		500			Northern Districts . . . . .			1 000	
Port Adelaide Central Methodist Mission . . . . .		500			Whyalla . . . . .		500	2 500	200
Port Pirie Central Methodist Mission . . . . .			2 000		Elizabeth . . . . .		500	2 000	
Port Pirie Y.C.W. Pekina . . . . .		500			Port Pirie and District Y.W.C.A.	5 000	500	700	
Prisoners Aid Association . . . . .			3 000		Adelaide . . . . .	2 000		2 500	125
Purple Haze Social Club		250			Whyalla . . . . .	3 000	500	1 250	
Renmark Table Tennis Association . . . . .		250			Young Christian Students . . . . .			1 250	
Reorganised Church of Latter Day Saints . . . . .				150	Young Christian Workers . . . . .	1 000	300	4 500	300
Robe R.S.L. Sub-Branch	2 500	500			Young Christian Workers St. Marys . . . . .		220		
Salisbury Methodist Church . . . . .	5 000				Youth Hostels Asstn. . . . .	2 000		1 000	
Scout Association . . . . .	1 145		5 000		Youth line . . . . .			2 000	
Scout Groups					Boy Scouts Association Elizabeth Counselling Centre . . . . .				2 500
1st Darlington Scouts and Guide Group . . . . .	2 000				Girl Guides Association				2 500
1st Eden Hills . . . . .		350			Juvenile Delinquency Research Project . . . . .				2 000
Elizabeth Downs . . . . .	2 000				Marriage Guidance Council of South Australia . . . . .				12 000
Findon Scout . . . . .		200			Roselea Children's Home . . . . .				2 700
1st Kingston . . . . .	1 000				Save the Children Fund Service to Youth Council				2 000
1st Marble Hill . . . . .		200			Society of Sponsors . . . . .				7 200
Port Pirie Scout Asstn. . . . .	800				South Australian Council of Social Service . . . . .				700
1st Strathmont . . . . .	2 000				Wanslea Incorporated . . . . .				2 500
2nd Woodville Gardens . . . . .	1 000				Whyalla Counselling Centre . . . . .				6 500
Scripture Union . . . . .		200	900		Young Men's Christian Association Whyalla . . . . .				5 000
Service to Youth Council South Australian Youth Clubs			5 600						10 500
Affiliated Clubs . . . . .				100					
Angas River Campsite	750		3 000						
Holden Hill Drop In Centre . . . . .			3 500						
St. Bernards . . . . .	2 000	500	2 000						
St. Clair . . . . .	200		2 000						
Salisbury District . . . . .			1 200						
South East Corner Community Development	5 000	500	2 500						
Southend Progress Asstn. . . . .	500								
Stanley Street Development Asstn. . . . .	750								
St. Monica's Youth Club		200							

COMMUNITY WELFARE CENTRES

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. How many Community Welfare Department centres have been established and what are their locations?
2. What has been the annual staffing cost for each centre since its establishment?
3. What was the original capital cost of each centre?
4. What are the annual maintenance costs of each centre?

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

1. Eight community welfare centres have been established as follows:

Location	Date of Occupation
Adelaide Community Welfare Centre, 134 Waymouth Street, Adelaide .....	5/8/74
Campbelltown Community Welfare Centre, 163 Montacute Road, Newton ..	1/12/73
Elizabeth Community Welfare Centre, 1 Windsor Square, Elizabeth .....	4/12/72
Salisbury Community Welfare Centre, 9 John Street, Salisbury.....	April 1972
Kadina Community Welfare Centre, 10 Digby Street, Kadina .....	21/2/77
Port Augusta Community Welfare Centre, 5 El Alamein Street, Port Augusta .....	28/9/75
Ceduna Health/Welfare Centre, Eyre Highway, Ceduna .....	14/4/75
Port Lincoln Health/Welfare Centre, 21 Oxford Terrace, Port Lincoln .....	22/8/76

2. The annual staffing cost for each centre since its establishment is:

Location	Year	Salaries \$
Adelaide Community Welfare Centre.....	1974-75	147 109
	1975-76	262 996
	1976-77	317 128
Campbelltown Community Welfare Centre .....	1973-74	29 808
	1974-75	71 303
	1975-76	104 768
	1976-77	164 417
Elizabeth Community Welfare Centre.....	1972-73	42 858
	1973-74	95 052
	1974-75	121 119
	1975-76	144 199
	1976-77	190 451
Salisbury Community Welfare Centre.....	1971-72	39 296
	1972-73	44 713
	1973-74	62 789
	1974-75	96 347
	1975-76	126 063
	1976-77	161 747
Kadina Community Welfare Centre.....	1976-77	18 299
Port Augusta Community Welfare Centre .....	1975-76	69 189
	1976-77	103 309
Ceduna Health/Welfare Centre	1974-75	7 984
	1975-76	51 106
	1976-77	51 288
Port Lincoln Health/Welfare Centre.....	1976-77	69 663

3. The original capital cost of each centre was:

	Building and commissioning \$
Adelaide Community Welfare Centre .....	30 118 (Building leased)
Campbelltown Community Welfare Centre .....	193 270
Elizabeth Community Welfare Centre .....	2 450 (Building leased)
Salisbury Community Welfare Centre.....	91 512
Kadina Community Welfare Centre .....	7 800 (Building leased)
Port Augusta Community Welfare Centre .....	511 275

	Building and commissioning \$
Ceduna Health/Welfare Centre.....	471 205
Port Lincoln Health/Welfare Centre.....	605 740

The Health and Welfare Centres at Port Lincoln and Ceduna were constructed under the Community Health Programme out of moneys provided by the Commonwealth.

4. The annual building maintenance costs of each centre are:

Location	Year	Cost \$
Adelaide Community Welfare Centre.....	1974-76	Nil
	1976-77	1 347
Campbelltown Community Welfare Centre.....	1973-76	Nil
	1976-77	1 495
Elizabeth Community Welfare Centre.....	1972-77	Nil
Salisbury Community Welfare Centre.....	1971-75	Nil
	1976-77	38
Kadina Community Welfare Centre.....	1976-77	Nil
Port Augusta Community Welfare Centre.....	1975-76	Nil
	1976-77	683
	1974-75	102
Ceduna Health/Welfare Centre ..	1975-76	1 416
	1976-77	Nil
	1974-75	145
Port Lincoln Health/Welfare Centre.....	1976-77	145

**WIND-SOCKS**

**Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Will the Government have placed at necessary intervals, wind-socks, on the section of the South-Eastern Freeway, between the Mount Barker Summit bridge and the Callington ramp because of strong prevailing cross-winds?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** The Highways Department proposes to place six wind-socks at selected locations between Mount Barker Summit bridge and the Callington ramp. Two of these wind-socks were placed in position on March 3, 1978.

**REPTILES**

**Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): How many cases of illegal trafficking in reptiles have been reported in each year from 1972, respectively, and how many of these cases have resulted in prosecution?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** 1972—one; 1975—two; 1976—one. Three cases resulted in prosecution.

**ENVIRONMENT IMPACT STATEMENT**

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

1. When did the Government first announce its intention to introduce environmental impact statement legislation?

2. When does the Government now intend to introduce this legislation and what are the reasons for its delay?

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

1. December 10, 1973.
2. As soon as possible. Environmental impact legislation is extremely difficult to frame, and it has been essential to integrate it with intended changes in planning law so that citizens are not faced with a whole series of different and separate approval processes before they proceed with any development.

**ANIMAL SALES**

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

1. What revenue has been gained by the Government from the sale of protected birds and reptiles in the years 1975, 1976, and 1977?

2. How is the money being used?

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

1. \$38 493.
2. The funds are paid into the Wildlife Conservation Fund and are used to support land acquisition for conservation, fauna management, research, and administration.

**HEYSEN TRAIL**

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

1. What progress has been made on the Heyesen Trail since the opening of the trail in May, 1976?

2. Have there been any delays in the progress and, if so, what are the reasons for such delays?

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

1. Progress has been limited to:

- (a) Exploratory work on extension of the trail northward from Cleland Reserve towards Mount Crawford.
- (b) Fixing of the route through Mount Remarkable National Park.
- (c) Discussions on spur trains with the District Council of Crystal Brook.

2. (a) Yes.

- (b) The inability to negotiate walking track rights-of-way across private land.
  - (i) Lack of funds.
  - (ii) Lack of staff.

**PARKS VANDALISM**

**Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): How many cases of vandalism have been reported to the National Parks and Wildlife Division in the years 1975, 1976, and 1977?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The administrative effort required to determine incidents of vandalism prior to December, 1976, when specific records were set up could not be justified. However, seven incidents were reported in the subsequent period to June, 1977, and 20 have been reported since July 1, 1977.

**COMMUNITY WELFARE ACT**

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

1. How many families have been assisted under section 32 of the Community Welfare Act?
2. What is the maximum amount that has been paid and what were the circumstances justifying such payment?
3. What was the annual budget for the years 1972-1977?
4. Of the amounts paid, what costs have been recovered

by the Government and what amounts are outstanding?

5. What action, if any, has the Government taken to recover the cost of assistance to persons in need?

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

1. 1971-72 .....	9 924
1972-73 .....	14 176
1973-74 .....	16 178
1974-75 .....	14 109
1975-76 .....	12 278
1976-77 .....	13 409

2. Payments are made to deserted wives, sole supporting parents, wives whose husbands are in prison, sickness cases and some other miscellaneous categories at rates equivalent to Commonwealth pension and benefit rates. Applicants are required to meet the eligibility criteria as approved by the Government. Payments are also made for some children living apart from their parents and children in non-Government children's homes. The maximum amount paid would be approximately \$125 per week for a deserted wife with eight children.

3. Annual Budget:

	\$
1971-72 .....	1 609 100
1972-73 .....	4 042 000
1973-74 .....	3 801 000
1974-75 .....	4 156 500
1975-76 .....	6 578 000
1976-77 .....	6 900 000

4.

Recovery from  
the Common-  
wealth under the  
State Grants  
(Deserted Wives)

	Act	Other amounts recovered	Total
	\$	\$	\$
1971-72 ....	310 580	76 898	387 478
1972-73 ....	930 493	199 545	1 130 038
1973-74 ....	1 334 065	310 901	1 644 966
1974-75 ....	1 045 261	377 824	1 423 085
1975-76 ....	1 508 636	621 191	2 129 827
1976-77 ....	1 879 087	820 524	2 699 611

Amounts outstanding from clients as at June 30, 1977, amounted to \$226 402.

5. Where it appears that the persons assisted might be able to repay the amount involved, they are contacted and asked to arrange for repayment. In appropriate cases court action is taken under Section 33 of the Community Welfare Act.

**CEDUNA COURTHOUSE**

**Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Does the Government intend to build a new courthouse at Ceduna, and if so, when and what type of building will it be?

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

(a) Yes.

(b) The Public Buildings Department is currently negotiating to purchase the land.

(c) Details of the type of building are not available at this stage.

**E. & W.S. DEPARTMENT**

**Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Is the Engineering and Water Supply Department upgrading any of its establishments on Eyre Peninsula and, if so, where?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Yes, Ceduna and Kimba.

**CEDUNA CLERK**

**Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Will the Clerk of the Court at Ceduna be acting as an agent, or spending some of his time acting for the Public and Consumer Affairs Department and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Yes.

**RAILWAYS AGREEMENT**

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

1. What now is the value of the annual contribution by the Federal Government from the sale of the non-metropolitan railways?

2. Have all documents pertaining to the agreement been ratified and, if not, why not?

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

1. The anticipated value of the direct contribution in 1977-78 is about \$42 000 000. The annual contribution is not a set amount but escalates each year.

2. Under the terms of the Transfer Agreement the two parties must make supplementary detailed agreements about a number of matters pertaining to the operations of the South Australian railway system. For example, last week I signed a supplementary document which sets out the basis for sharing current assets and liabilities between the two parties and for sharing operating costs and revenues in the interim period. A similar document relating to superannuation matters is in the process of preparation but has not yet been completed. As soon as final details have been agreed, representatives of the two parties will be able to sign the remaining supplementary agreements in respect of superannuation and other matters.

**LINCOLN HIGHWAY**

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

1. When the Whyalla section of the Lincoln Highway has been completed, to where will the department gang be shifted?

2. When is it anticipated that work on the Whyalla section of the Lincoln Highway will be completed?

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

1. When the departmental gang completes work on the Port Augusta-Whyalla road, it will remain at Whyalla to reconstruct Broadbent Terrace between Playford Avenue and McDouall Stuart Avenue, and to complete the duplication of Norrie Avenue Extension. A decision has not yet been made as to where the gang will be shifted after completion of works at Whyalla.

2. It is anticipated that the above works will occupy the gang until approximately the end of 1979.

**Mr. ANTONIO MIRALDA**

**Mrs. ADAMSON** (on notice):

1. Who was responsible for engaging Mr. Antonio Miralda for the purpose of designing Flower Day for the Adelaide Festival of Arts?

2. What were his conditions of employment?

3. What was his salary?

4. For what length of time was he employed?

5. What were his duties?

6. From what source was his salary funded?

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

1. The Board of Governors of the Adelaide Festival of Arts approved the recommendation of its Programme Planning Advisory Committee that Mr. Miralda be engaged to direct the outdoor activities on the opening day of the 1978 Adelaide Festival of which the flowers were only a component.

2. Mr. Miralda was engaged as an artist under a contract entered into on September 28, 1977.

3. The artist received a fee. The festival feels this information is of a domestic nature and is confidential between the festival and the individual concerned.

4. The period of his engagement was from the date of the signing of the contract, i.e. September 28, 1977, until March 5, 1978.

5. He was responsible for outlining and developing a format for the opening day of the 1978 Adelaide Festival of Arts.

6. His fee was met from the general funds for the festival which come from the Australia Council; the Adelaide City Council; the State Government; and donations from business houses, friends, donors and guarantors.

**BLACK HILL RESERVE**

**Mrs. ADAMSON** (on notice):

1. What is the area in hectares of Black Hill Native Flora Reserve?

2. How many people have visited it on an annual basis since it was declared a reserve?

3. How many professional, administrative, and ancillary staff are employed?

4. What is the salary of the Director?

5. What are the responsibilities of the Director?

6. What is the annual budget for the current year?

7. What is the anticipated staff ceiling?

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

1. 772.9 ha.

2. Visitation figures for the park are not available, but a tally shows that 780 people have visited the Wildflower Garden since August, 1977.

3. Professional and sub-Professional (2), Administrative (1), Ancillary staff (5).

4. \$19 232.

5. (a) The design, development, management and administration of the Black Hill Native Flora Park.

(b) Promotion of landscaping using native flora.

(c) Dissemination of information to the public on the use of native plants.

6. \$139 080.

7. 20.

**PUBLIC SERVICE**

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

1. What is the current total of members of the Public Service in South Australia?

2. What is the total current wage and salary bill for the Public Service fortnightly and estimated annually?

3. What has been the average growth rate of the Public Service each financial year since 1969-70 to date?

4. What was the total wage and salary bill for the Public Service each financial year since 1969-70?

5. What is the size of the Public Service in each other State of the Commonwealth?

6. How many school-leavers have entered the Public Service this current financial year?

7. What percentage of the South Australian workforce is constituted by the Public Service?

8. Of the 558 new positions created, which departments have they been created in and how many positions in each department?

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

1. The latest information available without incurring the expense of a special programme and computer run shows:

Total of officers (permanent and temporary) under the Public Service Act as at January 12, 1978, equals 16 967.

Number of temporary officers at March 1, 1978, equals 2 547

Approximate number of permanent officers at March 1, 1978, based on above equals 14 420.

Number of unfilled vacancies as at January 5, 1978, equals 1 731.

These figures include part-time positions:

331 (actual) at June 22, 1977.

or 345 (approximately) at March 1, 1978.

2. The Under Treasurer states:

"The Government's central accounts do not record salaries paid to persons employed under the Public Service Act separately from those employed as teachers, nurses, police officers, or weekly paid staff. Payments made to these groups from the Revenue Account are recorded and reported in the annual accounts. Payments made to employees out of the Loan Account or from Deposit Accounts are not available. These would relate mainly to weekly-paid personnel.

This year it is estimated that \$530 000 000 will be paid to Government employees from the Revenue Account, and fortnightly payments at present are about \$20 000 000. These figures are approximate and need to be interpreted with caution. For example, staff employed in the Education Department, the Libraries Department, the Department of the Public Service Board, the Department of Labour and Industry and the Department of Further Education are paid on the alternate week to other departments.

This means that some groups will have 27 pays this financial year, while others will receive only 26. Furthermore, the amount paid each fortnight will fluctuate as employees are assigned to work funded from other accounts; as pays in advance are made to those going on leave; as increments, advancements and award increases occur; as back pays are caught up; as leave and payroll tax payments are made; and as vacancies occur and are filled.

3. Growth rate of Public Service each year:

Year	Per cent Growth
1969-70	10.80
1970-71	7.09
1971-72	6.05
1972-73	8.07
1973-74	12.60
1974-75	5.20
1975-76	7.30
1976-77	3.75

4. See 2.

5. The only consistent basis of comparison between the States in this area is provided by Commonwealth Bureau of Statistics figures which incorporate the whole range of each State's public sector employment including permanent and temporary officers, daily and weekly paid employees, Statutory Authorities, Departments etc. As at November, 1977, the figures were—

New South Wales . . . . . 320 000

Victoria	250 300
Queensland	142 200
South Australia	112 400
Western Australia	101 900
Tasmania	36 400
Total	963 200

These are the only directly comparable figures available. The figures for Public Service employment alone do not give a true comparison. Various functions such as road construction, public works, education, health etc. may be performed by a Government department in one State and a statutory authority in other States. For example, while water supply and sewerage are handled by a department in South Australia, they are the responsibility of statutory authorities in New South Wales and Victoria.

As at June 30, 1977 the number of permanent and temporary officers employed under the Public Service Act (or its equivalent) in each State was:

New South Wales	75 166
Queensland	45 355
Victoria	31 804
South Australia	16 597
Western Australia	12 925
Tasmania	6 494
Total	188 341

6. 189.

7. As at November, 1977:

Total employed persons in S.A.	546 800
Total unemployed persons in S.A.	29 600
Total S.A. workforce	576 400

State Public Service officers under Public Service Act . . . . . 16 900  
 Percentage of public officers in total workforce in S.A. . . . . 2.93

8. Sub-total Positions

Department	Positions
Agriculture and Fisheries	33
Art Gallery	2
Auditor-General	2
Community Welfare	32
Corporate Affairs	10
Correctional Services	25
Economic Development	15
Education	23
Engineering and Water Supply	24
Environment	37
Further Education	26
Highways	2
Hospitals	33
Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs	17
*Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science	8
Labour and Industry	5
Lands	14
Law	19
Libraries	5
Marine and Harbors	5
Mines and Energy	8
Police	22
Premier's	28
Public Buildings	4
Public and Consumer Affairs	26
Public Health (now Hospitals Department)	67
Public Service Board	10

Department	Sub-total Positions
Services and Supply .....	16
Tourism, Recreation and Sport .....	10
Transport .....	15
Treasury .....	7
Woods and Forests .....	8
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>558</b>

\*Not a department, but certain officers are under the Public Service Act.

It should be noted that the figures provided above are gross figures for new positions created, not net figures for the actual increase in number of offices. The number of new positions is offset to an extent by abolition of other offices and transfer of positions from one area to another.

### MR. D. F. WILSON

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

1. Is Mr. D. F. Wilson, S.S.M. again sitting as a rule in the Adelaide Magistrates Court and if so—
  - (a) when did he return to the court; and
  - (b) where had he been sitting before his return?
2. Had Mr. Wilson requested that he return to the Adelaide Magistrates Court and, if so, when?
3. By whom was the decision made that he should return?
4. What were the reasons for that decision?
5. Why was he ever removed from that court?
6. What advantages, if any, were there to the Government, by such removal?

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

1. Yes.
  - (a) February 27, 1978.
  - (b) The Adelaide Local Court.
2. Yes. On November 10, 1977.
3. By the Director-General, Premier's Department, after discussion with the Premier and me.
4. Although the Public Service Board had disallowed Mr. Wilson's appeal against the previous decision not to return Mr. Wilson to the Adelaide Magistrates's Court, the Premier and I considered that, as the factors that gave rise to his transfer in the first place had now passed, it was appropriate that he be returned to the Adelaide Magistrates Court.
5. A full reply to this question was given on October 11, 1977.
6. A full reply to this question was given on October 11, 1977.

### HOUSES

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

1. How many Housing Trust houses at Elizabeth are at present vacant?
2. How many have been vacant at the beginning of each of the last six months?
3. What are the reasons for such vacancies?
4. What is at present the waiting time for an applicant for a purchase home under the \$500 deposit scheme?

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

1. 19.
2. Not available.
3. It is normal for some sale homes to be vacant at any time due to the normal delays between completion and sale. In addition, in Elizabeth, there are a small number of

houses let to the defence forces, some of which are vacant only because of the change of occupant. Over the past six months, the trust has sold 74 houses in the Elizabeth area.

4. Under the rental purchase or low-deposit (\$500) sales scheme, the trust is processing applications lodged in September, 1974, for the northern metropolitan area, and November, 1975, for the southern metropolitan area. There are not vacant houses under this scheme.

### SUPERANNUATION FUNDS

**Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice):

1. What were the total funds set aside as of June, 1975, by the Government towards superannuation funds for employees of the South Australian Railways?
2. What will happen to these funds now the non-metropolitan section of the railways has passed to the Commonwealth Government?
3. Have any of these superannuation funds been paid into general revenue and, if so, how much?
4. Were any superannuation funds transferred to the Australian National Railways and, if so, how much?

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

1. Nil.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.
4. No.

### HOUSEBREAKING

**Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice):

1. How many cases of housebreaking and entering have been reported each year for the last four years?
2. If there has been an increase in the number of cases what have been the reasons for this increase?
3. Is the Government considering a review of the maximum penalty that may be imposed for such an offence?

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

1. Housebreakings reported during the last four fiscal years:
 

1977—	6 649.
1976—	6 413.
1975—	6 456.
1974—	6 318.
2. There is no significant change in the number of housebreakings reported in the last four fiscal years.
3. Housebreakings and larcenies carry a maximum penalty of eight years. The police consider this adequate. All penalties will be reviewed by the Government in the light of the fourth report of the Mitchell committee.

### FLORAL SPECTACULAR

**Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice):

1. What was the total cost to the Government and/or organisers of the festival to purchase or provide all the flowers and flower seeds for the floral spectacular at the commencement of the Festival of Arts?
2. What was or will be the total payment to Mr. Antonio Miralda as fees, salary and reimbursement for costs during the last 12 months, and how much has already been paid to him?
3. What was the total cost of providing and displaying the flowers for previous flower day exhibitions in conjunction with previous Festivals of Art?

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

1. The festival distributed 90 000 packets of seeds and purchased 7 000 blooms at a total cost of \$8 290.

2. The festival feels this information is of a domestic nature and is confidential between the festival and the individual concerned.

3. The flower days last held in 1974 were part of the activities of the National Flower Day Committee, chaired by Mr. Pollnitz, then Director of the Tourist Bureau. The bureau was responsible for co-ordinating projects mounted by a wide range of people and firms. The Festival of Arts is unable to supply any details of the direct costs or the value of services supplied by Government or private organisations.

Regarding the festival's comments about previous flower days, the Government has not had sufficient time to recall files from archives and research all costs. The Government contributed \$330 in the 1972-73 period (between flower day years) and \$6 288 in the 1974-75 period during which the last flower day occurred. In addition, the services of several senior staff of the Government Tourist Bureau, and other bureau resources, were provided to the flower day organising committee at no cost. The value of those services is estimated at about \$5 000, in preparation for the 1974 flower day, in addition to the \$6 618 paid in grants.

#### GOVERNOR

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

1. What are the criteria used in selecting nominees for the position of Governor of this and other States?

2. What type of security check is made of the nominees?

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

1. and 2. No particular procedures or criteria are used except that recently we have only considered Australians. This Government and presumably other State Governments nominate the person most suitable in their opinion.

#### MERRY-GO-ROUND

In reply to **Mr. SLATER** (February 21).

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The honourable member asked who would be competent authority qualified to give a certificate of safety for a merry-go-round. Consulting engineers possess the mechanical and structural knowledge and experience to examine merry-go-rounds and other mechanical amusement devices and issue certificates of safety. They are regarded as being competent authorities for this purpose. Consulting engineers are of course listed in the yellow pages of the telephone directory and their fees would vary according to the location of the device to be inspected.

#### RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL

In reply to **Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** (February 28).

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** As part of the study of groundwater for possible radioactive pollution, the Mines and Energy Department drilled several holes in the area and collected water samples from each. These samples were tested by Amdel and the results forwarded to the Australian Ionising Radiation Council. No consequent report has been received from the council.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order, and it concerns the announcement you have just

made of the answers to Questions on Notice. With the greatest of respect, what you have announced is really quite unintelligible. I know that at one time it was the practice for all questions to be answered on the day—

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** What's the point of order?

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I could not understand which questions have been answered and which have not. I know that the practice of not answering questions has gradually grown. When there were only one or two that were not answered, it was perhaps appropriate to announce the answers in that way—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is now debating the question.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** My point of order is—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is out of order, as is the Minister.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the Deputy Leader to order.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Therefore, I ask that today, if you possibly can, but certainly in future, so that members will be able to understand which questions have been answered you read out a list of the questions actually answered, and not a list of the questions that remain unanswered.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** It would shorten the list.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** It would soon be a shortened list because the number of unanswered questions has grown and grown. My point of order is this (for the edification of the Minister of Works): that when you make the announcement, it should be intelligible to members and those people in the gallery: it should mean something, and the only way that can be done, because of the way in which the Government is carrying on in not answering questions on time, is by announcing the numbers of the questions that are answered, not the numbers of questions that are not answered.

**The SPEAKER:** This is what I intend to do in future: when the balance of the questions unanswered is greater than the questions answered, I will indicate accordingly rather than in the normal form that has just been read.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PRESS ALLEGATIONS

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** In the House in a recent debate the Leader of the Opposition made the following statement concerning me:

Journalists have found to their cost that they dare not offend the Premier or the Government without running the risk in some cases, of losing their jobs and livelihood. The events at 5DN are the latest example where people have crossed swords with the Premier and somehow or other have suffered accordingly.

The *Sunday Mail* of January 29, 1978, carried a front page story which, after referring to the resignation of the news editor of radio 5DN, stated:

Radio 5DN news editor, Mr. Des Ryan has resigned following a management directive to stop probing a matter he says is of "major significance to South Australia". The investigation by the station's reporters is believed to include the Premier, Mr. Dunstan.

In other words, I have been condemned of an unspecified charge in a newspaper headline, a habit that seems to be

growing in certain areas of the press in South Australia. The statement of the Leader of the Opposition that I was in some way responsible for depriving these men of their livelihood is completely baseless and untrue, and I propose to deal with my knowledge of this particular matter for the benefit of the House.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Honourable Opposition members gave leave.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** My first knowledge of the activities of members of this particular group at 5DN occurred at the time of the recent election when a Mr. McEwen, who was a reporter at 5DN, questioned me at a factory gate meeting at General Motors-Holden's.

His questioning was in such a form that he constantly interrupted me and prevented me from putting the Government's position on the matter he was questioning me about, which was the Northfield pilfering matter. His behaviour was so unprofessional that I had finally to terminate the interview.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Who the heck is that the judgment of?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** A number of people who were present. As a matter of fact, numbers of the members here were present and said that I had been far too tolerant with the man.

**Mr. Millhouse:** He was probably asking—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has interjected three times. I hope he will cease interjecting.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I protested to the station management, and the station manager asked me to re-do the interview, after apologising to me for the incident. Before the arranged re-interview had taken place, however, the news staff that night broadcast an edited version of what had been said at G.M.H. that day. I again protested to radio 5DN, whereupon the news service said that they were dropping the story, anyway.

I was thereby deprived of having been able to broadcast on 5DN the Government's point of view on this matter and the Government's case as to what it had done in relation to the matter. However, I left it at that at that time. After the election, when there was a news conference on the fact that the Auditor-General's Report had not included matters critical of the Government, as had been forecast by the Opposition before the election—

**Mr. Tonkin:** Not critical? You're joking!

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** There was no critical matter on this topic, nothing. At that conference, Mr. McEwen appeared and tried to revive the line of questioning on the very subject which I had been prevented from speaking on on 5DN at election time. I objected to this strongly, and asked the management of 5DN not to continue with this way of dealing with me. I had an interview with the station manager and Mr. Ryan; I think probably that is the only time I have ever seen Mr. Ryan, as far as I can remember. At that interview, it was agreed that journalists from radio 5DN would in future deal with me in a professional manner, and I took that undertaking and proceeded to treat them in a perfectly normal way as radio journalists.

The next incident occurred when I called a press conference to announce the result of the Government's deliberations concerning the report of Mr. Acting Justice White. At the end of that interview, I was approached by Mr. McEwen, who stood in front of me with a microphone, and asked me did it cause me concern that the police may have been investigating my activities with Mr. John Ceruto. I was completely taken aback. I could not see what in the world any activity with Mr. Ceruto, who was a former employee of my department and

subsequently ran some restaurants in Adelaide about which matters have been canvassed in debate in this House, had to do with Special Branch.

I said, in some indignation, "What evidence have you for that statement?" He said, "I said 'may' have been investigated." I said, "That is grossly improper. What you have done is to impute on radio that there is some reason for the police to have been investigating my activities in some way, and that is utterly reprehensible and unprofessional, and I will not talk to you." I left the room, and protests were made to the station management. My Press Secretary was then in conversation subsequently with Mr. Ryan.

Mr. Ryan, the news editor, said that he considered that that action on the part of Mr. McEwen was quite professional, that two members of his staff had been engaged full time for some months on an investigation, the results of which would do me unending personal harm, and that McEwen was merely testing the water.

**Mr. Rodda:** When was D day?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The honourable member can listen because I will tell him quite a bit on this score, and I hope that he will be informed at the end of it. As a result of this, I refused to answer any further questions from Mr. McEwen, but that did not stop him from coming to my press conferences and posing questions. Indeed, he went to Mr. Salisbury's press conference and put to Mr. Salisbury (much to his indignation) a suggestion that Mr. Salisbury had at my direction signed a false document concerning the Northfield scandal. Mr. Salisbury utterly rejected the suggestion. Mr. McEwen subsequently put the same question to me, and I also rejected it. I refused to answer any other questions of Mr. McEwen on the perfectly proper grounds that he did not act professionally as a journalist.

Subsequently, I was interviewed by an interstate radio station for the Macquarie broadcasting network and, in the course of that interview, it was put to me that I had had some differences with a radio news reporter in South Australia. I said what had occurred—I told the story of Mr. McEwen's question to me and what Mr. Ryan had had to say. I said that it was evident that a vendetta was being undertaken in that news office—a personal vendetta as far as I was concerned, and that was the only conclusion that one could come to as a result of what Mr. Ryan had had to say. That was the full extent of my involvement in any internal matter in 5DN. I did not talk any further to the management or to the directors. I had no conversations with them in the matter at all, but I have subsequently been informed by Macquarie (and this information was volunteered), just as I have been informed by other journalist members of the A.J.A., as to what had transpired at 5DN.

Picking up that radio broadcast on an interstate Macquarie station, the manager of news services for Macquarie asked Mr. Ryan what was going on and asked for the material. Mr. Ryan made difficulties about providing the material for some time but, eventually, provided to the news manager a synopsis of his inquiries.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Can you vouch for the accuracy of this?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I am telling the honourable member what I have been told by Macquarie.

**Mr. Millhouse:** You can't vouch for it, then?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I personally accept what I have been told by Macquarie, and it is also vouched for by members of the A.J.A.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Are you going to say who they are?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** No, I am not, any more than a newspaper reporter reveals his sources of information or the honourable member revealed his in a

recent notable incident.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** A synopsis was provided. I have not seen it, but I have been told by those who have seen it that it was ludicrous—that it was a series of pieces of hearsay and unjustifiable innuendoes from what evidence could be produced, which was concerned with an allegation against me personally (and I will come to the allegation a little later).

However, the synopsis was so laughable that Mr. Ryan was instructed to discontinue this activity. He refused to do so. There were subsequent visits of the chief of the news services of Macquarie to Adelaide, negotiations with the A.J.A., and, as Mr. Linkson has said publicly, the A.J.A. is fully aware of the situation; in fact, Mr. Linkson wrote a letter to the paper making quite clear the station's position and stating that there had been no pressure, nor was there any policy on the part of the station not to take action in relation to persons in high places, or anything of that kind. However, Mr. Ryan chose to resign and, subsequently I understand, Mr. McEwen also did that, on the grounds that they could not have this so-called investigation interfered with.

Now I come to the nature of the allegation. I am informed by the people who told me about the synopsis that the allegation is that somehow or other I personally am connected financially and in business interests with Abraham Saffron. In addition, apparently this association with Mr. Saffron's interests has occurred in some way in relation to Mr. Ceruto. In relation to Mr. Ceruto, I can only say that I have no knowledge and no evidence whatever that there has been any connection between Mr. Ceruto and Mr. Saffron. If there has been, I have never seen any of it, none whatever.

As far as Mr. Ceruto was concerned, my knowledge of his business interests of any kind ceased when he left the managership of the Coalyard Restaurant. I am aware that he ran a restaurant in Adelaide, but, as to the nature of the arrangements he made in relation to it, I have never been privy to them. I do not know anything about Mr. Ceruto's business interests, so I can only say that I have no evidence at all concerning the allegation concerning Mr. Ceruto.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Isn't he still at Tramps?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Yes. What of it? That is not a restaurant with which the Government has had anything to do in any way, and it never has had.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! As the honourable Premier's time has expired, he must now ask for further leave if he desires to continue.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I ask for that leave, Sir.  
Leave granted.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The ludicrous nature of this allegation concerning myself and Mr. Saffron can be better seen when I detail my knowledge of Saffron, and the action which has been taken in respect of Saffron, which will be further obvious to the House when the Attorney-General this afternoon gives details of the concerted action which the Government has taken for some time to make life extremely difficult and unpleasant for Mr. Saffron's business interests in this State.

My knowledge of Mr. Saffron began in a conversation in 1975 with the Deputy Commissioner of Police and with the then head of the Vice Squad. At that time the Deputy Commissioner said to me that it was well known that Abraham Gilbert Saffron already had extensive business interests in Adelaide in the form of night clubs, hotels and massage parlours, although inquiries to date had not revealed any credible evidence to prove his connection with organised crime in South Australia. They did,

however, forecast to me their fears that his involvement in these areas might lead to stand-over tactics, extortion rackets and the like in South Australia and that the police were worried about that situation. It was discussed in relation to the licensing of massage parlours.

In consequence, after that interview late in March, I sent a minute to the Chief Secretary for the Commissioner of Police concerning a suggestion that I raised as to the way in which evidence might be obtained in respect of the activities of Mr. Saffron and the difficulties of getting evidence that we had talked about in the previous discussions. I table that minute, as it makes clear—

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** That was March, 1975?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** April 8, 1975. It makes very clear my concern that the utmost activity should be undertaken to make difficulties for Mr. Saffron.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Why are you giving all this explanation?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The honourable member will get the information for which he is asking. Subsequently, on May 8, 1975, I had an interview with the Commissioner of Police and Mr. Holland. At that interview the Commissioner of Police said that the suggestion that I had made in my minute of April that some undercover activity be undertaken by the police to try to get evidence in relation to Saffron's activities was not something that the police felt justified in undertaking at that time and that he would not advise it. We had a general discussion, in the course of which the question of the proposed lease of Ayers House came up. At that time it had been proposed by the lessee of the Ayers House restaurant that a situation that had been disclosed in an accounting investigation of the problems of Ayers House restaurant that he was under-capitalised should be remedied by his bringing in additional capital. A lease to a new company had been proposed and put forward by his solicitor. That was then under consideration in the department.

At the meeting with the Commissioner of Police, Mr. Holland, my Chief Administrative Officer, said that it had come to his notice that morning that it was rumoured that the money that would be put into Ayers House restaurant was associated with Saffron interests. I immediately ordered that all further activity in relation to signing a lease to a new company at Ayers House stop, and that a full investigation be made about the associations of Saffron and whether there could be any connection at all with the money proposed to be put into Ayers House.

An extensive investigation was then undertaken throughout Australia on company registers to get information about the associations of Mr. Saffron. That investigation revealed that the proposed money to be put into Ayers House was in fact associated with Saffron interests. I immediately called in Mr. Cramey and notified him that, in no circumstances, could we in any way contemplate that the licence of Ayers House should in any way be associated with interests of Mr. Saffron and that his alternative, if he could not find other capital and was in difficulty in the restaurant, would be for us to buy him out, if he chose, from his licence at a valuation that we would fix after investigation. He chose that course at that time. However, the negotiations as to valuation broke down and a notice to quit was given to Mr. Cramey. That was subsequently settled when he brought his wife into the business and traded out of his then difficulty. We checked very carefully to ensure that there was no possibility that any money associated with Saffron interests was in Ayers House. That check has been carried out rigorously and we were quite satisfied that that was the case.

In September, 1975, the new Attorney-General was appointed. I had then assembled information concerning

Mr. Saffron in the course of the investigations that had been made. I concerted a plan of action with the Attorney-General that all opportunities be taken by Executive action in South Australia to oppose, as far as we were able, any spreading or continuation of Saffron's interests in this State. That has been done. It has been a continued policy of the Government to make economic life difficult for Saffron's interests in this State.

**Mr. Millhouse:** How have you done that?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The Attorney-General will detail to the honourable member in a moment all the things we have undertaken in the Licensing Court, the Companies Office, and the like—and they have been lengthy and concerted actions. If there are two people in this State whom Mr. Saffron has reason to feel umbrage at, they are the Attorney-General and I, and the ludicrous thing is that the whole of this allegation, which has never been a specific charge at all, but just in newspaper headlines, relates to a matter such as this.

It has not stopped there because, having left 5DN, these individuals have continued with this activity. They have been around to interview restaurateurs and others in Adelaide, making a series of allegations about me and Saffron interests, and have concerted a contractual arrangement, I am told, with the *Adelaide Advertiser*. The purpose of their investigation is quite obvious. They have never been to a Minister to check out or to put anything to us on the basis of what was our relationship or our attitude towards Mr. Saffron. They could have got the information without any difficulty in coming to us; we could have told them. That was not the purpose of the investigation. The purpose of the investigation was to manufacture dirt to, in Mr. Ryan's words, do me unending personal harm. If that is the level to which journalism has got in South Australia, that is a gross abuse of journalism and indeed of Parliament.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: Mr. A. G. SAFFRON

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** On Thursday last, February 23, 1978, in another place, the Hon. John Cornwall, M.L.C., asked me a series of questions relating to the business activities, company directorships, and shareholdings of Mr. A. G. Saffron, a Sydney businessman, and of his business associates. The Hon. John Cornwall had on October 12, 1976, asked questions about associated matters, in particular Mr. Saffron's possible involvement in the illegal sale of drugs in South Australia and illegal activities in other States and overseas.

Since Mr. Saffron's business interests and other activities in South Australia first came to the notice of the Government, we have kept a close watch on these matters, and since my appointment as Attorney-General I have personally, under direction from the Premier, kept the South Australian activities of Mr. A. G. Saffron and his associates under careful scrutiny. With close co-operation of members of the South Australian Police Force and officers of my department, I have at various intervals monitored the involvement of Mr. Saffron in South Australia. Later in this statement I will detail the precise actions which this Government has taken to stop the spread of Mr. Saffron's activities and, where possible, to put a stop to Mr. Saffron's involvement in the South Australian business community.

The steps taken by the Government in this area, whilst being co-ordinated by me, have been undertaken in close

co-operation with the Premier, members of the Police Force, and members of my department. I am now able to give the House details of Mr. Saffron's involvement in South Australia and also details of his activities in other States and overseas, and I do so in light of the Hon. J. R. Cornwall's request for detailed reasons as to why Mr. Saffron has been described as a person well known to the police throughout Australia and overseas for his criminal activities. The account I shall give to the House this afternoon is by no means a comprehensive account of the activities of the Saffron organisation.

**Mr. Millhouse:** There might be a lot you don't know.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** That is possible, and I do not deny that for a moment. Members on both sides of the House will be well aware of the activities of organised crime and its ability to legitimise business activities and infiltrate respectable and legal business enterprises, thereby creating an illusion of respectability and honest business practice. The behaviour of organisations such as the Mafia in the U.S.A. has been well documented by various U.S. Senate subcommittees, and in recent years suggestions have been made that the phenomenon of huge multi-national crime corporate enterprises has manifested itself in Australia.

To emphasise this point I need go no further than to refer to the findings of the Moffitt Royal Commission into infiltration of organised crime into the licensed club and entertainment industries in New South Wales, which studied the operations of the Bally Corporation of the United States in Australia. From the experience of organised crime in both America and the United Kingdom, it is becoming apparent that criminal organisations attempt to legitimise their operations by devolving their economic wealth into what ostensibly is legal business activity. This is the phenomena of corporate crime in the post-war era.

Mr. Saffron's activities in New South Wales have in the past come under the attention of police authorities in that State and I table a copy of Mr. Saffron's police file and record. Mr. Saffron was a key figure in the 1953 Maxwell Royal Commission into liquor trading in the State of New South Wales. I would like to quote for the benefit of the House certain excerpts from Judge Maxwell's findings, at page 12, as follows:

A. G. Saffron employed a number of persons to conduct various hotels on his behalf though this was concealed from the Licensing Court. The facts shortly are as follows: Saffron was at the material times licensee of the Gladstone Hotel, Sydney. Before the Commission, he first swore that no one else had an interest in the licence . . . he later admitted that one Kincaid had a half share in it. Kincaid was interested in other hotels with Saffron, but it was—as stated—concealed from the Licensing Court. The licence of the Mortdale Hotel was held on his behalf by Mrs. Frack, of the Cumberland Hotel by one Kornhauser. Kornhauser admitted that on his application he misled the Licensing Court. Mrs. Frack also admitted that she concealed the facts, as she "thought it necessary to tell lies to the Licensing Court." H. Taylor, licensee of the Civic Hotel, misled the Licensing Court as to Saffron's interest in the hotel, because "I had given a promise I would not mention his name." Taylor swore falsely before the Commission.

Before passing from individual ownership in leases, where the owner or lessee is also a licensee of one or—by subterfuge—more than one licence, it is proper to draw attention to Saffron's interest in the Roosevelt Restaurant, for this purpose only: the evidence clearly establishes that it is undesirable for the holder of a publican's licence to be financially interested in any restaurant or night club, even though it is the holder of a restaurant permit in the present

form or any other form in the future.

At page 30 of the findings appears the following:

A. G. Saffron ultimately admitted his beneficial interest in a number of hotels using different persons as "dummies". These hotels included West End Hotel, Westdale Hotel, Cumberland, Gladstone, Albert Hotel. These interests were successfully concealed from the Licensing Court; and before this Commission—with a clear appreciation of his obligation to abide by his oath and of his liability if he failed—he engaged in systematic false swearing.

When they look at the document I have tabled, members will note that Mr. Saffron's personal involvement with the police appears to have ended abruptly in 1964, but despite this he was called as a witness to the 1973 Moffitt Royal Commission inquiring into the infiltration of organised crime into the licensed club and entertainment industries in New South Wales.

During the proceedings of the Moffitt Royal Commission it was put to Mr. Saffron that he was one and the same person who was commonly referred to in the press as the Mr. Sin of Australian organised crime. Mr. Saffron denied this allegation. However, one matter which became apparent from the proceedings of the Royal Commission was that Mr. Saffron had close involvement with Mr. Jack Rooklyn, of the Bally Poker Machine Company. That organisation has close links with the Mafia in America.

In his report the Royal Commissioner, Judge Moffitt, said that the continued operation of the Bally company in Australia posed a real threat of the infiltration of organised American crime syndicates in this country.

Further evidence of the activities of Mr. Saffron and his organisation came to light in a special report in *Nation Review*, and I seek leave to insert a copy of the unedited version of that article in *Hansard* without my reading it.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It must be statistical, but that does not seem to be. The honourable Attorney may read it if he wishes. Can the Attorney assure the House that the material that he seeks to have inserted in *Hansard* is of a statistical nature?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I cannot assure the House of that.

**The SPEAKER:** The opportunity will be available for the honourable Attorney-General to read it.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Further—

**Mr. Millhouse:** What we want to hear is what you've done in this State.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** If the honourable member would just wait for a few moments—

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

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** —he would hear the details. Further, for honourable members' information, I have a copy of an interview between Detective-Sergeant K. Arkins, of the New South Wales Police Force, and Antony Reeves, a New South Wales journalist and Alderman on the Sydney City Council, who has been investigating the activities of Mr. Saffron in Sydney. That document indicates the links between establishments in Sydney owned by Mr. Saffron and certain employees of Mr. Saffron with the circumstances surrounding the mysterious disappearance of Juanita Nielsen on July 4, 1975, who it is believed was murdered.

Further, I have a copy of a record of an interview with one Shirley Brifman taken by the Queensland and New South Wales police. Ms. Brifman makes certain allegations concerning involvement of the New South Wales police, the Saffron organisation, and organised crime generally, and I seek leave to insert both of those documents in *Hansard* without my reading them.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Then I seek leave to table them.

**The SPEAKER:** The Attorney does not need leave; he can table the documents.

In the specific case of the Reeves record of interview a Mr. Trigg and Mr. Anderson are specifically mentioned. These are both key employees of Saffron and in particular Anderson is well known as Saffron's right hand man. In the Brifman record of interview, a former Detective-Sergeant of the New South Wales Police, Mr. F. Krahe, is a key figure. Krahe is a known business associate of Saffron. I just mention that to honourable members so that they can see the clear relevance of the situation when they read the documents.

What emerges from all this is that Mr. Saffron has been, from time to time, publicly linked with criminal and illegal activities in the State of New South Wales in particular, and that his behaviour and organisations with which he is associated have been the subject of a number of Royal Commissions and inquiries conducted by various authorities.

I am making no claims as to the veracity of the allegations made in the documents I have produced this afternoon. However, it was important in light of the Hon. J. R. Cornwall's question as to reasons why Mr. Saffron has been described as a person well known to the police throughout Australia and overseas, to make the information contained in those documents available to honourable members.

In this regard I make it clear to the House that I have been informed by the police that Mr. Saffron is a key figure in organised crime in this country.

I now turn to other matters referred to by Hon. J. R. Cornwall in order to apprise all members as to the activities of Mr. Saffron in South Australia and as to the response of the law enforcement agencies of this Government, which I have co-ordinated in consultation with the Premier.

Licensed premises in which A. G. Saffron personally holds a shareholding interest or, alternatively, companies in which A. G. Saffron holds shares.

Castle Motor Inn (Hotel), 1010 South Road, Edwardstown

Elephant and Castle Hotel, 179 West Terrace, Adelaide  
West End Silvers Restaurant, 173 Hindley Street, Adelaide

La Belle Cabaret, 181 Hindley Street, Adelaide  
Companies registered in South Australia of which A. G. Saffron is a Director

Burbridge Properties Proprietary Ltd., 195 Victoria Square, Adelaide

Mosman Holdings Pty. Ltd., 209 Hutt Street, Adelaide  
West Side Holdings Pty. Ltd., 231 Greenhill Road, Dulwich

Parisiene Restaurant Pty. Ltd., 231 Greenhill Road, Dulwich

Co-ordinated Consultants Pty. Ltd., 231 Greenhill Road, Dulwich

China Palace Pty. Ltd., 231 Greenhill Road, Dulwich  
Elephant and Castle Pty. Ltd., 231 Greenhill Road, Dulwich

Cooks Hotel Pty. Ltd., 209 Hutt Street, Adelaide  
Register Investments Pty. Ltd., 231 Greenhill Road, Dulwich

West End Freeholds Pty. Ltd., 231 Greenhill Road, Dulwich

La Belle Restaurant Pty. Ltd., 231 Greenhill Road, Dulwich.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall sought details of co-directors

of companies in which Saffron is involved. They are as follows:

Burbridge Properties Pty. Ltd.: Bruce Combe Calman, 6 Shirley Crescent, West Beach; Grant W. Davidson, 13 Upper Sheoak Road, Mosman, New South Wales; Jack Rooklyn, 252 Pitt Street, Sydney.

Mosman Holdings Pty. Ltd.: Grant William Davidson, Sheoak Road, Crafers; George Edmonds Davidson, 32 Bridge Street, Sydney; Robert L. Davidson, 32 Bridge Street, Sydney; Frederick George Storm, 98 Bunga Heid Road, Newport, New South Wales.

West Side Holdings Pty. Ltd.: Peter Paul Farrugia, 80 Kyle Bay, Kyle Parade, New South Wales.

Parisiene Restaurant Pty. Ltd.: Peter Farrugia, 26 Bennett Place, Maroubra, New South Wales; Robert John Booth, 6 Payneham Road, Stepney, South Australia; Allan Gerald Taylor, 10/372 Military Road, Tennyson, South Australia.

Co-ordinated Consultants Pty. Ltd.: Peter Paul Farrugia, 26 Bennett Place, Maroubra, New South Wales; Brian Arthur Scott, 80 Hamlyn Street, Elizabeth Downs, South Australia.

Elephant and Castle Pty. Ltd.: Peter Paul Farrugia, 26 Bennett Place, Maroubra, New South Wales; Daphne Estelle Quirini, 179 West Terrace, Adelaide, South Australia; John Scott Sutton, 2 The Grove, Dulwich, South Australia.

China Palace Pty. Ltd. formerly West End Casino Pty. Ltd.: Peter Paul Farrugia, 26 Bennett Place, Maroubra, New South Wales.

Cooks Hotel Pty. Ltd.: Grant William Davidson, Sheoak Road, Crafers, South Australia; George Edmonds Davidson, 50 Wolseley Road, Point Piper, New South Wales; Robert L. Davidson, 32 Bridge Road, Sydney, New South Wales; Frederick George Storm, 98 Bunga Heid Road, Newport, New South Wales.

Register Investments Pty. Ltd.: Vincent Farrugia, 14 Conway Avenue, Rose Bay, New South Wales; Peter Vardon Fairweather, 1 Woodland Road, Springfield, South Australia.

West End Freeholds Pty. Ltd.: Peter Vardon Fairweather, 1 Woodland Road, Springfield, South Australia; Irene Jill Vickery, Main Road, Cherry Gardens, South Australia.

La Belle Restaurant Pty. Ltd.: Geoffrey Roy Cassidy, 24 Natalie Avenue, Salisbury, South Australia.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I may have misinterpreted what the honourable Attorney-General said. I think what he is reading out is statistical.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** In any event, Mr. Speaker, I have nearly finished. Regarding the third point raised by the Hon. J. R. Cornwall, Mr. Saffron had an interest in the licensed restaurant Jeremiah's, 6A James Place, Adelaide, between April, 1975, and December, 1977. Associates of Mr. Saffron have substantial interests in the following licensed premises: the Pooraka Hotel and the Belair Hotel.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Attorney-General's time has expired, and he must seek further leave to continue.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I seek leave.  
Leave granted.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Associates of Mr. Saffron operated the Tivoli Hotel from March, 1976, until the licence was transferred in April, 1977.

Mr. Saffron has interests in the following non-licensed businesses: The Private Bookshop, Hindley Street, Adelaide; Love Craft Shops at 125 Gawler Place, Adelaide, 278 Jetty Road, Glenelg, and 116 O'Connell Street, North Adelaide; the Ecstasy Sex Shop, Gouger

Street, City; West End Casino, Hindley Street, City (now closed); Clipet Amusements Pty. Ltd. (now ceased trading); and Adult Movie Club, Hindley Street, City.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall has sought details of any activities or investigations which I or my departments have undertaken to control or oppose the issue or transfer of licences to Mr. Saffron or his associates.

Prior to my appointment as Attorney-General, the following Licensing Court decisions and actions taken by the licensing administration relating to licences in which Mr. Saffron or his associates have an interest took place.

September, 1970: The Licensing Court refused an application by Burbridge Properties Pty. Ltd. to erect a hotel to be known as "The Sundowner" on land at the corner of Burbridge and Military Roads, West Beach.

August, 1972: The Licensing Court granted a cabaret licence for the La Belle premises, Hindley Street, subject to a condition sought by the Superintendent of Licensed Premises that all full-time and part-time persons employed by the licensee company in operating the business of the cabaret licence (except those employed as entertainers) were to be persons approved in writing by the Superintendent of Licensed Premises.

Following my appointment as Attorney-General, discussions were held between myself and the Premier concerning Saffron's activities in South Australia and it was agreed that all steps legally available to the Government should be taken to try to limit (and, where possible, to eradicate) the influence of Mr. Saffron and his associates in South Australia.

To implement the Premier's policy on this matter, the following steps were taken: December, 1975 (about two months after I became Attorney-General), an application to transfer the Surabaia Restaurant to Stormy Summers Pty. Ltd. was, on my instructions, opposed by the Assistant Superintendent of Licensed Premises, and the application was not proceeded with.

January, 1976: An objection was lodged to a further application for the transfer of the restaurant known as the Surabaia to Stormy Summers Pty. Ltd. The application was again, at my direction, opposed by the Assistant Superintendent of Licensed Premises and the application was subsequently withdrawn. However, as a serious breach of the provisions of the Licensing Act was proved against the licensee, again at the behest of the Government the licence was voided for the balance of the year.

January, 1976: Mr. Peter Vardon Fairweather was interviewed regarding his involvement with breaches of the Licensing Act at the Surabaia Restaurant. This was done with my knowledge and in accordance with the policy laid down by the Premier.

February, 1976: An application for J. E. J. Coffey to be appointed manager of Jeremiah's Restaurant was opposed by the Superintendent of Licensed Premises, with my knowledge and consent, and was refused by the court.

March, 1976: Objections were lodged to applications for renewal of the liquor licences for all companies in which Peter Vardon Fairweather was a director, including the companies operating the Castle Motor Inn, the Elephant and Castle Hotel, the Pooraka Hotel, Jeremiah's Restaurant, and the La Belle Cabaret. These objections were lodged by the Superintendent of Licensed Premises following discussions with me.

In July, 1976, the Licensing Court decided that the licences for the above premises would not be renewed so long as P. V. Fairweather remained a director. The Licensing Court determined that he was not a fit and proper person to hold a liquor licence following the taking of evidence presented by the Superintendent, at my

direction. In the judgment handed down in the matter the Deputy Chairman said of Fairweather that, on the most charitable view of his conduct as a director of licensed premises, he was irresponsible and careless. At the worst, it can be said that he was a conscious and deliberate party to a wholesale flaunting of the Licensing Act. Later in his judgment, he said "very much of what Fairweather said went far to demonstrate that he was not a fit and proper person to be licensed judged alone on what he said he did as well as on what he failed to do, in his determination to preserve this licence for Saffron and Farrugia".

February, 1977: Again with my knowledge, Messrs. Davidson and Schembri were interviewed regarding the unsatisfactory conduct and management of the Tivoli Hotel. Subsequently this hotel licence was transferred to interests outside of the Saffron group in May, 1977.

May, 1977: The licensee of the Pooraka Hotel was convicted of failing to keep a lodgers book in accordance with the provisions of section 161 of the Licensing Act. The persons in residence at the Pooraka Hotel who had not signed the register were New South Wales police officers attending the National Police Golf Titles in Adelaide.

In April, 1976, after consultation with the Premier, I arranged to have prepared proposals for a review of certain aspects of the licensing legislation to control the then growing practice of licensee companies being "taken over" rather than the licence being transferred in accordance with the provisions of the Licensing Act. This step became necessary because of the licensee take-overs of the Elephant and Castle Hotel in December, 1970, Jeremiah's Restaurant in April, 1975, and the Pooraka Hotel in August, 1975, and various other company take-overs of licensee companies without the approval of the Licensing Court.

In the second reading speech of October 12, 1976, (*Hansard*, page 1443), I said:

The Bill deals with the provisions of the principal Act relating to the holding of licences by companies. For some time the Government had been concerned by the fact that licences can be effectively transferred from company to company by means of company takeover, rather than in accordance with the normal procedures of the Licensing Court. The effect of the Bill is to provide that no change in the directorship of a company that holds a licence under the Licensing Act, and no change in the membership of a proprietary company or a public company that is not listed on the stock exchange, is to take place without the approval of the Licensing Court.

On November 3, 1976 (*Hansard*, page 1893), in answer to a question from the member for Fisher, I said:

... the problem is that some persons are able to transfer a licence to other persons without those persons who are to become owners of the licence being approved by the Licensing court. The shares of that company might be in the hands of person A, who decides to sell his shares to person B, and the effective control of that company is transferred to person B. Presently, the Licensing Court had no say in whether or not the second owner is a satisfactory person or group to hold a licence.

Section 82 of the Licensing Act has now been amended, and the new provisions regarding company takeovers of licensee companies came into operation in December, 1976. The Hon. J. R. Cornwall's questions related largely to the involvement of Mr. Saffron and his associates in licensed premises in South Australia and, as can be seen from the information now before the House, the policy which I have applied, in consultation with the Premier on behalf of the Government, has been reasonably successful in controlling and limiting Mr. Saffron's activities in this

area. There has been, in fact, a decrease in the number of licensed premises controlled by the Saffron interests in this State.

As the direction of the honourable member's question was towards the situation involving licensed premises, I have not sought to deal in any detail with Saffron interests in this State in other areas. However, members can be assured that the Government policies in such areas are being applied vigorously by the South Australian Police department with considerable success, and I would like to place on record the Government's appreciation of the excellent work that the police in this State have done and are continuing to do in this area.

I have put this information before the House this afternoon to enable the members of this Parliament and the public of South Australia to be aware of the operation and activities of Mr. Saffron and his organisation in this State. When his activities are put in the total picture of his involvement and influence in other States, it is clear that the South Australian Government has placed a high priority on the possible infiltration of organised crime into this State. While it is true that Mr. Saffron has not been charged with criminal offences since 1964, it is also clear that he is one of the principal characters in organised crime in Australia. The fact that he has been the subject of a number of governmental inquiries and independent investigations, and that he is without doubt involved in more than 100 companies throughout Australia, makes it imperative that the public be aware of the extent of his influence.

The phenomena of organised crime is one which has pointed up some inadequacies in the existing criminal law. Organised crime, unlike sporadic and unco-ordinated instances of criminal behaviour, can only be understood as part of a pattern of criminal behaviour, a pattern which involves legal and illegal operations. I want to assure the House, the Parliament and the people of South Australia that this Government will not stand by and simply allow organised crime to infiltrate this State, and that we will take such steps as are necessary—whether they be administrative or legislative—to ensure that organised crime does not flourish and grow in the State of South Australia.

#### QUESTION TIME

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

That the time for asking questions without notice be extended to 4.5 p.m.

Motion carried.

#### QUESTIONS RESUMED

**The SPEAKER:** During the absence of the Minister of Labour and Industry, the Minister of Transport will take questions directed to that Minister.

#### MR. A. G. SAFFRON

**Mr. TONKIN:** First, I thank the Minister of Works for his courtesy in extending Question Time as he has done. Will the Attorney-General make available to the House as soon as possible details of the Saffron interests in this State

that he says involve other than licensed premises? Statements by the Premier and the Attorney-General that the Government has consistently made things difficult for Mr. Saffron have been made in this House this afternoon. The Attorney-General has detailed actions that have been taken by the Government in respect of licensing changes. Further in his statement the Attorney-General stated that there had been a reduction in the number of licensed premises controlled by Saffron interests in South Australia as a result of the Government's action in this way. What evidence has he to suppose that the present licensees of the premises involved and in other businesses not covered are in no way associated with Mr. Saffron, either directly or indirectly? There is little in the Attorney-General's statement to support his statement that the Government has made Mr. Saffron's involvement in South Australia at all difficult.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I am amazed to hear the last statement in the Leader's question. I can hardly believe that he listened to my statement this afternoon for him to make that sort of statement in rebuttal. If the Leader looks at the latter part of my statement he will see in great detail the list of actions that officers of my department have been taking to ensure that Saffron interests find it as difficult as possible to continue to hold interests in licensed premises in South Australia.

Mr. Tonkin: What—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Leader has asked his question.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The details are there for the Leader to see. I am somewhat disappointed at his attitude, because he has tried to introduce an element of politics into the situation that has certainly not existed to date. The Government has been most concerned about this situation and has been taking such steps as it has been able to take. The point raised by the honourable member is one of the great underscores, one of the great difficulties, in this area; that is, that one never knows quite where the interests of a person such as Mr. Saffron begin and where they end.

At least in South Australia we have, through the agency of the Police Force, officers of my department and other Government personnel tried to keep a close watch on the activities of this group. We have tried to eradicate it, to make life difficult for it, and we shall continue to do that regardless of the Leader's attitude as displayed this afternoon. As to the many other matters—

**The Hon. D. A. Dunstan:** He asked you for details of the non-licensed interests.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I intended to deal with that in a moment. A number of other interests of a property nature are listed in the statement that I made this afternoon. Doubtless, Mr. Saffron has other interests in South Australia that are not known to the Government directly, some of which may be known to the Police Force, some of which may be part of the investigations going on at present. I do not have details of those matters we with me presently, but I will make investigations to determine whether or not there are other matters that can be brought before this House.

One thing I can tell the honourable member is this: the point I was making was that the Hon. J. R. Cornwall's question related directly to licensed premises and, as a result of that, the work undertaken to prepare that reply to the questions asked by the Hon. J. R. Cornwall related primarily to licensed premises. The answer was slanted towards the question of licences, which is why the details given in my reply this afternoon related primarily to licensing matters.

## CHILD CARE CENTRES

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Can the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security (Senator Guilfoyle) whether the child care and development certificate sponsored by the South Australian Council of Social Services could be raised in status, thereby attracting a staffing subsidy through the office of child care services to local government bodies operating child care centres?

Recently, the Elizabeth council opened a day-care child centre. After selecting staff to run the centre it found that two ladies who held the child care and development certificate, which is obtained by a two-year part-time course, were not eligible for staffing subsidy, and therefore the council was unable to offer them employment as nurses. The office of child care informed the Elizabeth council that its certificates were not equivalent to the child care studies course offered by the Further Education Department and that it was doubtful whether this course would be recognised by the Community Welfare Department for licensing purposes.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I will undertake those inquiries. I think that the honourable member already understands that the decision is a Commonwealth decision. The child care centres, such as the centre to which he is referring at Elizabeth, are funded under the Commonwealth child care legislation and the requirement relating to the current staff salary and level of qualification is set by the Commonwealth office of child care. My department's involvement in a matter such as this is mainly concerned with the granting of a licence or otherwise to the premises to operate in the field of child care. I will certainly take up the problem with the Federal Minister to see whether some resolution can be obtained.

## DRUG TRAFFICKING

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Can the Attorney-General say whether there is any evidence of Mr. Abraham Saffron being involved in drug trafficking in South Australia? The statement was made today by both the Premier and the Attorney-General that the Government has been at great pains to inhibit the activities of Mr. Saffron in South Australia. From the list of companies and licensed premises in which he is involved, those efforts would appear to have been unsuccessful.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** Where have you been this afternoon?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** I have been listening to the incredible dialogue from the Premier and the Attorney-General for the last hour.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** You couldn't have been and then make a statement like that.

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

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Some hotel premises are mentioned from time to time as being involved in the drug scene in South Australia. Despite what the Attorney-General said in his statement, that he has not sought to deal in any detail with Saffron's interests in this State in other areas (which seems to me a rather incredible state of affairs in view of the statement to the House this afternoon), I ask whether the Attorney-General has any evidence, or whether the police have uncovered any evidence, that Mr. Saffron is engaged in drug trafficking in this State.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I cannot speak on behalf

of the Police Force in this matter; the Chief Secretary would be the appropriate Minister to deal with that. What I can tell the honourable member is that to my knowledge, from discussions I have had with police officers, there is no direct evidence of that sort. There are the types of rumour that exist from time to time to which the honourable member has referred, but I am not aware of any activity of that sort that is directly related back to Mr. Saffron.

### LEVEL CROSSING

**Mr. OLSON:** Can the Minister of Transport take action to have the level crossing at Strathfield Terrace, Taperoo, improved? It has been brought to my attention by motorists that, in addition to the roadway being too high over the railway line, the protective fencing parallel to the line extends too far, thereby greatly reducing the width of the roadway at the crossing. An accident occurred recently, when a car was forced into the guardrail as it attempted to pass another vehicle on the crossing.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** I will ask my officers to look into the problem, and I will give the honourable member a report of that investigation.

### DRUGS

**Mr. RODDA:** As Minister responsible for the Police Force, can the Chief Secretary say, further to the revelations made to the House this afternoon, and in view of the reports about the discovery of a large drug plantation at Tintinara recently, reports of other cases of small amounts of a drug being grown for distribution to users of drugs in this State, and reports of aircraft engaged in drug running flying into this country and from Port Lincoln to a place called Eden, what progress his department or the police are making in finding a Mr. Big in South Australia?

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** I do not know of any connection with a Mr. Big in South Australia. I think that the police officers have been quite successful in their attempts to stamp out the practice of producing marihuana. The raid they made in the Tintinara area recently was an efficient operation which put out of action a considerable amount of this drug in one hit. I know they are working actively on this matter and that every attempt will be made to stamp out the practice. I do not know of any connection with Mr. Big; none has been reported to me.

### PUBLICATION OF NAMES

**Mr. WHITTEN:** Can the Attorney-General say whether an amendment to the legislation is required to prohibit the publication of names and addresses of persons arrested and charged with offences until such time as they may have been found guilty? If an amendment to legislation is required, will he consider that matter? Recently, my attention has been drawn to the trauma that exists when persons' names are published after they have been charged with a serious offence and neighbours ostracise them.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I would rather deal with this matter following the publication of the fourth Mitchell Committee report (which I understand will be available for tabling in the House before the end of this session), as I understand that is one of the matters on which the Mitchell committee has made recommendations.

### NORTH-EAST AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY

**Mr. WILSON:** Can the Minister of Transport say whether Cabinet has made a decision on the recommendations of the North-East Area Transport Review Study? If it has not, when will Cabinet consider the recommendations, and, when will the decision be announced to this Parliament?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** The decision has not been taken. It will be taken, however, in due season when all of the information that we seek has been brought together, and when the discussions with people concerned have been completed. A public announcement will be made as soon as a decision has been taken. If the House is in session, it will be made here; otherwise it will be made in the press in the normal way.

**Mr. Wilson:** Can you give us a projection?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** As soon as possible.

### SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Can the Minister of Works say when it is now intended that the present sittings of the House should finish? It had been announced (certainly I had understood this) that it was proposed that the sittings of the House should go on into Holy Week, I think Wednesday of Holy Week, which is the week after next. It is obvious from the business that the House has had today (and I refer to the statements from the Premier and Attorney-General)—

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** You would be commenting if you said that.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I have said it but, if I am commenting, I apologise. It is quite obvious from the business we have had today that the Government is nervous and that there is something very wrong.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member is definitely commenting now.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** It was quite unprecedented this afternoon, and it is difficult not to comment.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** Question!

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! "Question" has been called.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** The Government is anxious to close up as soon as possible—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister of Works.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I have always paid due regard to the honourable member's respect of and deference to Holy Week. I do not know whether his convictions have diminished or not lately in this direction—

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** It's his Christian charity.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I will not talk about Christian charity. The honourable member has always taken great exception to sitting on Maundy Thursday, because he was always deadly afraid that we might sit into Good Friday, and that would be unthinkable for the honourable member. It was out of respect to the honourable member that I decided that the House would cease its sittings for this session on March 22. The Government has not changed its view regarding that date. In fact, it has no reason, concerning the programme, to do so.

**Mr. Millhouse:** The way you've been going on today—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The honourable member has commented, and I emphasise "commented", to the extent that today's actions were unprecedented. They are

not. I have known Ministerial statements in this House to go on for some time. I have also known times when two Ministerial statements have been made on the one day in this House, and so has the honourable member. He is just trying to make something out of it.

**Mr. Millhouse:** You are just—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** It is a feeble attempt, not one of the better attempts the honourable member has made. For his information, the reply to the question is March 22.

#### ELECTION CANDIDATES

**Dr. EASTICK:** Can the Attorney-General say when it is expected that the necessary investigations, to determine whether any electors or candidates of the State of South Australia were disadvantaged as a result of their candidature at the recent State election, will be concluded. The Attorney will appreciate that an inquiry was initiated in late November by the posing of a question which still appears on the Notice Paper and to which to this date there has been no indication from the Government about the results of those investigations. In the interests of people who in my opinion and the opinion of others, have been affected, the investigation should be concluded at the earliest possible moment.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I will try to arrange for the question to be answered next week. I explained privately to the honourable member that we have been waiting for a Crown Law opinion about one of the aspects of the inquiry that was conducted into this matter. I will endeavour—

**Mr. Millhouse:** Why not put a bomb under them?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I think the honourable member well knows that that sort of interjection, apart from being out of order, is quite unfair to officers of my department, and I resent it.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Why do you resent it?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I am not in any way blaming officers of the Crown Law Office. I said that a Crown Law opinion had to be obtained in relation to this matter. I am not aware whether that opinion has been provided at this stage to the appropriate officer. However, I will investigate the matter and will try to ensure that the question is answered next week.

#### FISHING

**The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL:** Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Fisheries to consider the banning of fish nets in fish breeding areas throughout the State? My question flows from a report in the *News* of March 3, which, if I read it, will explain why I am asking the question. It is as follows:

Fishing has never been better along the metropolitan coast with big catches of garfish, tommies, whiting and a wide variety of rock fish on most grounds. This makes me wonder where all the experts have gone who claimed only a year ago that the gulf was being fished out. In my opinion there was only one thing affecting fish close to Adelaide and that was nets. These were banned from Outer Harbor to Brighton and the numbers of fish have increased. If this upturn in fish stocks is to continue however, more breeding areas have to be closed to netting—and quickly.

This applies to some country areas as well. Study programmes often take too long. This has been shown in the past so why not close an area while the study is being done. I am aware that the Minister has indicated an interest in

closing some areas from netting, and has replied at least once to me by saying that a study is being made over a number of areas to determine whether such a policy should be implemented. I should like the Minister to consider the report to which I have just referred and to provide me with information of his own views on the matter.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I shall be pleased to refer the matter to my colleague, and get a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

#### YOUTH TRAINING

**Mr. BLACKER:** Can the Premier say whether the Government has considered using within the Public Service the Special Youth Employment Training Programme as a means of partially alleviating the unemployment problem? Under that programme, which I believe is referred to briefly as "Sweet Pea", the Federal Government pays \$66 a week to employers for each unemployed person meeting certain criteria who is hired and "trained" over a six-month period. The Federal Government introduced the scheme to give employers some incentive, in the form of cash, to take on school-leavers who might otherwise become long-term features of the dole queue.

The scheme was directed specifically to private employers since the Government was looking to the private sector to take up the resources in the economy as part of the long haul towards recovery. It now seems that the New South Wales Government has stepped in and has become a sizeable employer beneficiary. I understand that the New South Wales Government has taken on 500 youths who will be employed briefly throughout the New South Wales Public Service under this scheme.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The matter has been under examination for some time. Some difficulties are attached to the normal criteria for the Public Service and the use of the Sweet Pea scheme as a result. However, we are trying to iron out those difficulties, and it is under investigation at the moment.

#### HUMAN RELATIONSHIPS REPORT

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** Can the Premier say, as a consequence of the Prime Minister's statement in Federal Parliament last week that a considerable part of the report of the Royal Commission on Human Relationships refers to matters that would need to be implemented by the States if they were to be put into practical effect throughout most of Australia and that the Prime Minister had written to the Premiers asking them for their views on the report, whether he will indicate his response to the Prime Minister's request and the means, if any, by which he intends to initiate public debate on the recommendations before proceedings to implement any of them in South Australia? Because of the contentious nature of some of the commission's recommendations and because many of them fall within areas of State responsibility, it is essential that ample opportunity be given for public debate and that the public be informed of what avenues are open to them to express their views.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I have had from the Prime Minister the letter to which the honourable member refers. At the moment, we are studying the report to see whether in fact there should be some specific response to the Federal Government from the State Government. Following upon that study, if the Government determines

that any aspect of the matter should be introduced, where legislation would be required it would come before the House, and we would endeavour to initiate the widest possible debate on matters affected by such legislation. That is not to forecast that there will be any legislation. Matters have to be studied at some length before any determination is made as to whether further proceedings would take place within the State.

#### SPORTS INJURIES

**Mr. EVANS:** Can the Attorney-General say whether the Government is planning to introduce legislation to implement a scheme to allow compensation for sports persons crippled in sporting accidents? In New South Wales, a scheme is being implemented to allow for \$60 000 compensation for people seriously injured in sporting accidents, as well as probably allowing compensation for the families of persons who may be injured in such accidents. We have had quite a few serious injuries in sports in South Australia—some with ball games, some in cycling and equestrian activities, and some in hang-gliding activities. People are often placed in a serious situation, without any monetary resources to see them through the initial stages of rehabilitation or establishing themselves again in what one might call anything like a normal life.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** This matter has been under study, I understand, in the Labour and Industry Department, and it would be appropriate for me to refer the question to the Minister of Labour and Industry so that he can bring down an answer for the honourable member.

#### RIVERLAND SCHOOLS

**Mr. ARNOLD:** Can the Minister of Education give an indication of when the proposed redevelopment of Barmera Primary School and Renmark High School will take place? Recently, we have had the report of the Public Works Standing Committee on both projects, and the committee has recommended highly that they should proceed. Can the Minister say what is likely to be the actual construction date?

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I have a personal apology to the honourable member, because he raised the matter privately with me last week and I have not yet had the information back from my department. As soon as it comes to hand, I shall make it available to the honourable member and, since the question has been asked, to the House. The last time I examined this matter, which was quite some time ago and which is why I have taken the precaution of getting up-to-date departmental advice, the priority was such that it would depend very much on this year's Loan allocations. It was not so far up the list that it was automatically included, but it may well get a guernsey, depending on the allocation to the Education Department building line. I shall undertake to get a reply for the honourable member as soon as possible.

#### PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

**Mr. GUNN:** In view of recent press statements indicating the likelihood of a decision being made within the next few weeks regarding the establishment of a petro-chemical plant in South Australia, can the Premier say whether the Government has seriously considered the establishment of that plant at Whyalla if the companies involved in the negotiations come forward with a

favourable report? Constituents at Whyalla have drawn to my attention that, in view of the serious unemployment situation in the town, and because facilities are available and could be utilised for a project similar to that envisaged at Redcliff, the matter should be put to the Premier so that proper consideration could be given to these suggestions.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Serious consideration has been given to the possibility of a petro-chemical plant being at the Whyalla site. However, the companies concerned have clearly indicated that that would not be possible and that the time of decision would be delayed beyond the crucial time for them if any change of site were proposed. Consequently, while we wanted to investigate the matter, it seems that it would be quite remote that we could get a decision in favour of Whyalla, although we were interested in doing so if we possibly could.

#### WALLAROO JETTY

**Mr. VENNING:** Will the Minister of Marine report to the House on the progress in rehabilitating the Wallaroo jetty and the stage negotiations have reached with the people thought to be responsible for the damage to the jetty?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I think on March 15, 16, or 17 the plant from Port Lincoln will be towed across the gulf to Wallaroo. It should arrive in Wallaroo on one of those dates. I believe the work is on schedule, and we expect to finish it at the time I stipulated to the honourable member, to the House, and to the people of Wallaroo. I know of no difficulty in relation to that. In relation to negotiations for payment for the damage by the shipping company involved, the honourable member would know that a guarantee has been lodged with the Supreme Court of South Australia which is enforceable in South Australia. Discussions have taken place between the Crown Solicitor and counsel for the shipping company in connection with certain legal matters. The matter in question at the moment involves which Act is in force in South Australia and which Act has precedence: the Marine and Harbours Act of South Australia, or the Merchant Shipping Act. That question is being placed before the Supreme Court, and eventually it may have to be decided by the High Court. The decision could have far-reaching consequences, not only in relation to the Wallaroo jetty but also in connection with any other incident that may occur throughout Australia. The renovation of the jetty is on schedule, and I am not aware of any difficulties in that regard. In relation to the other facet of the question, everything possible is being done to reach a settlement. However, once the matter has entered the court it is likely to be protracted.

#### METROPOLITAN BUSES

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** Can the Minister of Transport report to the House any further progress regarding disputes and problems with drivers of the Bus and Tramways Division? I raised this question with the Minister last week, and he was able to report the situation applying at that time regarding the lengthy dispute with those employees. Over the weekend, I read newspaper reports of further problems that are apparent within the division in the Elizabeth area. I am not sure from the reports whether the two situations are connected, but I ask the Minister to report on the current situation of the disputes involving bus drivers, and to give some indication of whether they have been resolved and whether bus services in and

around the metropolitan area are to be maintained.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** In a general way, there is nothing I can add to what has already appeared in the press, which, I think, the honourable member has read. The dispute at Morphettville and the dispute at Elizabeth have been resolved. The remaining matter still not resolved is the question of hours, which will be before Commissioner Cohen, tomorrow morning, in Adelaide.

#### STUART HIGHWAY

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Can the Minister of Transport say whether the Federal Government has indicated in any practical way that it is aware of the vital economic importance of the Stuart Highway to South Australia? My question is motivated by a report in the country pages of the *News* of March 6, in which Senator Jessop is reported as follows:

It is the only unsealed national highway in South Australia, and the Federal Government believes that its construction is a matter of priority. Senator Jessop said he was extremely disappointed that, following the sealing of the Eyre Highway to Western Australia, Mr. Virgo did not propose any work on the Stuart Highway this financial year.

I would not be asking my question if it were not for Senator Jessop's notoriety for misrepresenting the facts in South Australia and for getting good press coverage in the northern part of this State. I believe that the situation should be put in its true perspective.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** I suspect that Senator Jessop is being used as a pawn by the Deputy Leader of the Country Party (Mr. Sinclair) to try to get himself off a very big hook on which he put himself prior to the last Federal election. Mr. Sinclair went to Alice Springs and found that there was a very cool reception for him and for Mr. Sam Calder, the Country Party member for the district. In an attempt to try to get support for Mr. Calder, Mr. Sinclair sent a telex to the Mayor of Alice Springs. In that telegram, he gave an unqualified promise that the Federal Government, if re-elected, would provide South Australia with additional funds over and above the \$15 000 000 a year presently within the legislation for the purpose of constructing the Stuart Highway.

Mr. Nixon has repudiated that promise. I have now written to Mr. Sinclair asking him to take some action, but he is not prepared to make Mr. Nixon acknowledge the undertaking that was given. I have just written back to Mr. Sinclair and, quite frankly, we are going to have to expose him if he does not live up to the promise he gave. I assure members that the Mayor of Alice Springs (Mr. George Smith) and many others who are not interested in the politicking of people like Mr. Calder, Mr. Sinclair, or even our friend from Eyre but who want that highway built will back the South Australian Government in its endeavour to get a fair deal out of Canberra for roadworks in general, and particularly for the national highways.

#### COMMUNITY WELFARE

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether the Government intends to adopt the Nies report, with all of its wide implications, a great deal of which is the direct opposite to the report of Judge Mohr's Royal Commission into the Juvenile Court Act? The Minister has been reported as being in full support of the Nies report. The Premier stated publicly earlier, and it is reported in the *Advertiser*, that Judge Mohr's report was excellent. Indeed, a report in the *Advertiser* of August 25,

1977, states:

The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) said yesterday the Cabinet had decided to draw up a new Act rather than to try to amend the present one. This was in line with the recommendations of the Royal Commissioner (Judge Mohr). The new legislation would be drawn up quickly and it was hoped to have it before Parliament this year. . . . The working party appointed by the Cabinet to plan the implementation of Judge Mohr's recommendations completed a point-to-point examination of the report on Monday.

One report states that the court shall retain the power of sentencing, as it did before the Government withdrew it in 1975, whilst another report wants the power to be vested in the Community Welfare Department. Can the Minister explain the Government's current position?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The situation is, as I think has been outlined in the House on at least three or four occasions during the past couple of weeks, that the whole question tied up both in the Juvenile Courts Royal Commission and in the Nies report is now under examination by officers of my department. When that examination is completed, the necessary legislation can be introduced in Parliament. However, a corollary to that is the drafting of the actual legislative changes themselves, and that is under way. I am as anxious as is the honourable member to see them completed, but much work still needs to be done. As he pointed out, the Premier said that the number of changes that would need to be made were, in effect, so great that it might be better almost to rewrite the Act.

**Mr. Mathwin:** You're not—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has asked his question.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** What will apply is what will be decided by Cabinet when the proposals are complete; that has not changed from the beginning.

**Mr. Mathwin:** It was decided last August.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I notice that the honourable member said that I had been quoted as being in favour of the Nies report. Did he say that?

**Mr. Mathwin:** You were reported as being in full support.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I do not know whether that was by the umpire at half time, or what. I originally set up the Nies committee, with Cabinet support, and assumed that that would indicate that I believed that it was time to look at the system that applied. However, that does not commit me to be 100 per cent in favour of the report before I had received it. Surely the honourable member would agree with me there.

**Mr. Mathwin:** You've had it.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** Yes, but, if we are to bring about so many changes, more than one Act is involved. The Community Welfare Act is involved as well, together with necessary changes, because they were hand-in-hand Acts before. If changes are to occur in the Juvenile Courts Act (and they are), there are also a number of necessary changes in the Community Welfare Act. They must be taken at that time, so that the administrative steps and the machinery changes which will be necessary can be carried out. Overall, there is no change in plans. It is taking considerable time to get the draft legislation ready, but that is because of the complexity and difficulty of the drafting.

**Mr. Mathwin:** You aren't going to put it into operation?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The honourable member over the years has tried various ploys in an attempt during Question Time to extract information. The legitimate method is to ask a question. I do not propose to take up

members' time by continuing to answer further interjections he puts forward, because he is a member who has been known on occasions to complain that the time of other possible questioners has been taken up with too long a reply. In that case, I propose to leave the matter where I have given it to the honourable member and to resume my seat.

#### TABLING OF REPORTS

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** Subsequent to the Saffron affair which was raised earlier today, will the Premier now table the report from the Crown Law Office on the Fairweather and Saffron involvement in Ayers House and their association together, and the report from the Inspector of Companies referred to when answering a question I asked on August 3, 1976? On August 3, 1976, I asked a question of the Premier concerning the involvement of Mr. Fairweather in a company called Ayers House Restaurants Proprietary Limited. I asked on that occasion whether, in fact, Mr. Saffron was involved and whether this company had any interest in the trading of Ayers House. I was told by the Premier that this was a non-trading company. I have since checked and find that just after I raised this question in the House Mr. Fairweather resigned as a director of that company. I think Mr. Cramey's wife then took over the other directorship with Mr. Cramey. That occurred late in 1976.

**The Hon. D. A. Dunstan:** That was in a separate company.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** That was in Ayers House Restaurant Proprietary Limited.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** You've got your facts wrong again.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** If the Minister goes to the companies office, he will find that Ayers House Restaurants Proprietary Limited had both Mr. Cramey and Mr. Fairweather as directors, that Mr. Fairweather resigned and that his place was taken by Mrs. Cramey in late 1976. In answer to my question on that occasion, the Premier referred to two reports. The first report was referred to as follows:

It was at that stage that the matter came to the Crown law office: I think I was the Attorney-General at the time and I immediately ordered an investigation. It was apparent from that investigation that Mr. Fairweather was associated with Mr. Saffron. In fact, it was the first investigation that was made by the Government in relation to Mr. Saffron's and Mr. Fairweather's association.

I have looked at the document that the Premier tabled in the House today; it is dated April 8, 1975. It mentions nothing about Mr. Fairweather at all. I am rather surprised that the document referred to has not been tabled, if the Premier wishes to reveal all the facts. In the same answer to me on August 3, 1976, the Premier said:

Suffice to say that, when I received the report from the Inspector of Companies relating to the investigation I had ordered, I made it clear that in no circumstances would Mr. Fairweather or his business associates have anything to do with any property in which the Government had an interest.

I believe that seeing that this matter has come before the House today, that report should also—

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

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** I think it is pertinent to the fact that that report comes before the House. I was interested in the statement made by the Premier. In looking at the statement made by the Attorney-General, I can see no

reference to Ayers House Restaurants Proprietary Limited. Whether that company is currently trading I am unable to determine. I have sought to investigate the company's files, and I cannot see any record of annual returns lodged for the past two years. I believe it is most pertinent that these reports referred to previously by the Premier now be tabled in this Parliament.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I must confess that I listened to the remarks of the honourable member when he quoted me. I am not able to make out from that the two reports that he mentioned in his question. The first report to me concerning Mr. Fairweather was, in fact, a statement by my Chief Administrative Officer that was made to me at a meeting with the Commissioner of Police in May, 1975.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** From whom was that?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has asked his question.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** That was a verbal report made to me at a meeting with the Commissioner of Police by my Chief Administrative Officer, Mr. Holland.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** Will you table that?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** How do I table that—it was a verbal report? The note I have of it is that Mr. Holland said it had come to his notice that morning that the rumored criminal money placed in Ayers House Limited was that of Saffron, Fairweather being a front man. Documents had been sent to Michael Abbott for final vetting and were expected back shortly. Should the matter be held? The note states, "The Premier agreed that no further action should be taken until a comprehensive report has been obtained"; that is, no action should be taken to conclude the lease. That was the first report made to me. I then directed that material be obtained through the companies office and it was obtained. I do not have that here with me today. It was, in fact, a list of companies, shareholdings and associations of Saffron. I did not table it today, because, in fact, now, as to all relevant material since that date, the Attorney-General has listed the material. However, I will endeavour to get the original schedule for the honourable member.

#### RENTAL ACCOMMODATION

**Mr. BECKER:** Will the Minister of Works obtain for me a break-down of rental paid for office accommodation by the Environment Department? My question is supplementary to my question 397 on the Notice Paper, that question having been answered today. My question was:

Why did the Environment Department Press Secretary have an office in Ansett Gateway building?

The Minister replied:

To facilitate liaison with the Minister and departmental staff. I understand that the Minister's office is in the State Administration Building.

The Minister also informed me that the press secretary's office formed part of the overall Environment Department accommodation in the Ansett centre, and that the cost of specific areas could not readily be determined.

I understand that the department is looking for further office accommodation in the Gateway building, and I believe that a breakdown of the overall office accommodation can be supplied. I would like to know what that breakdown is for the whole of the Environment Department.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** From the way in which the honourable member has framed his question, it appears as though he does not know that the Environment Department is housed in the Gateway Inn. He phrased the

question as though the only person belonging to that department who was in the Gateway Inn was the press secretary. That is not the case. The press secretary occupies a small office in that area, which is part of the departmental scene. There is an office there for the Minister that I do not occupy because, as the honourable member has said, I mainly occupy an office in the State Administration Centre. However, I do visit, sometimes twice or three times a week, that department and I use the office occupied by the permanent head when I go there in order that that space is utilised fully and not left vacant when I am not in the building. That is why that office is occupied by the permanent head; it makes more space available for other purposes. Possibly one could give a cost of that office if one wanted to do so by saying how much a square foot we pay in rent. If that is what the honourable member wants, there is no difficulty about that.

#### QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY HOLIDAY

**Dr. EASTICK:** Can the Chief Secretary say on what basis Monday, June 5, was decided as the Queen's birthday holiday, when it has been the practice for the second Monday in June to be the Queen's birthday holiday? Inquiry has revealed that Government calendars show that Monday, June 5, will be the Queen's birthday holiday. The matter has been decided in the Chief Secretary's Office, and the creation of a holiday on that day has caused much concern to many organisations that have planned on the basis of celebrating the holiday on the second Monday in June. One of those organisations is the Minister's own political Party, which had undertaken to meet on the following weekend, assuming that to be the long weekend.

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** I cannot reply to the honourable member off hand. It is customary to observe the holiday on the second Monday in June. I was not aware that the holiday was not being held at that time this year. However, I will make inquiries and bring down a report for the honourable member.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** Has the Attorney-General or any member of his staff ever given specific advice on civil rights to individuals or groups who have come under the notice of the police, or is the Attorney-General aware of any such advice being given to people who are in trouble with the law? I have had complaints from my district that efforts made by police to apprehend hooligans and vandals who harass residents have been hampered because the offenders have been well briefed in the technicalities of the law; for example, when asked to move on they take one step away from the police and claim that they have fulfilled their legal obligation.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I did not hear the question, but I understand that the honourable member asked whether any officers of my department have given advice to civil rights groups in any of the matters referred to. The reply is "No".

#### MR. FRED KERR

**Mr. VENNING:** Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to consider acknowledging the excellent service Mr. Fred Kerr, Director, Country Fire Services, has given to the State by naming the new

building at Keswick Kerr House?

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. VENNING:** Order!

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I know at certain times in the House there is a certain amount of frivolity and that the honourable member does call out "Order!". The honourable member might be in the Chair one day. For the present, I hope he will not carry on in the same vein.

**Mr. VENNING:** Thank you, Sir. The excellent service Mr. Fred Kerr has given to fire fighting in South Australia is well known and it would be fitting if in some way we could acknowledge those services.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I endorse the honourable member's remarks in relation to Fred Kerr, who has been the officer responsible for what was known as the Emergency Fire Services and what is now known as the Country Fire Services. There is no doubt that over many years his undivided attention has been given to that service. He has been assiduous in the way in which he has approached his duties and persistent in his approach to officials regarding the needs of country services for radio equipment, transport, methods of control and headquarters. Certainly, he has left no stone unturned to do the best he could for that service.

The honourable member would be aware that Fred Kerr has already been recognised by Her Majesty the Queen for services rendered to this organisation. That recognition is well deserved. I do not know whether consideration has been given to the naming of the building after anyone, but certainly I shall be pleased to put the proposition to the Minister of Agriculture because I happen to know what part Fred Kerr has played in ensuring that that building went ahead. The honourable member would know that the building was delayed from time to time but that it was Fred Kerr's persistence and advocacy that played a big part in that building proceeding in the way it has. I shall be pleased to do what the honourable member has suggested, and I will get a report for him.

*At 4.6 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

**The SPEAKER:** Call on the business of the day.

#### SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

The Legislative Council intimated that it had appointed the Hon. J. C. Burdett to be one of its representatives on the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation in the place of the Hon. A. M. Whyte.

#### OUTBACK AREAS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TRUST BILL

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

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to establish the Outback Areas Community Development Trust; to prescribe its powers and functions; and for purposes incidental thereto. Read a first time.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

The purpose of the Bill is to establish a trust, the main functions of which will be to foster, direct and facilitate development projects in remote areas which do not lie within municipalities and districts established under the Local Government Act, 1934-1977. The Government's initiative in this field is in recognition of the special difficulties faced by people in isolated districts. In recent years, the Government has been called on to provide facilities which are normally organised by local government in many of the outback towns. Most of the far northern areas of the State are not subject to local government and rely heavily on the activities of local community groups, and other civic organisations. The establishment of the trust is intended to support and further encourage the activities of such groups.

As well as carrying out development projects and providing services to outback communities, the trust will be responsible for examining proposals for loan and grant assistance and recommending on the disbursement of such funds to local community groups in the unincorporated areas. In addition, it is intended that the trust consider the upgrading of communication facilities in all remote areas of the State including those which are incorporated. It is intended that the trust will rely heavily on local community groups in establishing needs and priorities in the outback areas. The Bill anticipates this mode of operation.

The Bill also provides the trust with the power to borrow, and the Government has undertaken to service the first \$1 000 000 of such debt. The trust should also benefit from the normal range of financial assistance provided to local government through the South Australian Local Government Grants Commission and other Government sources.

*Mr. Venning interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** If the honourable member does not want any of it in his own area he has only to speak up and we will endeavour to exclude the benefits of it from his area.

**Mr. Venning:** You've got to—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** There are areas in incorporated areas which can benefit from grants made under this organisation.

*Mr. Venning interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I appreciate the honourable member's deep motivation in this matter. It is important that we provide an organisation not only to assist with grants in the way prescribed, but an organisation which is in effect a *quasi* local government commission and which could then claim the moneys presently denied to those areas in South Australia which are out of local government from the grants of the Commonwealth Government that other wise might be available. About \$270 000 a year is being lost to South Australia because these areas are not incorporated in local government. That cannot be claimed unless some form of local government is involved. We have endeavoured to get the agreement of communities out of the local government areas to agree to be incorporated in local government, but so far they have uniformly refused to accede to that view. They want the services, but they do not want local government there, at any rate in the traditional form.

**Mr. Venning:** Will this overcome the Commonwealth problem?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** We hope so. We are making the best endeavour we can. This trust is being set up in effect as a commission which could give grants and assistance to local communities in the form of a sort of local government commission and, as members will see from the terms of the Bill, specific portions of the Local

Government Act can be prescribed as applying to the Outback Areas Development Trust. That is an important provision in order to apply for the Commonwealth moneys for this area. If we can possibly get them to the area, it is the best mode we can devise for obtaining them. Consequently, I commend the Bill to members.

The form of the commission itself is not one which is directly representative of local communities because of the very great difficulty in providing direct community representation in present circumstances. In addition to that, of course, it has normally been the policy of the Government, where local communities are applying for grants to a body, not to have those applying for the grants on the body actually making the grants, because that leads to divisions within the local communities concerned. We have endeavoured to devise a trust with the necessary expertise to do this job and which is able to carry it out on behalf of the local community.

I emphasise that the view of Government is that, as soon as we can get agreement from local communities for incorporation in local government areas, we would prefer district councils in the area to take over, rather than that they should be under a *quasi* local government organisation of this kind, but we have to accept that the best endeavours of the Minister of Local Government to induce them to that course have not so far been successful. As soon as they are successful and local residents indicate their desire for incorporating a local government area, the Government would seek to have them so incorporated.

The remainder of the explanation is as to the technical nature of the clauses, and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 sets out definitions of terms used in the Bill. Clause 5 establishes the trust and sets out its basic powers as a body corporate. Clause 6 provides for the appointment of trust members and the terms and conditions upon which they hold office. Clause 7 deals with the remuneration of members. Clause 8 provides for the appointment of a Chairman of the trust and clause 9 sets out various procedural measures relating to the conduct of trust business.

Clause 10 is concerned with the validity of acts of the trust, and the liability of trust members. Clause 11 provides that any trust member who has an interest in any contract made or contemplated by the trust shall disclose such interest to the trust and thereafter refrain from any deliberations relating to the contract in question. When such a disclosure is made, the contract is not liable to be avoided by the trust on any ground arising from the fiduciary relationship between the trust member and the trust. Clause 12 provides for the execution and proof of trust documents. Clause 13 is concerned with officers of the trust, who are to be appointed and to hold office under the Public Service Act, 1967-1977.

Clause 14 provides that the trust shall be subject to the general control and direction of the Minister. Clause 15 sets out the specific functions of the trust. These include carrying out development projects and providing services to local communities, making grants and loans to community organisations and otherwise fostering their development and work, exercising such local government functions as may be assigned under the Act and improving communications to country districts, either within or outside the area subject to the operations of the trust. In subsection (2) of this clause, the Governor is empowered

to apply, by proclamation, specific provisions of the Local Government Act, 1934-1977, to the trust and its area. Clause 16 provides that the trust may delegate any of its powers or functions to any of its members or officers.

Clauses 17 and 18 set out the trust's powers to borrow and invest, and the former provides that the repayment of any moneys borrowed by the trust may be guaranteed by the Treasurer. Clause 19 requires the trust to present a budget of estimated receipts and payments to the Minister in respect of the financial year immediately following. Clause 20 provides that the accounts of the trust shall be audited once a year by the Auditor-General. Clause 21 requires the trust to submit an annual report on its operations to the Minister and provides that such report, together with the trust's audited accounts, shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament. Clause 22 provides that offences against the Act shall be dealt with summarily and clause 23 empowers the Governor to make regulations under the Act.

Mr. GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

### PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Prices Act, 1948-1977. Read a first time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

This short Bill is designed to give full effect to the compromise reached by the managers' conference between the two Houses on the Bill for the Prices Act Amendment Act, 1977. Section 18a of the Prices Act empowers the commissioner to investigate excessive charges for goods or services, unlawful or unfair trade or commercial practices or any infringement of a consumer's rights. Prior to the amending Act of 1977, this power of investigation could be exercised only upon the complaint of a consumer. The managers' conference on the Bill for the Prices Act Amendment Act, 1977, agreed that the power should be exercisable upon the complaint of a consumer, upon the request of an interstate consumer affairs authority or upon reasonable suspicion by the commissioner and subsection (1a) of section 18a was inserted to that end. However, a consequential amendment to paragraph (d) of subsection (1) of that section was omitted from the schedule of amendments agreed upon by the two Houses. Accordingly, this Bill gives effect to the intention of the amendments agreed upon in 1977 by deleting from paragraph (d) of subsection (1) of section 18a the passage "any complaint from a consumer of".

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends paragraph (d) of subsection (1) of section 18a by deleting the passage still restricting the investigation powers of the commissioner to matters the subject of complaint by consumers.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

### DEBTS REPAYMENT BILL

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to establish a debtors assistance office to assist persons in financial

difficulties to overcome those difficulties, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

This Bill is designed to establish a scheme for helping debtors who are in financial difficulties. It provides for the establishment of a debtors assistance office and for the appointment and training of debt counsellors. The origin of this project lies in the recommendations of the Poverty Commission and the Sixth Report of the Australian Law Reform Commission. South Australia has in existence a small office known as the Budget Advisory Service, but official recognition of the broader role which those seeking reform have advocated is required if debtor assistance schemes are to be effectively implemented.

The functions that will be carried out by the debtors assistance office and by debt counsellors are principally to provide debt counselling for any members of the public who desire counselling, to negotiate with creditors with a view to arriving at satisfactory arrangements for settling debts, and to formulate statutory schemes for the regular payment of debts. Any scheme formulated under the new Act is to be referred to the Credit Tribunal for approval.

This Bill is part of a reformative scheme relating to the law which affects debtors, and seeks to provide assistance to persons who may, or may not, have been brought before the courts in relation to their financial difficulties. The Bill seeks to strike a reasonable balance between the interests of creditors and the interests of debtors. No law of the State can, of course, prevent a creditor from taking advantage of the Commonwealth law relating to bankruptcy. However in many cases bankruptcy of a debtor is in the interests of neither the debtor nor the creditor. This Bill is thus designed to fill a significant gap in the present law relating to debt repayment.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act. Clause 3 sets out the arrangement of the Act. Clause 4 provides the necessary definitions. The word "debt" is defined to exclude a business debt, maintenance payments and fines imposed by a court. The Act is directed at consumer debtors and it is not appropriate that such debts be taken into account in this Act. The other definitions are self-explanatory. Clause 5 provides that the new Act will bind the Crown. Clauses 6 to 8 establish necessary administrative machinery and are self-explanatory.

Clause 9 provides for the appointment of debt counsellors. Clause 10 confers upon debt counsellors and other officials involved in debt repayment schemes immunity from tortious liability arising from acts or omissions done or occurring in good faith and in the course of carrying out statutory functions. Clause 11 provides for assistance to be given by a debt counsellor to a debtor. Subclause (2) provides for necessary information to be given to the debt counsellor. Subclause (3) confines the application of the section to debtors with liabilities less than \$15 000. Subclause (4) removes mortgage debts from the calculation of a debtor's total indebtedness for the purpose of subclause (3).

Clause 12 provides for the formulation of a scheme for the regular payment of debts and the requirements with which the scheme must comply. Before formulating a scheme the debt counsellor must be satisfied that the

scheme will be in the interests of the debtor and his creditors. Clause 13 allows creditors whose debts are subject to a scheme to make representations to the Credit Tribunal which may approve, amend or reject the scheme. Clause 14 prohibits a creditor from taking proceedings to recover a debt or enforce a security to which a scheme applies during the subsistence of the scheme. Clause 15 enables the tribunal on the application of the debt counsellor or a creditor to revoke a scheme because of default by the debtor.

Clause 16 provides for termination of the scheme. Clause 17 provides for the purposes of proceedings under the new Act, the tribunal may be constituted of the Chairman sitting alone or the Registrar. Clause 18 prohibits the waiving or limiting of rights given by the Act. Clause 19 provides for service of documents. Clause 20: because clause 13 prohibits a creditor from proceeding with a claim against a debtor, it is necessary to protect the creditor from the effect of laws limiting the times during which a claim can be enforced. Clause 21 is necessary to ensure that accurate and honest information is given to the debt counsellor. Clause 22 provides for proceedings to be disposed of summarily. Clauses 23 and 24 are self-explanatory.

Mr. WILSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENTS BILL

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to make provision for the execution and enforcement of judgments of the Supreme Court and of local courts, to amend the Mercantile Law Act, 1936; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

The principal object of this Bill is to establish a simplified procedure for the enforcement of civil judgments of the Supreme Court and of local courts, and to implement recommendations of the Commonwealth Law Reform Commission in relation to the enforcement of civil judgments.

In 1974, the Law Reform Committee of South Australia recommended a general reform of the law relating to execution of civil judgments. The major recommendation was to sweep away the old writs of execution and to substitute certain statutory writs in their place. Thus, the Bill provides for new forms of writs of execution—the writ of sale, writ of possession, and writ of attachment. Further, the Bill provides for enforcement procedures in accordance with recommendations of the Poverty Commission and the Law Reform Commission of the Commonwealth. These recommendations relate to the recovery of what might be described as “consumer debts”, that is to say, non-business debts incurred by a natural person and not exceeding \$15 000 in amount.

It is intended in these cases that, before execution issues to enforce judgments of this kind, the judgment debtor should be examined as to his means. Upon such an examination the court will be able to decide what is the most appropriate means of enforcement in the particular circumstances of the case and will make appropriate orders for securing compliance with the judgment.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act. Clause 3 sets out the arrangement of the Act. Clause 4 provides the necessary definitions. Clause 5 is a transitional provision. Clause 6 by reducing to three the number of writs available for execution of a judgment greatly simplifies the procedures for enforcement. These procedures, until now, have been the result of hundreds of years of haphazard development resulting in a complex system which is both inefficient and cumbersome. Clause 7 provides that the Crown is to be bound by the new Act. Clause 8 provides for the issue of a writ of sale where a judgment for the payment of money has been given. The writ is issued as of right except in the circumstance set out in subclause (2) of clause 7. This exception is aimed at the smaller, non-business debts of a natural person. In such a case the court shall examine the debtor as to his means and may issue a conditional or unconditional writ of sale or may decline to issue a writ where an instalment order would be a more appropriate remedy.

Clause 9 provides that the writ of sale shall authorise execution against the real and personal property of a debtor. Subclause (2) protects certain property of a natural person from execution. Subclauses (3) and (4) make special provision in the case of bank-notes and negotiable instruments respectively and subclause (5) provides for removal of chattels seized in execution. Clause 10 makes detailed provision for the sale of real and personal property pursuant to a writ of sale. Clauses 11 and 12 provide for a writ to be known as a writ of possession. This will be used where judgment has been given for the delivery of land or a chattel by one party to another as distinct from a judgment for the payment of money. Clause 13 provides for the issue of a writ of attachment for contempt of a judgment or order of a court. Clause 14 provides the powers and duties of the Sheriff under a writ of attachment once it is issued.

Clause 15 provides for the priority of entitlement of execution creditors to the proceeds of execution. Clause 16 deals with the case of a conditional judgment. Clause 17 provides for execution against a partnership or the members of a partnership. Clause 18 requires leave of the court in cases of delay or death of a party to the proceedings. Clause 19 provides for the resolution of disputes as to liability to execution. Clause 20 deals with expiry and renewal of writs of execution and is self-explanatory. Clause 21 enables a party to apply to the court for a stay of execution against him. Clause 22 gives the court power to set aside a writ in certain circumstances.

Clauses 23 and 24 make provision for the return of writs. Clause 25 entitles the party issuing the writ to claim the costs of issue and execution against the debtor. Clause 26 enables a person who has obtained a judgment in his favour for the payment of money to have the judgment debtor examined by a court as to his means and sets out the orders that a court may make upon such an examination. Clause 27 provides for the making of garnishee orders. Clause 28 protects an employee against whose salary or wages a garnishee order is made from suffering prejudice in his employment. Clause 29 corresponds to the present section 33 of the Supreme Court Act and provides for the execution of instruments in pursuance of an order of a court. Clause 30 provides that certain old legislation of the Imperial Parliament shall not apply in the State. Clause 31 repeals a provision of the Mercantile Law Act which prevents garnishee of an employee's wages. Clauses 32 and 33 provide for miscellaneous matters and are self-explanatory.

Mr. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

**SHERIFF'S BILL**

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the appointment of the sheriff and sheriff's officers and to define their powers and duties; to amend the Supreme Court Act, 1935-1975; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

**Explanation of Bill**

This Bill is consequential on the proposed new scheme for enforcement of judgments of the Supreme Court and local courts. At present the office of sheriff is established under the Supreme Court Act and the sheriff is thus constituted as the authority for executing judgments of the Supreme Court. On the other hand, the Local and District Criminal Courts Act provides for the appointment of bailiffs who have the responsibility of executing judgments of local courts. Under the new scheme the execution of civil judgments of the Supreme Court and local courts is to be brought under a single authority. Hence the present Bill sets up the office of sheriff under independent statutory provisions and provides that the sheriff is to be responsible to both the Supreme Court and to local courts and district criminal courts.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 provides for the repeal of the present provisions of the Supreme Court Act relating to the sheriff and enacts the necessary transitional provisions. Clause 4 contains definitions necessary for the purposes of the new Act. Clause 5 provides for the appointment of the sheriff and of sheriff's officers. Clause 6 provides for the appointment of sheriff's officers by the sheriff. Clause 7 provides that a court may appoint a suitable person to act in the place of the sheriff where the sheriff is unable or unavailable to act. Clause 8 sets out the duties of the sheriff. Clause 9 provides that the sheriff or one of his officers must attend criminal sittings of the Supreme Court or a district criminal court.

Clause 10 provides that, where the sheriff arrests any person in pursuance of any process, he must bring the arrested person, without delay, to the place nominated in the process. Clause 11 deals with the offence of hindering the sheriff in the execution of his duty. Clause 12 deals with the commission of torts by the sheriff or a sheriff's officer in the course of his official duties. Clause 13 deals with the procedure for disposing of complaints of offences against the new Act. Clause 14 provides that the sheriff is not disqualified by his office from holding an appointment as a justice of the peace. Clause 15 provides for regulations to be made governing the performance of the duties of the sheriff.

Mr. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

**SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Supreme Court Act, 1935-1975. Read a first time.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

**Explanation of Bill**

This Bill is consequential upon the Enforcement of Judgments Bill, 1978. The substance of the sections of the Supreme Court Act repealed by this Act is to be incorporated in the Enforcement of Judgments Act, 1978. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act. Clause 3 provides for the repeal of section 33 of the principal Act which relates to the execution of documents in pursuance of a judgment of the Supreme Court. Clause 4 repeals sections 115 and 116 which relate to matters to be dealt with by the new Enforcement of Judgments Act, 1978.

Mr. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

**LOCAL AND DISTRICT CRIMINAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926-1976. Read a first time.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

**Explanation of Bill**

This Bill amends the principal Act by increasing the jurisdictional limits applicable to the court. Under the amendments the jurisdictional limit of a local court of full jurisdiction is increased from \$20 000 to \$30 000. The jurisdictional limit of a local court of limited jurisdiction is increased from \$2 500 to \$10 000. The jurisdictional limit of the small claims division of the court is increased from \$500 to \$2 500. The Government believes that these amendments will produce a more realistic division of work within the court in the light of current money values. The Bill also provides that, where an action is referred to a local court by the Supreme Court in pursuance of section 40 of the principal Act, the local court will have power to deal with all aspects of the case from that point onwards. In addition the Bill makes necessary amendments to the Act consequential on changes in the law made by the Enforcement of Judgments Act, 1978, and the Sheriff's Act, 1978.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act. Clause 3 makes consequential amendments to the definition section of the principal Act. Clauses 4 and 5 remove references to "bailiffs" in sections 16 and 17 of the principal Act. The new Sheriff's Act, 1978, will, from now on, provide for sheriff's officers who will take the place of bailiffs. Clause 6 repeals section 18 of the principal Act. This section is no longer necessary. Clause 7 makes amendments to section 25 of the principal Act consequential upon the Enforcement of Judgments Bill, 1978, and the Sheriff's Bill, 1978.

Clause 8: Similar provisions to the ones removed by this clause are to be incorporated in the proposed Sheriff's Act, 1978. Clause 9 repeals section 27 of the principal Act which deals with the powers and procedures of bailiffs. The necessary powers and duties of the sheriff and his officers will from now on be contained in the Sheriff's Act, 1978. Clauses 10 and 11 increase the jurisdictional limits of local courts of full and limited jurisdiction to \$30 000 and \$10 000 respectively. They also delete paragraph IV of

sections 31 and 32 of the principal Act which deal with unsatisfied judgment summonses. These summonses will no longer exist after the amendments made by this Act, their place being taken by the procedures laid down in clause 25 of the Enforcement of Judgments Bill, 1978. Clause 12 amends section 32b of the principal Act for the same reason that the two preceding clauses amend paragraph IV of sections 31 and 32 of the Act.

Clause 13 deals with a case in which a matter is remitted by the Supreme Court for hearing in the Local Court. The amendment provides that, where this course is taken, the action shall proceed in all respects as if it had been instituted in the Local Court. At present there is a rather awkward procedure under which the Local Court hears the action but the judgment is enforced as a judgment of the Supreme Court. This provision has no practical merit and is accordingly removed. Clause 14: This amendment simply removes an unnecessary reference to the sheriff. Clause 15 increases the minimum value of property referred to in section 46 (2) of the principal Act. Clause 16 increases the limit over which a party may appeal as of right to the Supreme Court to \$2 500. This is consistent with the provision increasing the jurisdiction of the Small Claims Court to \$2 500. Clause 17 confines proceedings by way of special summons to claims over \$2 500. Clause 18 simplifies the procedures for the defence of a small claim.

Clause 19 simplifies the procedures where a counter claim is made in answer to a small claim. Clause 20 allows the rate of interest on a judgment where no appearance is entered to be fixed by rules of court instead of being fixed by the provisions of section 107. This allows the rate to be varied more easily. Clause 21 provides that where the defendant is a natural person proceedings against him must be taken in the court nearest to his place of residence. In all other cases the jurisdiction of the court is unaltered. Clause 22: This amendment is similar to that made by clause 20. Clause 23 is a minor amendment which improves the drafting of section 131 of the principal Act. Clause 24 removes section 134 of the principal Act which is now inappropriate in view of the provision made by the Enforcement of Judgments Bill, 1978. Clause 25 allows the detailed alterations required to streamline the procedures in the Small Claims Court to be made by rules of court.

Clause 26: The purpose of section 152g is to further simplify procedures in the Small Claims Court by removing pre-trial procedures. Such procedures cause long delays and defeat the speedy administration of justice which is the purpose of this court. In addition they involve technical considerations which cause difficulty to unsophisticated parties. Section 152h is a transitional provision dealing with the increase of the jurisdictional limit in the Small Claims Court. Clause 27 by paragraph (a) makes an amendment to section 153 of the principal Act which is consequential upon the amendments made by the next clause. Paragraph (b) is similar to clauses 20 and 22. Clause 28 removes sections of the Act which deal with enforcement of judgments and orders. For the sake of simplicity, provisions for the enforcement of the judgments and orders of the Supreme and Local Courts are now made in the Enforcement of Judgments Bill, 1978.

Clause 29 removes sections relating to unsatisfied judgment summonses and garnishee orders. The subject matter of those sections is now provided for in the Enforcement of Judgments Bill, 1978. Clause 30 removes from the principal Act interpleader provisions enacted for the benefit of bailiffs. Clause 31 increases the jurisdiction limit of the court in actions for the recovery of premises from \$3 180 to \$5 000. Clause 32 amends section 223 of the principal Act, simplifying it and bringing it into line with the Enforcement of Judgments Bill, 1978. Clause 33:

Provisions similar to these sections are made in the Enforcement of Judgments Bill, 1978. Clause 34 by paragraph (a) brings subsection (1) of section 228 of the principal Act into line with section 216. Provisions similar to subsection (8) of section 228 are incorporated in the Enforcement of Judgments Bill, 1978. Clause 35 is consequential upon changes in the jurisdictional limit of the court. Clause 36 removes subject matters which will be dealt with in the Enforcement of Judgments Bill, 1978. Clause 37 is consequential upon changes in the jurisdictional limit of the court. Clauses 38, 39 and 40 are consequential amendments. Clause 41 provides that fees be specified by schedule or rules of court. This will facilitate alterations when required. Clause 42 is a consequential amendment. Clause 43 removes section 301 of the principal Act which is no longer relevant. Clauses 44 and 45 bring sections 302 and 303 respectively into line with the Sheriff's Bill, 1978. Clauses 46 to 49 repeal sections 304, 308, 311 and 312 respectively to bring the principal Act into line with the Sheriff's Act, 1978, and to enable similar provisions to be made in that Act. Clause 50 removes the fourth schedule to the principal Act. Matters covered by this schedule will be provided by regulations made under the new Sheriff's Act, 1978.

**Mr. MATHWIN** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT 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. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport)** moved:  
*That this Bill be now read a third time.*

**Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition):** The Bill, as it has come out of Committee, is substantially the same as it was when it went into Committee.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** Exactly the same.

**Mr. TONKIN:** That is basically substantially the same. It is important for me to say that we do have and have had from the Minister certain disclosures of information, which make the Bill far more acceptable to us now than it was when it went into Committee, and for that I thank him. Obviously, we will be concerned about borrowings made by the State Transport Authority. We want to know how and where that money is to be raised, and how it will be expended and to what extent the Government will be called on to honour any guarantee. Those assurances have been given by the Minister, and I thank him for them. For that reason, we regard the Bill more favourably than we did when it was first debated.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### BUS AND TRAMWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of the sum of \$220 000 000 to the Public Service for the financial year ending June 30, 1979.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer):** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to apply out of the general revenue the sum of \$220 000 000 for the Public Service for the year ending June 30, 1979. Read a first time.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It provides for the appropriation of \$220 000 000 to enable the Public Service of the State to be carried on during the early part of next financial year. In the absence of special arrangements in the form of the Supply Acts, there would be no Parliamentary authority for appropriations required between the commencement of the new financial year and the date, usually in October, on which assent is given to the main Appropriation Bill. It is customary for the Government to present two Supply Bills each year, the first covering estimated expenditure during July and August and the second covering the remainder of the period prior to the Appropriation Bill becoming law.

Members will notice that the Bill provides for an amount greater than that provided by the first Supply Act last year, which was for \$190 000 000. Some increase is needed to provide for the higher level of costs faced by the Government and, in the normal course, an amount of \$210 000 000 would have been proposed. However, a special advance may be required when revised arrangements between Government hospitals and the South Australian Health Commission are introduced at the start of next financial year, and provision has been made to cover this contingency in the \$220 000 000 which this Bill proposes. I believe this Bill should suffice until the latter part of August when it will be necessary to introduce a second Bill.

Traditionally, Supply Bills are short Bills containing three clauses. Clause 1 is the short title. Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of up to \$220 000 000. Clause 3 imposes limitations on the issue and application of this amount.

*Later:*

**Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition):** This Bill traditionally requires little debate. It is essential that the public business of the State continue and finance be available for it to continue so that the State Public Service can discharge its duties in the exemplary way in which it does. However, I make the point that the sum involved (about \$220 000 000) is considerably more than the \$190 000 000 that was allocated at a similar time last year. I believe that the difference, that is, about \$20 000 000 (because \$10 000 000 is to be set aside for Medibank changes, in relation to the agreement between Government hospitals and the Health Commission) is a considerable sum, particularly as inflation has now been contained within single figures by the Federal Government's activities. Obviously, this points up the growth that has occurred in the Public Service

The Premier has said that the growth rate of 3.5 per cent in the Public Service has not been as great as the increase in other years but, with what looks to be a record deficit of \$26 000 000, the \$20 000 000, which is over and above the amount for the past 12 months, is considerable. It simply points out the real need that exists for the Government to examine its expenditure carefully both in the matter of costs and in establishment. I believe that there should be a freeze on the Public Service and on the creation of all but the most essential new appointments. For that reason, I sound a word of warning. However, since this is a financial Bill, I support it.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare)** moved:

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

**Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition):** Once again, as is traditional, it is the right of members to bring up matters of concern. I believe that South Australia is at present approaching a crisis point which is far more serious than any other it has faced in its history. Government administration is only one of the major problems now confronting the State.

We are confronted with a record \$26 000 000 deficit, which in one year is greater than the sum of all the deficits in the past 10 years. Inevitably, as a result of this, there will be increases in State taxes and charges, and I have no doubt that once July 1 arrives we will engage in exactly the same exercises as before: there will be announcements of increases in State taxes and charges, regardless of what has been said, up until now. When the Budget is finally introduced to deal with the following 12 months, there will be much trumpeting about no increases in taxes and charges being necessary, because they will already have been increased.

The growth of the Public Service has received much attention in recent weeks, and wasteful Government spending is continually receiving the attention of the Opposition and constantly coming before members of the public. I repeat that I cannot look forward too eagerly to the release of the Public Accounts Committee's report, which I hope will soon be available to this House.

Not only have we seen an increase in the Public Service growth rate with the creation of more than 500 new positions since the end of the past financial year, but the amount of money that is being thrown away and wasted is absolutely amazing. We have seen not only that but also the loss of reserves, the reserves that came from the transfer of the railways to the Commonwealth. The Premier stated before the 1975 election that that sale would bring South Australia the benefit of about \$800 000 000 over the next 10 years.

The question now asked by the public is this: why did not the Government upgrade public transport with the funds it received, instead of wasting it as it has done? It is becoming more and more apparent that the Government has let that money run through its fingers, and that it has continued to spend as if we had a projected surplus of \$26 000 000 and not a deficit of \$26 000 000.

The second major factor following the problems of Government administration comes from the run-down of secondary industry. I refer to the publication *Development 77* produced by the Economic Development Department, issued at the end of January, 1978. A job slump is predicted in South Australia—employment in South Australian manufacturing industry may decline dramatically over the next eight years. The report estimates the following:

... South Australia's population in 1986 will be 1 391 300, almost 128 000 more than in 1976 . . . The report estimates an annual growth in the State's labour force of about 10 800 workers, little better than the 1954-1966 growth. This projected increase is lower than the rate of growth in the labor force over the past 10 years . . . and is continually declining.

We cannot allow that to happen in South Australia, yet the report of the Government itself states that employment in manufacturing industries is declining and is likely to continue to decline.

All honourable members know that industry is folding

up and that small industries are closing their doors and leaving South Australia, or simply going out of business altogether because it does not pay them to stay in business. The policies of this Government have given no incentive to small businesses to stay in operation. We have lost that most important factor—the cost advantage that allowed South Australia's small businesses to compete actively on interstate and overseas markets.

No longer (and this is a tragic thing to say) can Adelaide be considered to be the centre of the Australian motor car industry. The problems being encountered by car manufacturers in South Australia are enormous and, although manufacturers have large capital sums invested and would find it difficult to move away from South Australia, there is nevertheless a real fear that they may do so, and they could do so in the relatively near future. The white goods industry, too, has been under much pressure. Let us make no mistake about the fact that Government policies since 1970 are the cause of all this.

The third factor (related to Government administration in its own way, and because of the second factor, the run-down of secondary industry), is the fact that this Government has fixed policies and has taken no action whatever to correct the disastrous situation that is now building up. For example, I refer to the \$43 000 000, which it will soon have spent on unemployment relief schemes. To what effect has this been used in terms of long-term advantage?

Much of that money, although it will have gone to relieve difficulties confronted by individuals through their lack of employment, will have no permanent effect in creating jobs for those people. In other words, that \$43 000 000 has been spent in the majority of cases in providing short-term employment but it has done nothing whatever to provide long-term employment. As the Government that claims it is doing the best it can to stimulate industry, it is rather surprising to read the Auditor-General's report and to see the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation's involvement in helping local industry.

Presently, support for industry can be summed up as being surprisingly small, comprising only about \$8 000 000 or \$9 000 000 outstanding in loans and guarantees. Moneys could be spent in this State to prevent the collapse of industry and stop the migration of industry to Albury-Wodonga, to western Victoria and to other centres. Certainly, it could have been spent in supporting the private sector by giving incentives, to create employment and permanent jobs, and by giving pay-roll tax incentives. Unfortunately, we know only too well that the Premier has refused to accept that pay-roll tax incentives can have the effect that his colleagues in the Labor Party (Mr. Wran, and formerly Mr. Whitlam) advocated strongly as being worthwhile measures to create permanent employment.

Another matter that could be looked at carefully is the subsidising of transport costs. In the past, with our cost advantage, we were able to export goods to other States. However, transport costs are such that now it is impossible for any industry in South Australia to make any sort of a profit if it has to meet interstate transport costs. Indeed, it has been said to me that a leading car manufacturer in South Australia is presently making a loss on every unit that is produced in South Australia, because of the high labour costs and because of transport costs to eastern markets.

We cannot expect any industry to continue to make a loss, and I emphasise that, if we carry on as we are, it is only a matter of time before our major industries in South Australia cut their losses and leave this State. We could be spending some of that \$43 000 000 not only on pay-roll tax

incentives and transport subsidies but also to investigate the nature of structural unemployment and study the restructuring of industry.

That is a most important subject, something that will have to be considered by all sections of the community and something that is now being undertaken by a joint meeting of Ministers of Labour and Industry of all States and the Commonwealth. It has received the close attention of the Opposition and has now been recognised by the Premier, who admits its existence. It is difficult to see that the Premier is doing other than jumping on the bandwagon. I refer to the latest report in yesterday's *News*, showing that the Premier is willing to jump on the bandwagon of structural unemployment. He has done this by talking about tertiary industry. However, this sort of statement has been made before. Unemployment has grown steadily, and the State Government cannot in any way avoid the blame that lies at its feet for creating unemployment and maintaining it. Tertiary industry may help but the statement that was attributed to the Premier (I have no reason to believe that it was not an accurate report) is quite frightening. The report states:

On future industrial development, Mr. Dunstan says: "The future development of industry in South Australia lies in the tertiary field. We see no reason why Adelaide cannot become the home of major corporate offices while factories and manufacturing plants operate in other States."

That is ridiculous. Why should industries establish head offices in Adelaide while continuing to manufacture in other States? Why should industries come to South Australia to establish head offices if they are unwilling to manufacture here? That is a totally unrealistic concept. Why will these industries come to South Australia—simply because it is South Australia? We have to find a way to persuade people that it is worth coming to South Australia to establish industry. We have to persuade them that it is worth while for them to manufacture in South Australia, because that is where the jobs come from, and that is whence South Australia's prosperity emanates.

Presently, our record deficit, which is now confronting us, is likely to get worse without industrial development, yet the Government is doing nothing; it stands there doing nothing at all about industrial development while at the same time saying that it cannot understand why the deficit will get worse. The most frightening aspect about the statement attributed to the Premier is that he is obviously willing to let manufacturing industry leave South Australia. As my colleague has stated, he is resigned to the fact that manufacturing industry is not coming back to South Australia.

The Premier is tacitly admitting that his Government's policies for industrial development for the manufacturing sector have been an absolute and total failure. No wonder we have reached a crisis point in this State's history. However, the report that appeared in tonight's *News* following up yesterday's report is a breath of fresh air, although at the same time it is tragic. For the first time in a long period leading members of industry have come forward and have stated what they believe to be the truth. I find it refreshing that these men should have such a love for their State that they are willing to say what exactly is going on and what is wrong.

The day that South Australia could be called a leper colony I thought would never come, yet that is what it has been termed; indeed, that is exactly how people in other States see us. Also, I was interested to see that several senior industrialists contacted by the *News* would not comment for the record but made unattributable comments ranging from the startled to the pungent, and I can understand exactly their feelings in this matter.

**Mr. Groom:** You Liberals are always downgrading South Australia.

**Mr. TONKIN:** That brings me to the member for Morphett. If he is a true South Australian truly concerned about the future of South Australia, although he is bound by a pledge, he would stand up for the people of South Australia and their prosperity. He would not stand by on the back bench, or in the back of the Caucus room, saying nothing about the disaster which is being wrought on the economy of this State by his leaders (we are not sure which leader at present: apparently, there is some discussion at the present time.) There is a disaster, certainly, whoever takes control. If the left wing takes control, we will be even worse off.

I would have thought that the honourable member would have learned enough in the short time he has been in this House to know that he ought to be putting South Australia, not the Australian Labor Party, first. There is no question that the socialist experiment in South Australia is failing and it is ruining the State. At this critical time for South Australia all that the Premier can put forward for the future are his visions of the future. Tourism may well be an important industry in the future, but an international hotel has been mentioned yet again for at least the twentieth time. Let us hear something new. We heard about craft industries. Yet, when it came to the jam factory, which was set up according to the Premier's ideas of how things should be done, and a report which was commissioned (and we will not go into the details of how that report came about), the recommendations that were put forward suggested a private enterprise approach to the craft authority. Of course, since that happened we have heard nothing about the recommendations at all.

We have consumer protection; we have seen that. Consumer protection is fine, but how important is consumer protection in the light of the present crisis. I would like to predict that the Premier and the Attorney-General will perfect their total protective legislation just in time to see the last manufacturing industry leave this State. That is almost certainly what will happen. Then we have the statement that we are going to democratise (what a ghastly term) every aspect of life in South Australia. This collection of rehashed, revamped ideas is the best that we can get from the Premier and the Government at a time when this State is facing the most important financial and economic crisis of its whole history. This is the best that we can get from them, and they are sitting there immobilised, apparently, by their own obsession with socialist reform and the socialist experiment, while South Australia goes down the drain in terms of real prosperity and security. All these visions were set out in 1970 and again and again and again, but very few of them have come to pass.

We have lists of broken promises which have been ventilated before. Some of them are laughable, but they become less laughable as time goes by. Now these old tired ideas are being put forward again. The truth is that we are faced with a tired played out Government, with no chance of implementing its social visions, even if we wanted them, because it has lost sight of a fundamental principal that visions must be paid for if they are to become reality. It is time for strong and firm action to be taken by the Government. Words do not count for very much, as the member for Newland may well find out, in the absence of actions. We would be pleased indeed to be in a position to take action to rescue this State from the total incompetence of the present Administration.

The Government should be taking strong and firm action, not for the good of the Australian Labor Party, not for the good of the socialist philosophy, but for the good of all South Australians. We do not want the best social

conditions in the world without the freedom and ability to be able to afford to enjoy them. Real prosperity comes from having a prosperous State with everyone enjoying the benefits which come from general prosperity.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. TONKIN:** They do not worry me; they are just stupid gnats.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. TONKIN:** I am sorry: I should not say anything about insects. The people of South Australia are sick and tired of "leading the world" and having "another first", and of having presented to them "the most exciting concept" which is "the envy of every other State". Words and promises go just so far, and they are going down badly with the people of South Australia at present. South Australians (and I am proud to be one) love their State and all it has achieved. More and more they are determined not to let it be destroyed, as the Labor Government is destroying it. I repeat that this is the time for strong, firm and realistic action, action which is urgently needed. The Government must reverse its policies for the good of South Australia.

I have eight points that I believe it is absolutely vital that the Government should consider, swallow its pride (if pride it has), and do what is best for South Australia and not what is best for the Labor Party.

**Mr. Mathwin:** That's right—resign!

**Mr. TONKIN:** That would certainly solve all the problems. The list is as follows: first, it should stimulate the private sector to create permanent employment by giving pay-roll tax incentives and other incentives for trading; secondly, it should restore South Australia's cost advantage by considering transport cost subsidies and other incentives; thirdly, it should rationalise workmen's compensation legislation so that the crippling effects of workmen's compensation do not destroy our chances of attracting new industry to South Australia; fourthly, it should revise restrictive and oppressive legislation that is increasing costs and unnecessarily inhibiting development, such as building licencing legislation; fifthly, it should investigate urgently schemes for a restructuring of industry and the retraining of workers; sixthly, it should adopt a policy of industrial democracy that involves voluntary participation and not worker control; and seventhly, it should provide capital tax incentives to fall into line with the Commonwealth and other States on succession and gift duties.

This State stands out like a shag on a rock when it comes to death duties. It is impossible for us to compete with the flow of capital to other States. Other Labor Administrations have already accepted that that is so. Eighthly, we should actively promote industrial development, and I mean "actively", not just making noises about it saying that we want industrial development and then making it impossible for people to come and develop here. We should get out and assist positively private enterprise in promoting the mineral developments at Roxby Downs where there are copper and uranium deposits, the coal deposits, and Lake Frome. We should be considering Redcliff and a uranium enrichment plant and the petrochemical plant there.

Members opposite have a twisted, bitter, and rather stupid attitude towards all this. It is probably better comment than any that I could make that, by way of interjection, they have indicated their lack of understanding of the needs of this State. The Premier will say that these schemes all cost money that we have not got. Of course, he does not particularly want to act and he will seize on this, he will hope, convincing excuse. This is the

tragedy. We have been wasting the money of our State and the reserves we have built up from selling off our railways. We have been wasting that money on excessive and wasteful Government spending and an increase in the size of the Public Service, despite the financial stringencies that have faced all the States.

The money that should have been spent, first, on maintaining our State's economy during stringent financial conditions that have affected all States and, secondly, by promoting and stimulating the private sector and generally maintaining our future prospects for development, has now been wasted, and we are in a position where we no longer have that money and are now facing a record deficit. The money must be found one way or another if this State is to remain viable and is to survive. I believe that South Australians are in the frame of mind now where they will accept a freeze on all but the most essential changes for the time being in Government services. That may not be palatable, but it must be faced if we are to preserve the future of our State.

We have two major and immediate priorities: we must control Government expenditure, and we must stimulate the recovery of South Australia by clearing the way for the private sector to develop again in South Australia. Finally, I wish to refer to the major development at Redcliff. We have probably lost any prospect of having a uranium enrichment plant in this State at Redcliff. I believe that the announcement by the Western Australian Government that it will set up a pilot uranium enrichment plant at Kalgoorlie effectively means that we have missed the boat yet again as a State. We have missed out on that chance.

However, the petro-chemical plant is a possibility, and we must leave no stone unturned to get it for South Australia. South Australia certainly cannot afford to go it alone, as I seem to remember the Premier saying that he would try two or three years ago. South Australia can get the petro-chemical plant only if it is helped by what will have to be massive Federal Government Loan funds for the infra-structure. I have already conveyed my strongest possible request to the Federal Government that it should give the South Australian Government's proposals and request for those funds the most urgent priority. I now intend to renew my request to the Federal Government along those lines. It is absolutely essential for the future of South Australia that we have such a plant.

As long as the Labor Party maintains its present policy on uranium, that other most exciting and life-saving project for this State, Roxby Downs, will continue to be ignored by this Government. It is absolutely ridiculous to say that Roxby Downs' copper deposits can be used only if we stockpile the uranium associated with it.

**Mr. Allison:** The copper market is depressed anyway.

**Mr. TONKIN:** Yes, and it is not a viable financial possibility. The Government must do everything possible to get South Australia moving again and, to do this, it must face reality. This is the first major step necessary to get South Australia back on the road to recovery. The most tragic thing that has occurred recently is that the Premier, in what should have been a most significant statement on the eve of the 25th anniversary of his entry into Parliament, should not have been able to come up with anything more than old dreams and old proposals that have all been tried and that are all unreal, unworkable, and impracticable. This is not the Government that we need for South Australia.

I repeat, that the first major step necessary to get South Australia back on the road to recovery is for the Government to recognise that a problem of massive proportions has been allowed to develop. Once the Government recognises that, possibly it may face reality.

Until it does face reality and until it does face the facts, the immediate future of South Australia under a Labor Government is grim indeed.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel):** I wish to raise two matters in this grievance debate. A recent occurrence in my district highlights clearly the stupidity of some of our industrial legislation and its effect on the public. A local bus proprietor at Angaston Mr. C. A. Liebig, has been running a school bus service locally for some years, and as a service to some parents also had a private school bus run to Angaston. Not to a private school, but it was not sponsored by the Education Department.

In September, 1976, the Transport Workers Union, under a Federal award, served a log of claims on the bus proprietor but, as the woman who was driving the bus on the private run was not a union member, he believed he did not have to do anything. The woman driving the bus was a neighbour who was quite happy to work for an agreed wage, having previously done other work she found less agreeable.

Recently, 18 months after the log of claims was served, an industrial inspector called to see the owner and told him he was underpaying his driver and that he must pay her \$90 a week for 9 hours work a week, including loading, etc., because she was classed as a casual employee. He was also told that he must pay about \$3 800 in back pay. I was first contacted by concerned parents who were worried that their school bus was being cut out. On investigation, I found that the proprietor could not afford to carry on.

The end result is that no-one is happy. The owner will have to sell his bus if he is to make good the back pay. His neighbour, the lady who drove the bus, was quite happy with the agreed arrangement, so she is now out of a job, and the parents are now left high and dry, having no transport now for their children to school. The owner, the driver and the public are now all disadvantaged because of the stupid inflexibility of the law as dictated by the union.

**Mr. Bannon:** The law is laid down. The union doesn't dictate the law.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** The union served the log of claims. All of this indicates to me the stupidity of some of our industrial legislation and the action of militant unionists, such as the Transport Workers Union, in enforcing conditions which are universally binding, taking no account of situations such as I have just outlined.

The proprietor was charging parents \$1 a week flat rate to carry the children, and the bus was earning \$50 a week in fares. His yearly expenses were insurance, \$152 a year; registration, \$121 a year; inspection, \$15 a year; repairs, tyres, etc., \$258 a year; fuel, \$400 a year; and depreciation, \$600 a year. This means that it was costing \$30 a week to run the bus. He was paying the driver \$20, so that it is clear that he was just breaking even. It is most unfortunate in my view that modern industrial legislation has brought this unfortunate situation to pass.

The second matter I wish to raise refers to one aspect of the Government's unemployment relief scheme. I understand that an officer of the Public Buildings Department has been drawing up lists of projects to be undertaken at schools in South Australia. I have not contacted the officer concerned, so I hope there will be no repercussions when the Government finds out who he is. My information came from elsewhere.

**Mr. Becker:** You've got to be careful.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** We have to be careful, or public servants are likely to have their heads chopped off at short notice with the present sensitivity of the Government. I did not get my information from the officer concerned. I understand that he was requested to draw up

a list of priorities in relation to works which were urgently needed. The Kersbrook Primary School had second place on that priority list. That school has recently become part of my electoral district. I understand that the list that has been drawn up has been ignored by the Labour and Industry Department in assessing which projects will proceed and be funded. Although many of these projects are to go ahead, the Kersbrook Primary School is out in the cold.

**Dr. Eastick:** What sort of work were they going to do?

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Work around the yard, bituminising, and so on.

**Dr. Eastick:** Landscaping—it has been promised for seven years.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Yes. It had a high priority. The department has completely ignored the findings of the officer, who must be browned off. I, too, am browned off that a school in my district which has been requiring work to be done for many years has been fobbed off. I would not be so uncharitable as to say that this is a political decision, although I could be excused for making that statement.

I understand that, if there are not many unemployed people in the district, people can be brought from elsewhere. I would think that whoever was employed to upgrade the facilities at many South Australian schools would have to be brought from another place to do the job. I hope that someone in the Minister's department whose job it is to check up on what is said in Parliament will look at my remarks so that in future, if priorities are established at the request of the Government, the Government will have the wit and the sense to see that they are maintained and that the Minister of Labour and Industry and those administering the unemployment relief scheme will take note of the work that has gone into compiling that list.

I am concerned that no account has been taken of the priority list. The Government could be accused of political patronage and favouritism in the areas in which work has been done. I am also concerned that the Kersbrook Primary School, which I understand was second on the list, does not appear to have had any work authorised.

**Mr. WILSON (Torrens):** A week or so ago I brought to light in this House the doctrine of collegiate responsibility, which is proposed to be introduced into the schools in this State after consultation between the Government and the South Australian Institute of Teachers. The problem with this doctrine is that it is not clearly defined at the moment, although we are in no doubt as to what some people in the South Australian Institute of Teachers believe it is. I raised this matter by means of a question and I shall quote from the question and answer so that the House will be reminded of what the institute regards collegiate responsibility to be. The institute conducted a referendum of nine points, one of which was the doctrine of collegiate responsibility. The question stated:

The division and allocation of tasks should be conducted in accordance with the general principle of collegiate responsibility.

That really does not tell us anything. In an accompanying article on the results of the referendum, collegiate responsibility was defined thus:

Collegiate responsibility implies that the staff collectively make decisions affecting the school. In the long term, the present hierarchy of principal and deputy principal are eliminated.

That takes us much further along the way, because the meaning of collegiate responsibility becomes clear: the principal and deputy principal are eliminated and the

schools, whether primary or secondary, are run by committees consisting of staff only. In his reply to my question, the Minister stated:

There is no doubt that it is my policy and that of the Government that we should expand collective decision-making in schools and that headmasters and principals should be encouraged to get together with their staffs and to make decisions on that basis.

That is a fairly reasonable statement, until you look at what lies behind it. The Minister went on:

This is something that has been happening increasingly in the schools.

That is an instance of the Government's attitude on this question. Later, the Minister makes the following comment:

If what comes up from the present ferment within the institute—

and he regards it as a ferment—

can assist us, we would look at it sympathetically.

That fairly harmless question and the seemingly harmless answer from the Minister have caused a fairly intense public reaction. My colleagues and I have received numerous phone calls and much correspondence on the matter. It would be interesting for the House to know what people teaching in the schools, the principals and deputy principals, think of the matter. Certainly, we have had telephone calls and letters supporting this doctrine of collegiate responsibility, and those letters give no doubt as to what they mean by collegiate responsibility, and that is exactly the definition I have quoted.

Other members are very concerned about this matter. The Government's attitude is borne out by an article in yesterday's *News*, quoting an interview with the Premier, that the Leader quoted earlier in another context. Part of the article quotes the Premier, as follows:

Democracy must be made to operate in the workplace, in schools, at institutions and places where people gather for social events. Industrial democracy is a significant part of this plan—but it is nowhere near all of it.

Education can be democratised to a great extent. More and more, we want people to make their own decisions about the system which is educating them—democracy must come to education.

They are fine words and, as they appear on the surface, not many people would disagree with them. However, what is behind it? When we look at the role of principals and deputy principals in the education system, we have to go back, first, to 1970, to the famous freedom memorandum of the then Director-General (Mr. Jones), which is defined really as follows:

A challenge against the bureaucratic system, with all its inherent restrictions that have strangled schools for years. In the main, principals accepted the challenge with open arms and instituted, on their own initiative, collective school-based staff decision-making on matters pertaining to all areas of school administration.

That is happening now in most schools. The memorandum continues:

This in no way has limited or minimised the role of the principal and his deputy but has, in fact, strengthened it in so far as he has the backing and support of his staff in the running of the school. We are now at the stage where community involvement and parent participation are gaining wide acceptance in the decision-making which in no way endangers the role of the principal or the deputy principal.

That is a plain statement, and it gives the effect of the Jones memorandum. The Minister also referred to the Jones memorandum and said, in reply to my question:

It is clear that the legal position is as was laid down by the former Director-General, Mr. Jones, in his freedom of

authority memorandum in 1970. The real effect of that memorandum was somewhat of a drawing back of the bureaucratic aspects of authority, the department which left very much the principal in charge, and that was not quite what was intended, because two other important inputs are involved: one is the parents and the other the staff.

Further to defining the role of the principal and deputy principal, I have a statement by the Director-General of Education in Victoria (and, no doubt, the member for Newland will be interested in this matter, because he has a great interest in education) which states:

Principals are appointed to schools to perform a number of functions. They are appointed to administer the school; they are responsible for the deployment of staff, the ultimate determination of school policy and all decisions relating to general administration, the allocation of duties, supervision of the teaching process, and the implementation of school policy, including the educational programmes encompassed. While there are very sound reasons for the involvement of staff and school councils in educational and administrative matters—and principals should ensure that this is done—the department expects that school principals will continue to exercise the executive leadership function for which they are appointed.

Finally, I quote from a letter I have received, which gives another definition of the role of the principal and the deputy principal. The letter, which I think members should hear, states:

The principal's role, as I believe it should be, and in fact to the best of my knowledge of what it obviously is, from my close contact with so many of my colleagues, first, what he is not: he is not a creature making decisions by riding roughshod over everybody to satisfy his own petty whims and idiosyncrasies. The principal is an indispensable part of a school. He is the central point where the views of every section and every person connected in any way with the school meet for evaluation. He must hear, weigh and evaluate the views of parents, students, staff, employers, administration, Governments (the order is probably right), and, in consultation with his own conscience, come to a decision which he thinks to be the most proper—of course it is not correct 100 per cent of the time.

Having come to a decision, and this is unlikely to be one taken in isolation, as other very experienced people would have been consulted as the last step, he should then satisfy the people whom it may offend as best he can, before his announcement. As he is convinced of the propriety of the decision he must carry it out and at times, as it may not be popular in some sections, he has a very lonely task.

**Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** I refer to the acute situation of Australia and, in particular, South Australia as part of a problem common to most Western nations, namely, the rapid decline in the importance of primary and secondary industries as producers of goods and things for sale and, therefore, as producers of revenue, by which countries stand or fall. The statistics presented by the Australian Bureau of Statistics are self-evident. In 1911, 31 per cent of the Australian work force was engaged in primary industry and 27 per cent in secondary industry. The estimate for 1977 from the bureau is that only 5.6 per cent of the work force is engaged in primary industry and 20.24 per cent is engaged in secondary industry.

This dramatic fall in the number of people engaged in primary and secondary industries has wide-reaching consequences for us all, not the least of which is that the old fashioned labour-based heavy industrial trade unions are a steadily declining force, with the Public Service-based unions and now the technocratically-based unions being an increasingly powerful force. It will be a steady

transfer of authority from one field to another.

More important is the fact that South Australia is also feeling the impact of being an extremely large State with a relatively small population, with two huge but lightly populated States adjacent (the soon-to-be-formed Northern Territory State and the existing West Australian State), and the markets, population and power bases are in Victoria and New South Wales. Melbourne, too, is rapidly overtaking Sydney as the financial and industrial capital, and is becoming a far more important and serious threat to South Australia than it has been hitherto. There is thus every possibility that an increasing number of automotive component manufacturers, banks and industrial headquarters will transfer to Victoria, not only for reasons into which I will go shortly for finding South Australia unattractive, but simply because Victoria is a central spot for the administration of business and the dissemination of goods and information across that heavily populated Australian market.

Another problem is that the chance of Australia's industrial force becoming larger is remote. Already, the heavily industrialised countries of Europe, Russia, the United States of America and Japan find that they are having problems with huge markets at their disposal. They are finding that it is increasingly difficult to get rid of goods, because the saturation point has been reached in so many manufacturing industries. Australia, with its already small basic market of only 14 000 000 people, has to break into a large overseas market if it is going to expand its industrial base. That will be extremely difficult, because of the swift change in Australia's financial base over the past few years.

In 1970-71, we were reasonably competitive. In 1972 (and I do not say this with any rancour or animosity), by Mr. Whitlam's own admission, his Government moved too quickly into a whole spate of inflation-fed social service benefits that cost literally billions of dollars. In order to finance them, the Whitlam Government admitted that it had, to some extent, encouraged inflation because the increase of taxes fed the increased expenditure which was necessary. That is hindsight. The point is that, irrespective of what the motives were, the damage was done. Australian costs, instead of being behind all western countries, including the United States, had outstripped them. Now freight charges in Australia are making it increasingly difficult for manufacturers to transport goods economically. Wharfage charges are making it almost impossible for Australian goods to compete anywhere in the world. We have already seen the Australian shipping industry, like that of so many other nations, collapse in the face of competition from elsewhere.

I was interested that the Premier was reported as saying that we should be looking towards the tertiary base for South Australia. It is an interesting and modern concept, that we have primary and secondary industry declining, and the tertiary base is now split into three groups—tertiary, quaternary and quinary. Those three groups will occupy well over 60 per cent of the Australian workforce without producing anything to sell. It would be interesting to ask the Premier and the Government where we are going to get the revenue to finance our rapidly increasing tertiary base if we have a declining primary and secondary base. It just isn't on.

Thinking people should be able to see now why the Redcliff petro-chemical industry has been of such major importance to South Australia and will continue to be until a decision is made whether we have that industry, because it represents one of those declining opportunities to obtain an increased industrial base. It is really dramatically critical that something is done for South Australia. The

importance of the uranium enrichment programme, which was envisaged for the Roxby Downs minerals (and the Leader has already referred to this) also represents an essential part of South Australia's burgeoning economy. If we do not get these major projects, we will be in a state of rapid decline. This is a major fear; South Australia just cannot afford to lose anything.

Tax concessions and cheaper labour are reasons why firms such as Dunlop and Slazenger have indicated that they will move to the Philippines. Seven or eight years ago we might have competed. Now, because Australia's financial structure is so high, we just cannot compete with countries such as that. Australian costs have outstripped all other nations and there seems to be little prospect, short of a massive overhaul, and a new look at things by trade unions, governments and every individual to see whether we cannot accept in some way a plateau standard of living instead of constantly searching after Utopia, when, in fact we are heading for an economic hell if we maintain that point of view.

One of the major features of Australia's decline was that massive 12 per cent Public Service wage hike in the early 1970s. That 12 per cent increase in salaries in one go set the pace for private enterprise to follow. Of course, the Public Service side benefits far outstripped those of private enterprise, which had to compete to retain members of its work force. These factors were part and parcel of that 1972 to 1975 cataclysm that the A.L.P. hurled us into. We are in the post-industrial revolution and, unless all Governments in Australia get down to analysing this situation and seeking some solution to it, Australia will be in a state of permanent decline. All it will have to show in years to come will be massive holes in the ground where its minerals have been dug out and exported so that overseas countries can develop their secondary and tertiary industries at our expense. It is a problem which is immediately with us and simply has to be faced now. We are already into the post-industrial era and we cannot afford to get any deeper into the mire.

**Mr. Groom:** Do you think these companies are irresponsible.

**Mr. ALLISON:** Anyone will do anything that he or she can get away with within reason, and it is up to Governments to determine what reason is, irrespective of who is in power. This problem transcends politics.

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

**Mr. WOTTON (Murray):** Earlier in the debate today the Leader referred to the massive increase in the Public Service in this State. I do not intend to spend a great deal of time on this subject. All members on this side appreciate the magnitude of the problem and the great amount of financial waste that has been caused because of this massive increase. I will refer to problems relating to the Environment Department. It is quite staggering to find that, despite such a massive increase in the numbers employed in the Public Service, such grave problems are associated with both the lack of finance and the lack of staff necessary for the National Parks and Wildlife Service. On a number of occasions in this Chamber during recent weeks we have referred to the appalling state of affairs regarding the morale of officers in that department. More will be said about that matter later. It is quite incredible that we are told by the Minister responsible and by those involved in that department that there is no finance or staff to supervise the amount of land that is involved at present, yet we know that at this time new departments are being established that are said to be looking into the policies relating to the environment. I suggest that it is quite late

enough, if not too late, to be looking at policies when we have a problem with that particular department. I will refer to some more problems associated with that department a little later.

I want to refer briefly to a number of answers that I received to Questions on Notice today. One of them relates to several pieces of legislation which have been promised by this Government—legislation relating to environmental impact statements, noise pollution regulations, off road vehicles and, indeed, South Australia's cultural heritage. I was interested in a reply that I received from the Minister about the environmental impact legislation. The Government first mooted the question of introducing such legislation on December 10, 1973. There have been many occasions since when the Government and the Minister responsible (and there have been a number of Ministers responsible in that time) have made statements about the need for such legislation, yet still we find that it is still in the pipeline. In fact, the Minister said today, in answer to a question about when we could expect this legislation to be forthcoming:

As soon as possible. Environmental impact legislation is extremely difficult to frame and it has been essential to integrate it with intended changes in planning law so that citizens are not faced with a whole series of different and separate approval processes before they proceed with any development.

It comes back to the point that this is extremely important legislation about which much is being said. It is far too important for it to be left in the pipeline.

Regarding noise pollution and legislation to control it, particularly as it relates to regulations, towards the end of last year I approached the Minister and asked him when we could expect regulations under this legislation to be forthcoming. I again refer to a letter that I received in reply to that question from the Minister. The letter is dated December 20, 1977, and is as follows:

I refer to your question without notice on Wednesday, November 30, 1977, regarding the Noise Control Act and offer this further information. The regulations in relation to the domestic noise section of the Noise Control Act, 1976-1977, and other relevant regulations, are at present being drafted by the Noise Advisory Committee. The committee has centred on the drafting of regulations to control noise emitted by machines under Part IV of the Act . . .

The Minister then lists the controls, and the letter continues:

Whilst there have been no prosecutions under the Act to date, it is felt at this stage that there has been some immediate control of excessive noise from domestic premises. It is anticipated that draft regulations in relation to noise emitted by machines, hearing conservation and the guide for predicting the outside noise levels of domestic air-conditioning units will be gazetted early in the new year. Draft regulations for the control of noise emitted from non-domestic premises will be made shortly thereafter.

I suggest that it is obvious that the Government is frightened to introduce such regulations. It has had ample opportunity seriously to consider this matter. When this legislation was introduced it was done with a flurry of fanfares as being extremely important. The legislation in its present form is completely and utterly useless. As I said earlier, it is a toothless tiger because, without regulations the legislation in its present form is completely useless. I suggest to the Minister that these regulations should be brought forward immediately if the legislation is to be effective soon.

Regarding off-road vehicle legislation, we are told that certain areas are being set aside for that purpose. In reply to a question I asked on this matter I was told today that

various areas are being set aside but that I am not allowed to know what those areas are. I again suggest that ample time has been provided for the Government to consider this matter. It has been stalling for far too long and the people of South Australia deserve to know what is in line for them regarding this legislation and off-road vehicles. It is essential that areas be set aside to cater for people who use these vehicles for sport, a hobby or for recreational purposes. It is important that people know where these areas are to be established. We should know this before the report is released so that the public is given an opportunity to comment on the report.

Regarding the cultural heritage legislation, I believe it was to be introduced today but has now been delayed until Thursday. It is with much anticipation that I await this type of legislation to be brought forward by the Government. I again bring to the attention of the Minister of Works the matter of a filtered water supply for the township of Murray Bridge. This matter has concerned me and other people for some time. Many attempts have been made by councils in the area for an improved water supply for Murray Bridge and its districts. Towards the end of last year a letter was written to the Engineering and Water Supply Department to which a reply was received. That reply was similar to a reply that I received from the Minister, and it is as follows:

The department has no plans to provide filtered water to townships outside of the metropolitan area at this time. Present financial commitments for a filtered water supply to the metropolitan area amount to \$120 000 000. Until this programme is complete the Government would not commit itself to providing a filtered supply to other areas.

This is again an example of the Government's being unwilling to look further than where a vote lies. This matter is as vitally important for country people, who should have a decent drinking and domestic water supply, as for people in the metropolitan area. I suggest that the Minister owes it to country people and people in that district seriously to consider the allocation of such a water supply.

**Mr. BECKER (Hanson):** I support the motion. I take this opportunity of warning the Government that we would have thought by now that it would have realised that its socialist economic policy is not working. In light of the current predictions of the State Budget, where a deficit of about \$26 000 000 is expected, of which \$18 000 000 will come from the reserve account, taxpayers must, before we start to consider the next Budget for the next financial year, find \$8 000 000 plus whatever will be the ruling rate of inflation just to keep the various State Government services going. If that is the case, the South Australian taxpayers could be expected to foot an additional bill of somewhere between \$50 000 000 and \$70 000 000 next financial year. I warn the Government that it should now be considering an economic policy to encourage stability and growth in South Australia and at the same time it should adopt a more responsible role as far as Government in South Australia is concerned.

My attention has been drawn to an article that appeared in the *Herald* (the Labor Party paper) some time ago about the selling of socialism. It is written by a former member of this House, Mr. Crimes. What he says sums up the attitude of the Government Party in this State. The article is as follows:

A letter to the *Australian* said: "The results of the 1974 general election revealed one thing: the people of Australia are not yet ready for democratic socialism and are, in fact, not quite sure what it is. Solution? More PR."

That is interesting because the article was written in July, 1974. It continues:

Right. Here's some:

Each and every person seeking membership of the Australian Labor Party pledges to actively support and advocate the socialisation of industry, production, distribution and exchange to the extent necessary to eliminate exploitation in those fields.

As we know, the A.L.P. is now undertaking a membership drive. I hope that the Party will tell the people that that is exactly what is expected of them and that they must pledge "to actively support", which they must because it is in financial difficulties as a result of the recent Federal election. The article continues:

Past history shows there is more than a grain of truth in the phrase, "The Labor Party is a Socialist Party in name only."

The Australian Labor Party has an answer—Democratic Socialism—about which there has been so much silence.

He then slams the Constitution and other things. The article was written in July, 1974. We all remember the golden years of 1972 to 1975 under the Federal Labor Government when, for the first time, we witnessed federally the advancement of socialism and the introduction of that system within the Australian Commonwealth. As we all know, socialism is a theory or system of social organisation which advocates the vesting of the ownership and control of the means of production, capital, land, etc., in the community as a whole. It is a procedure or practice in accordance with the theory.

**Mr. Groom:** That is Marxism.

**Mr. BECKER:** I was referring to what is known as the little red book, the constitution and general rules of the A.L.P. That book states:

The objective of the Party is the democratic socialisation of industry, production, distribution and exchange to the extent necessary to eliminate exploitation and other anti-social features in those fields, in accordance with the principles of action, methods, and progressive reforms set out in the State and national platforms of the Australian Labor Party.

The Labor Party still hangs on to the economic policy of nationalising and controlling industry, production, distribution and exchange, and that is where the economy has collapsed. That is where it collapsed between 1972 and 1975.

**Mr. Groom:** You're referring to Marxism.

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

**Mr. BECKER:** We are still paying for the policies brought forward by the Whitlam Government in haste, for all the attitudes and resolutions bound up for many years in the structure of the Labor Party. It will be many years before the nation can get out of debt, following that drastic period. Regrettably, the awkward situation caused by the Whitlam Administration is reflected in this State. That is why it is extremely difficult to meet our present obligations and to balance the Budget. A deficit Budget cannot be continued, whether by a Federal Government or a State Government.

That is why I have pleaded with the Premier over the years to balance the Budget. I am disappointed this year that he has decided to take all our reserves, but it was obvious that at some stage that money would be used to prop up the incompetent handling of the State finances. Today I received a reply to a question about the State Public Service, and the reply stated that, in the eight years that the present Government has been in office, the Public Service had increased by 60.8 per cent and that estimated

wages for this year were \$530 000 000 out of a total Budget payment of \$1 171 000 000. Yet, in 1969-70, the payments on the State Budget were \$335 000 000, so we can see the mammoth growth in the payments from the State Budget.

Further, 50 per cent of that money goes to Public Service wages and salaries. Is it any wonder that State Taxes increased by about 400 per cent in the same period? If we continue that growth rate and continue in the vein that the Whitlam Government followed, either we will get further in to debt or the cost of State services will have to be increased. Charges will have to be increased, and it will be impossible for the average worker in South Australia to own and maintain his own home.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. BECKER:** Government members may laugh, but they are not giving relief to the average worker, let alone giving him any incentive to obtain employment, nor are they giving incentive to the young people who left school last year and who are still seeking employment. The Government should take a harder look at the situation instead of blaming the Federal Government. It is no good Government members sitting in their benches like parrots and saying, "What is your policy?" The A.L.P. is in Government, and it must handle the situation and reach a solution. If it cannot do that, the only thing to do is resign. We can see the battle going on on the front bench between the Attorney-General and the Premier. If the Government cannot handle the problem and take the warnings that are being given, it has no right to be in office.

**Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg):** The first matter that I raise with the Government, particularly with the Minister of Transport, is that of the criteria that are used to establish priorities for the provision of traffic lights and pedestrian-actuated crossing lights. The Government has a poor record in supplying the needs of the many vehicles that use our roads: the Government's policy is for road closure rather than for providing better roads. It is putting on the roads, particularly the main one in my district, Brighton Road, a volume of traffic greater than was intended for them.

Brighton Road has become a big problem for all who use it, particularly pedestrians and young cyclists. When I became a member, I asked the then Minister of Works to provide cycle tracks when Brighton road was being widened, but the Government did not entertain the idea. Last week, a young cyclist was badly injured near the Hove crossing when he was knocked off his bicycle while trying to cross Brighton Road. It is imperative that the Government provide pedestrian-actuated lights to give a safe means for aged pedestrians and young people to cross Brighton Road near the Hove crossing.

The Government has procrastinated for a long time. Last November, Brighton council approved the plans for the provision of these safety measures, but the Government has not moved to provide the facilities. These facilities should be provided forthwith, and further proof as to the urgency of the work is not needed. In recent years, two deaths and many accidents and injuries have occurred at that place. In the past few years, 35 accidents have occurred near the Hove crossing, involving aged people and young students attending Mawson High School and those crossing the road from the railway to walk to Brighton High School. If the Government has an assessment about the need for these safety crossing facilities, it is about time it reassessed the position.

The people of the district can no longer tolerate the situation. It is an absolute disgrace that the Government has not provided a safety crossing at Hove long ago. Some time ago, I presented to the House a petition in relation to the crossing. Pensioners meet at the Brighton R.S.L. rooms, and hundreds of aged people attend the senior citizen's club daily. Students cross the road to attend Mawson High School or Brighton High School, many coming from Marino and other outlying districts. Brighton Road is a safety hazard for the children who attend the many schools in that area.

**The Hon. D. J. Hopgood:** What about King George Avenue?

**Mr. MATHWIN:** That crossing was in operation even when I was mayor. In 1974, five accidents occurred at the crossing, at the Brighton Road junction. Six accidents occurred in 1975 in Addison Road and Brighton Road, and four accidents occurred in the same year at Torr Avenue. In a short period, 35 accidents occurred in that vicinity. It is imperative that the Government act immediately. The whole of Brighton Road, from north to south, is a great problem.

Another danger area is situated at the intersection of Oaklands Road, Whyte Street, and Brighton Road. Traffic lights must be provided for the area, because it is frightening to see the number of accidents recorded on maps kept for that purpose. Lights must be provided also at the corner of Jetty Road and Brighton Road, thus easing the problem at Beach Road. I mentioned that in a debate some months ago, but nothing has happened. I hope the Government will take note of the matters I have raised.

In closing roads, I presume that the Government is following the policy adopted in some areas in Europe and the United Kingdom. Presumably, the Minister saw road closing as an advantage, but I suggest that his research did not go far enough. The main reason for closing roads in the United Kingdom is to provide safe play areas for children who have nowhere else to play. Here, the policy of our Government is to close the roads to enable a more free flow of traffic on the roads opened up. Never mind the cost in human lives and the problems created for elderly people and young students who find it almost impossible to cross the road! The Government should get its priorities in order. It is imperative that safety features be provided at the Hove crossing.

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

**Mr. RODDA (Victoria):** I heard the member for Hanson say, "Well may Government members laugh." I do not know whether he was referring to the \$26 000 000 deficit or to this rather presumptuous Bill, which gives us an opportunity, by way of a grievance debate, to raise matters of concern.

At present, 12 members of the South Australian public are racing, perhaps not madly but with some decision, across the country areas, endeavouring to serve their constituents, whilst 33 of their ilk are falling over one another in the city on postage stamp electorates. I wish to make some review of the plight faced by country members since September 17 last in serving their districts.

The country districts of Stuart and Whyalla are held by members of the Government Party. They are described as country urban districts, centred on the major cities of

Whyalla, Port Pirie and Port Augusta. Two-thirds of the State's area is represented by the member for Eyre. At the recent election, the Government saw fit to endorse two candidates to stand against the member for Eyre.

**Mr. Mathwin:** Neither won.

**Mr. RODDA:** They were not successful. The country constituent has sparse representation. The Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal has given its interpretation of district allowances, and they may be generous or ungenerous, depending on the situation, but money will not compensate for the physical demands placed on the country member who serves his people. He cannot divide himself into two parts, and as time goes by we will see that the country constituent has no option but to accept the inability of his member to be in two places at once. Constituents have been extremely patient and mindful of the difficulties facing country members.

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

**Mr. RODDA:** After the election of September 17, 1977, we had the spectacle of the country member serving an enlarged district on his former electoral allowance. I presume it would have been within the Government's province to call together the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal. Country members served their districts on the old allowances, and they cut their teeth on a penny-pinching basis. I hope that this will be noted for future reference. The member for Eyre was treated magnanimously by the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal. The Government must have had some feeling for him in the first three months; at the last election the Government put up two candidates against him. At present the Government's credibility is at an all-time low. The Government sacked the Commissioner of Police.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Victoria is straying a little from the Bill.

**Mr. RODDA:** Let us talk about the unsavoury events lying at the Government's door.

**Mr. Whitten:** What about Mr. Taylor?

**Mr. RODDA:** Never mind about him. The honourable member is one of the up-and-coming members of the Government who can always be relied on to ask the difficult question. The honourable member used poor old Mr. Lynch as a whipping boy when the Opposition was criticising the State Government's performance. Aspersions were cast on Mr. Lynch while he was on his sickbed. The member for Price lost no opportunity to raise the issue when a hot question came from the Opposition. Today, the Saffron story has been peddled and the Premier does not want anything to do with it. He was followed by the Attorney-General. This highlights the Government's lack of credibility. While all this is going on, the Electoral Act is possibly bringing about the demise of two more Opposition members, perhaps including me. The Government's time is running out. It will take more than the Dorothy Dix questions of the member for Price to combat the Opposition's penetrating questions.

**Dr. EASTICK (Light):** As was indicated earlier this afternoon, it will not be long before this session ends. Regrettably, a number of issues raised in this House have still not been answered by the Government, and it is doubtful whether they will be answered as they should be

answered. For example, I refer to the large sum spent on the conduct of the 1977 State election without authority. Although it is more than a week since the question was asked of the Attorney-General, there is still no answer as to who was responsible for authorising the expenditure of the large sum. Reference was made earlier this afternoon to the situation of some candidates. Many candidates who stood for election last year lost several hundred dollars, while other candidates were permitted to remain in employment and, as a result, they lost not a cent, nor any of their entitlements. Some candidates employed by the Education Department lost their entitlement to holiday pay during August and September, 1977, whereas other candidates employed by the Education Department remained in employment throughout and obtained their holiday pay.

I now refer to pages 1840 and 1841 of *Hansard* of February 28 in connection with the Country Fire Service. A major difficulty is arising because of the failure of the Minister of Agriculture to support the people who are providing this important community service. I do not know whether the Minister of Transport believes that I may leave him alone by virtue of his gracious act in providing water, but the Minister of Agriculture has failed to resist the intrusion of the Public Service Board into the decision on the amount to be paid to Country Fire Service officers. There are fewer than 40 officers in the whole service, and they will not have a nine-to-five job. Further, they will not have the opportunities of advancement which would otherwise apply. They will not be able to benefit from the entitlements associated with the Public Service Board. Because of their interest in fire-fighting services, they are willing to make themselves available for appointments, and they are being denied a reasonable remuneration.

There is an urgent need for the Minister of Agriculture to reassess the position and to act responsibly on behalf of these Country Fire Service officers. We must ask ourselves (and heaven forbid that this should be the answer) whether the Country Fire Service is to be the first of a number of authorities and whether the determination of their remuneration is to be the first of many that are going to be intruded upon by the Public Service Board.

Will the Fire Brigades Board be next, or will it be Samcor? Will authorities that currently do not have to consult the Public Service Board in relation to their remuneration have this pressure put on them in the future? I cannot say too strongly on behalf of the Country Fire Service that there is an urgent need for action to be taken. I am disgusted that the Minister of Agriculture has procrastinated for yet another week without finalising this important issue.

The member for Victoria referred to some of the problems associated with the electoral system. More particularly, we should have a close look at the term of reference in the Electoral Act which requires that, in considering the drawing of the boundaries, as nearly as possible existing boundaries must persist. I have in my possession a series of figures which indicate the percentage above and below the State average at the time of the effective date of June 30, 1976. I have the figures in relation to the increase above and below that effective figure for the 1977 State election (with the roll of August 24), together with the figures for the 1977 Federal election, that roll being concluded on November 10, 1977. As these figures are purely statistical, I seek leave to have them included in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

## PERCENTAGE ABOVE AND BELOW QUOTA (16 785) AT EFFECTIVE DATE, JUNE 30, 1976.

Effective Date June 30, 1976 (a)	1977 State Election Roll at August 24, 1977 (b)	1977 Federal Election Roll at November 10, 1977 (c)
	+24.56 Fisher	+20.58 Salisbury
+20 per cent	+17.68 Salisbury	+18.62 Mawson
	+15.21 Mawson	+16.95 Fisher +16.19 Newland +15.82 Baudin
+15 per cent	+13.84 Baudin +13.46 Newland +11.38 Hartley	+10.60 Hartley
+10 per cent	+ 8.25 Brighton + 8.24 Henley Beach + 8.04 Playford + 7.83 Semaphore	+ 9.66 Brighton + 8.72 Playford + 8.32 Henley Beach
+7.5 per cent	+ 6.82 Florey	+ 7.02 Florey + 6.78 Todd + 6.61 Semaphore + 6.12 Norwood + 6.06 Hanson + 5.96 Hanson + 5.94 Elizabeth + 5.66 Coles + 5.64 Albert Park + 5.61 Norwood + 5.52 Todd + 5.51 Coles
	+ 5.55 Hanson	+ 5.24 Torrens + 5.15 Mitchell + 5.11 Chaffey + 5.00 Morphett
	+ 5.08 Florey	
+5 per cent	+ 4.92 Norwood + 4.74 Morphett + 4.52 Brighton + 4.39 Adelaide + 4.37 Glenelg + 4.27 Semaphore + 4.24 Torrens + 4.09 Henley Beach + 4.06 Mitchell + 3.86 Coles + 3.75 Fisher + 3.19 Gilles + 3.07 Bragg + 2.94 Playford + 2.86 Mitcham + 2.75 Hartley + 2.07 Peake	+ 4.96 Glenelg + 4.92 Davenport + 4.89 Gilles + 4.37 Kavel + 4.33 Adelaide + 3.86 Mount Gambier + 3.61 Alexandra + 3.52 Whyalla + 3.13 Murray + 3.03 Mitcham + 2.83 Bragg + 2.14 Ascot Park
	+ 4.53 Gilles + 4.45 Torrens + 4.43 Chaffey + 4.34 Elizabeth + 4.18 Morphett + 4.08 Glenelg + 3.94 Albert Park + 3.92 Mitchell + 3.85 Davenport + 3.83 Adelaide + 3.46 Bragg + 3.43 Kavel + 3.40 Murray + 3.22 Mitcham + 3.22 Alexandra + 2.07 Peake + 1.83 Mount Gambier	

PERCENTAGE ABOVE AND BELOW QUOTA (16 785) AT EFFECTIVE DATE, JUNE 30, 1976—*continued*

Effective Date June 30, 1976 (a)	1977 State Election Roll at August 24, 1977 (b)	1977 Federal Election Roll at November 10, 1977 (c)
<b>+5 per cent</b>		
+ 1.93 Salisbury	+ 1.75 Unley	+ 1.22 Rocky River
+ 1.69 Davenport	+ 1.53 Ascot Park	+ 1.16 Unley
+ 1.46 Ross Smith	+ 1.25 Whyalla	+ 1.13 Napier
+ 1.33 Whyalla	+ 0.17 Stuart	+ 0.91 Stuart
+ 1.12 Ascot Park	+ 0.08 Goyder	+ 0.76 Peake
+ 1.04 Chaffey	+ 0.006 Rocky River	+ 0.18 Goyder
<b>0.00 per cent</b>		
- 0.08 Price		
- 0.31 Unley		
	- 0.41 Napier	
- 0.51 Stuart		- 0.68 Price
- 0.89 Kavel		- 0.70 Ross Smith
	- 0.79 Price	
- 1.33 Newland		
- 1.56 Baudin		
- 1.58 Mawson		
- 1.75 Todd		
	- 1.81 Ross Smith	
- 2.11 Mount Gambier		
- 2.19 Spence		
	- 2.22 Spence	
- 2.54 Rocky River		- 2.76 Light
- 2.81 Elizabeth		
- 3.33 Albert Park	- 3.72 Light	
- 3.84 Napier		- 3.41 Spence
- 4.61 Goyder		
- 4.97 Alexandra		
<b>-5 per cent</b>		
- 5.11 Murray	- 6.26 Flinders	- 5.18 Flinders
- 8.33 Light	- 6.67 Eyre	- 5.33 Eyre
- 8.58 Flinders	- 7.57 Mallee	- 6.84 Mallee
- 8.82 Mallee	- 7.76 Victoria	- 6.86 Victoria
- 8.83 Eyre		
- 9.00 Victoria		

(a) Commission Report.

(b) Answer to Question on Notice—*Hansard* pp. 1188 December 6, 1977.(c) Answer to Question on Notice—*Hansard* pp. 1188-1189 December 6, 1977.

**Dr. EASTICK:** Brief reference to these figures will indicate that, on the figures for the State election in September, 1977, the seat of Fisher had grown to 24.56 per cent above the 16 785 electors, plus or minus 10. At that point, the seat of Fisher, on the roll which was prepared, was 24.56 per cent above. The seat of Salisbury had risen to 17.68 per cent, and all of these figures are set out. We find that, in the December roll for the Federal election, the figure for Fisher had been altered, because of a cleansing of the roll, but we still find that the seat of Salisbury had risen to 20.58 per cent above the figure of 16 785. These are revealing figures, to which every member will want to give his attention. They show clearly that, in a number of electorates in which there was no disturbance of the existing boundaries, there has hardly been a shift, or a shift of only one or two per cent above the position, and some of them have slid away from the position they held on June 30, 1976. This clearly indicates that there should have been an alteration to those

electorates if we were going to obtain a proper Labor Party's catch cry of one vote one value.

I have a second group of figures that is based on the movement between the roll issues of the new electorates. Here, we find that the State average at the time of the determination of the new electorates was 0.00 per cent. We find that, during the period between then until the preparation of the State rolls in August, 1977, there had been a State increase of 3.73 per cent, and in the period between the State election and the Federal election there had been a further increase on a State-wide basis of 0.81 per cent. The figures above and below these means show that there are some electorates in which there is a quite dramatic increase in numbers. It fortifies the information contained in the first set of figures. As these are also statistical figures, I seek leave to have them included in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

## PERCENTAGE MOVEMENT BETWEEN ROLL ISSUES

	Effective Date 30.6.76	1977 State Election Roll 24.8.77	1977 Federal Election Roll 10.11.77
+ 5-55	Hanson		
+ 5-08	Florey		
+ 4-92	Norwood		
+ 4-74	Morphett		
+ 4-52	Brighton		
+ 4-39	Adelaide		+ 2-96 Mawson
+ 4-37	Glenelg		+ 2-47 Salisbury
+ 4-27	Semaphore		+ 2-40 Newland
+ 4-24	Torrens	+ 20-17 Fisher	+ 2-24 Whyalla
+ 4-09	Henley Beach	+ 17-07 Mawson	+ 1-99 Mount Gambier
+ 4-06	Mitchell	+ 15-64 Baudin	+ 1-74 Baudin
+ 3-86	Coles	+ 15-45 Salisbury	+ 1-63 Albert Park
+ 3-75	Fisher	+ 15-00 Newland	+ 1-54 Elizabeth, Napier
+ 3-19	Gilles	+ 8-96 Murray	+ 1-44 Eyre
+ 3-07	Bragg	+ 8-62 Alexandra	+ 1-30 Brighton
+ 2-94	Playford	+ 8-40 Hartley	+ 1-22 Rocky River
+ 2-86	Mitcham	+ 7-52 Albert Park	+ 1-20 Todd
+ 2-75	Hartley	+ 7-40 Todd	+ 1-19 Mitchell
+ 2-07	Peake	+ 7-36 Elizabeth	+ 1-16 Flinders
+ 1-93	Salisbury	+ 5-03 Light	+ 1-13 Ross Smith
+ 1-69	Davenport	+ 4-95 Playford	+ 1-03 Davenport
+ 1-46	Ross Smith	+ 4-92 Goyder	+ 0-99 Light
+ 1-33	Whyalla	+ 4-36 Kavel	+ 0-98 Victoria
+ 1-12	Ascot Park	+ 4-03 Mount Gambier	+ 0-90 Kavel
+ 1-04	Chaffey	+ 3-98 Henley Beach	+ 0-85 Glenelg
<hr/>			
State Average	0-00	+ 3-73	+ 0-81
<hr/>			
- 0-08	Price	+ 3-57 Brighton, Napier	+ 0-79 Mallee, Morphett
- 0-31	Unley	+ 3-42 Semaphore	+ 0-75 Torrens
- 0-51	Stuart	+ 3-35 Chaffey	+ 0-74 Stuart
- 0-89	Kavel	+ 2-61 Rocky River	+ 0-65 Chaffey
- 1-33	Newland	+ 2-54 Flinders	+ 0-63 Playford
- 1-56	Baudin	+ 2-37 Eyre	+ 0-60 Ascot Park
- 1-58	Mawson	+ 2-13 Davenport	+ 0-49 Norwood
- 1-75	Todd	+ 2-06 Unley	+ 0-48 Adelaide
- 2-11	Mount Gambier	+ 1-66 Florey	+ 0-38 Alexandra
- 2-19	Spence	+ 1-59 Coles	+ 0-34 Gilles
- 2-54	Rocky River	+ 1-37 Mallee	+ 0-19 Florey
- 2-81	Elizabeth	+ 1-36 Victoria	+ 0-14 Coles
- 3-33	Albert Park	+ 1-30 Gilles	+ 0-11 Price
- 3-84	Napier	+ 0-68 Stuart	+ 0-10 Goyder
- 4-61	Goyder	+ 0-66 Norwood	+ 0-09 Hanson
- 4-97	Alexandra	+ 0-40 Ascot Park, Hanson	+ 0-08 Henley Beach
- 5-11	Murray	+ 0-38 Bragg	- 0-18 Mitcham
- 8-33	Light	+ 0-35 Mitcham	- 0-26 Murray
- 8-58	Flinders	+ 0-20 Torrens	- 0-58 Unley
- 8-82	Mallee	0-00 Peake	- 0-61 Bragg
- 8-83	Eyre	- 0-04 Spence	- 0-70 Hartley
- 9-00	Victoria	- 0-08 Whyalla	- 1-13 Semaphore
		- 0-14 Mitchell	- 1-22 Spence
		- 0-28 Glenelg	- 1-28 Peake
		- 0-54 Adelaide, Morphett	- 6-11 Fisher*
		- 0-71 Price	
		- 3-33 Ross Smith	

\* Major drop in Fisher resulted from roll correction.

**Dr. EASTICK:** It is important, I believe that members consider these two sets of figures which are revealing and which indicate that the system of electoral determination in this State still does not get anywhere close to a one vote one value, as the A.L.P. insists, and I believe that members will want to continue to look at the figures as they unfold in the months ahead.

**Mr. BLACKER (Flinders):** I take this opportunity to raise once again in the House the problem many country people are experiencing with the lack of a reticulated water supply. Many areas in the State do not have the opportunity of being able to turn on a tap to water their garden, flush their toilet, or feed their stock. That situation is to be condemned, particularly for people who

have been pioneers in respective areas and who have developed the land to the stage where they are highly productive sections of the community. In times of drought, when local water storages are unable to meet the demands placed on them, these problems of lack of reticulated supply are accentuated.

I refer once again to the problem being experienced by the farmers and residents in the Mangalo area. Mangalo has been developed as a primary production area. It has great grain-growing potential, despite the adverse publicity that has been given to some areas of Eyre Peninsula. Although the crop has been minimal, there has been little actual drift in the Mangalo Hills area. The problem of maintaining stock is insurmountable. These farmers cannot continue in this way. On inquiring, I found that the endeavours of people in the area to obtain a reticulated supply go back a long time. People there have made every reasonable request of every departmental officer who has visited the area for a supply. They have tried to be incorporated in any scheme that is going past, whether it be the east coast main, the Cleve main or the Kimba-Polda main. They have been trying to have an extension attached thereto, but all attempts have failed. They are now in that awkward situation where, with pipelines running in neighbouring areas in all directions (and I refer to the east coast, Cleve, and Polda-Kimba mains), the problem now arises that none of those pipelines is of sufficient capacity to be able to handle the additional extension, anyway.

This is a clear indication of lack of planning in the early stages. Pipelines run all around the area, so to speak, yet none is of sufficient capacity to be able to handle an extension. I raised this matter of the Mangalo people on October 12, and referred to some documented evidence I had at that time. Further to that, I will give some chronological explanation to some of the endeavours the local people have made. First, the District Council of Franklin Harbour has applied for a water pipeline to Mangalo, and I have been supplied with a letter from the Minister to the council at that time, when some explanation was given, and an acknowledgment made that the pipelines concerned were of insufficient capacity.

Secondly, the Mangalo Progress Association has applied several times—on November 19, 1968, on November 29, 1971, and most recently on November 29, 1976. On March 8, we received another similar letter from the Minister of Works, giving much the same reply.

Not only has the Franklin Harbor District Council been endeavouring to push the cause of the Mangalo farmers and the Mangalo area community but the Agricultural Bureau has also been in touch on numerous occasions and various assurances have been given. The problem seems to boil down to Government policy on any rural extension. This situation has developed in just about every country rural extension proposal. The Government policy is that there must be a 10 per cent capital cost return, or a capital contribution of 10 per cent must be made before any new pipeline is laid. The same situation has applied at Edillilie and Wanilla. The Edillilie area local officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department have assessed the area and the potential for a pipeline. I understand that the maximum contribution that could be expected would be 3 per cent, so effectively the Government policy virtually says that there shall be no more rural extensions to country mains. This is a hard policy because those areas that are already serviced are all right. When they wear out it is Government policy that they will be replaced, but areas that are not connected with a service are in the awkward situation of not being able to have mains water, because the Government policy will not allow it.

What I am asking is that there be a change of Government policy to allow at least those areas which are highly productive and which have a capacity to produce wool beef cattle or pigs (and pig farming has kept farmers operating in the tough times of recent years) to have a mains water supply. Without such a supply, they are placed at a disadvantage to other primary producers and other residents throughout the State. Every metropolitan resident person believes that he is entitled to have a water service. Most country areas believe that they have a right to have a water service, but there are some people who are being denied that access. This situation cannot, in all fairness, be tolerated.

I would like to mention an activity presently being undertaken in my electorate—the farmer-training scheme. This is the first time in South Australia that this scheme has got under way. It is a joint venture involving the Further Education Department, the Education Department, the Agriculture Department and the United Farmers and Graziers. The scheme is being financed through a modified version of the NEAT scheme. In principle the scheme sets up a way in which farmers can be trained as master farmers. Those farmers can then employ lads (and for the sake of this exercise we will call them apprentices) to be taught the skills involved in various farming activities. Associated with that master farmer and apprentice relationship is a series of three-week camp block release courses. This enables the students to study and to be advised by a number of lecturers on as many aspects of the farming spectrum as possible.

This first block release session started in Port Lincoln last weekend. On present indications the scheme is going to be a tremendous success. I can only add my praise to the Government departments, the United Farmers and Graziers and to all the farmers who are responsible for the many hours spent in setting up the curriculum and bringing together this scheme; it is a first for South Australia. The scheme has been established, in the first instance, on the Eyre Peninsula and based at Port Lincoln. At least three of the block release sessions will be held on Eyre Peninsula. One of them is expected to be held in Adelaide, but I am not sure whether it will be at Roseworthy Agricultural College, or somewhere like that. At the end of two years, 30 young farmers will be going on to the land who will be experienced and who will have a good idea of what farming is all about. This cannot help but benefit those farmers. It is an opportunity that was not available to other farmers; it was certainly not available to me. Few people in South Australia have had this opportunity, and I can only give the scheme the highest praise.

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

**Mr. VENNING (Rocky River):** The deficit in this State of \$26 000 000 is the highest deficit we have had here for some years. This is amazing, when we realise that we have sold the bottom paddock (the railways) for a figure the Premier sometimes says is \$600 000 000, and at other time says is \$800 000 000. We are a little bit like the fellow who sold his wife for a bottle of beer, and his friend said to him, "I suppose your sorry now." He said, "No, but I am thirsty again." This is a similar situation. The Government was in trouble and got out of it by selling the bottom paddock; now it is in trouble again.

It would be interesting to know what the position would have been if we had kept the railways. I suppose the railways were running at a deficit of about \$50 000 000 in this State. If one takes the non-metropolitan railways figure away from that deficit, I imagine it would be about \$30 000 000, so that, if we still had the railways, instead of

having a deficit of \$26 000 000 it would be up to \$56 000 000. This, in itself, explains clearly that this Government does not have the ability to handle finance. I wonder how Government members individually manage their own affairs. I look at the member on the front bench now and wonder how he manages his affairs. The condition of the finances of this State is a matter of great concern, as all of us are worried about the welfare of the State. The Premier has already stated that there will be increased taxes. One wonders just where these taxes will be applied. Members will find that as time passes, and before the Budget period, the Premier (and I am not too sure who the Premier will be by that time; I am a little inclined to think it will not be the present incumbent) will undertake the same tactic as was the case last year. He will increase taxes before the Budget period and then he will bring down a Budget and say that there will not be any increase in taxes. People have short memories and they will say, "He is not a bad fellow after all." It really makes me smile, because he has done this time and time again and got away with it, to a degree. The Opposition will endeavour to point out to the people exactly what is going on with this matter.

One wonders just where the Premier will introduce these increased taxes. What amazes me is that the Electricity Trust of South Australia last financial year paid into the Treasury about \$7 000 000 or \$8 000 000. I guess the Premier will increase the percentage the trust will have to pay this financial year. When the trust started to pay funds into Treasury the sum amounted to about \$450 000. That imposition is iniquitous, because, as the trust increases its charges, so it must pay more into Treasury.

**Mr. Groom:** Should we turn off the light?

**Mr. VENNING:** The lights are getting dim all over South Australia.

**Mr. Harrison:** The Liberal Party—

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member for Albert Park is out of order.

**Mr. VENNING:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker; he has never been otherwise. As a responsible taxpayer of this State I am concerned about whence the Premier will get this money to make up this huge deficit. The member for Flinders referred to water in this State, about which I am concerned too, because we are the driest State in the driest continent. Last week I heard a professor from Flinders University talking about towing icebergs to Australia. The nearest point to which an iceberg could be towed in South Australia would be Robe, but that is a fair way from which to reticulate water to the metropolitan area.

An iceberg could be towed to Kwinana in Western Australia, where it would be effective. One iceberg would be sufficient to supply South Australia's water needs for 12 months. Although it would be an expensive operation now I believe that, with the increased charges that this Government will place on water in this State, it will be only a matter of a few years before it will be economical to tow icebergs to South Australia for water.

I now want to talk about roads in my area. Those roads are in a shocking state, to say the least. From Brinkworth through to Red Hill via Koolunga I was amazed at their roughness. I know it has been a dry year and it is difficult for councils to grade the roads. If the council graders try to grade the roads while they are dry the graded area just blows away. As soon as the southern freeway can be finished the better, because money allocated for country roads could be spent on sealing country roads. An unsealed section of road that comes to mind is that which runs through to Merriton and Port Broughton in the block F area. The Minister was invited to inspect this road last year but, as he had a touch of the shingles, he could not

come and instead sent the Director. The department has completed sealing one kilometre of that road, but still five kilometres or six kilometres of road is left to seal in that area, and that will probably take another six or seven years to do. This is an important road that links the northern part of the State with Yorke Peninsula. It is a road along which many primary producers in the north cart their superphosphate and grain. It is important that the Minister should consider spending the grant money allocated for roads on upgrading these roads instead of wasting it on the southern freeway. I know that the Minister has a commitment to the southern freeway but I hope that he will allocate money to upgrade roads in the North of the State.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** The Federal Minister will not allow me to do it.

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

**Mr. VENNING:** That is not true. The Minister of Transport gets up in this place and talks a lot of rubbish with his tongue in his cheek. We know that he is trying to put one over us. We know the facts.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** If I could do what you want I would do it, but Peter Nixon won't let me.

**Mr. VENNING:** The Minister has been committed to completing the southern freeway, and that is that. Until that project has been completed the Minister will not be able to allow money allocated for country projects to be spent where it is suggested it should be spent.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** You know we're under Federal domination now.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. VENNING:** I hope that this money will be made available and allocated to those areas of the State that need it most. It is a part of the State that has been neglected ever since the southern freeway project commenced.

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

**Mrs. ADAMSON (Coles):** I should like to talk about road safety. I am delighted that the Minister responsible for this matter is on the front bench at the moment and I hope that he will be receptive to some of the suggestions that I will make on the subject. A total of 317 people were killed on South Australian roads in 1975-76. Admittedly, that was a reduction in the number of fatalities from the previous year and a still further reduction from the year before that; nevertheless, we would all agree that that figure is far too high and that there is has been senseless carnage on the roads. Much of the tragedy that has occurred could have been prevented.

Crashes in rural areas accounted for 184 fatalities, many of which were the result of single vehicle crashes. Significant decreases were registered in driver and pedestrian deaths whilst there was an increase in the number of motor cyclists killed. The under-25 age group figured prominently in the fatalities. Ample evidence is available that alcohol was a significant factor in the cause of the crashes.

When one considers those figures and thinks about the human misery that has been caused as a result of carnage on the roads, one should think of prevention as well as cure. I have two suggestions that I hope the Government will consider and will introduce by way of legislation. The first relates to a compulsory first aid course for applicants for drivers licences. I refer the Minister's attention to a law that was passed in Germany in 1969 which made it compulsory for all applicants for a driver's licence to undergo a first aid course. The reason is clear when one

realises that if in Australia about 3 500 people are killed annually and if, as official estimates suggest, between 10 per cent and 25 per cent of these deaths could have been prevented if the right first aid had been administered on the spot at the time, I think that that suggestion is certainly worthy of consideration by the Minister and the Government.

If we could prevent a dozen deaths, or even one death, as a result of a first aid course being undertaken by drivers, it would be worth while. The German experience has indicated that each applicant for a driver's licence has two lessons of three hours duration and that the cost of the course for each individual is about \$4, which is borne by the applicant. The German experience has proved this to be worth while, and I think it is certainly worthy of consideration in South Australia.

The other suggestion, which is perhaps equally as important and which I regard as urgent, is the introduction of provisional licences for those who have just acquired a driver's licence. The Minister is shaking his head.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** We have looked at it; we have had a report on it and a recommendation from experts against it. That is why I am shaking my head.

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** I should be interested to hear what those experts have had to say, because my research indicates that it is well worth considering, and I think any parent of a new licence holder, or indeed any new licence holder, would know those rather tense moments after the "L" plate is taken off the car and one is let loose on the roads, still perhaps not entirely sure of one's driving skills, with relatively little experience, and with no means of signalling to other drivers that one is inexperienced.

For that reason alone, I think "P" plates are worth looking at. The scheme operates in New South Wales and Victoria, and possibly in other States. It was introduced in January, 1966, in New South Wales, and at that time it was associated with a small but statistically significant drop in the accident rate in the first year of licence experience. It is significant that drivers between the ages of 17 years and 20 years are frequently involved in crashes. Around Australia, one in five of all road deaths now occurs during those four years of life. About 40 per cent are drivers, 40 per cent are passengers, and 15 per cent motor cyclists. Many, many more are injured.

In relation to the size of age groups in the population or to the number of driving licences held, people in this age group have distinctly more crashes and are more likely to be killed on the road than are those in any other single section of the Australian populace. The Minister may say his expert advisers have rejected the idea of provisional licences. If that is the case, I wonder why they are still operating in New South Wales and Victoria. They are issued to a licensee who has not previously held a licence for a period of 12 months or more, or to someone who is not disqualified from holding a licence but has been refused a licence or renewal of a licence, or whose licence has been cancelled pursuant to regulations.

The provisional licences require that the holder does not drive at a speed of more than 40 miles an hour, and that the "P" plate must be conspicuously displayed on the vehicle. I know that many young people would welcome the security and the feeling of safety that a "P" plate would give them. Many older people, driving for the first time, would equally welcome that security. If it will mean even a slight decrease in the number of road accidents, it is something that should be considered.

I applaud the efforts of the Government (and I acknowledge its efforts) to diminish the road toll. The heavier penalties for drink-driving offences introduced last year have had a measurable effect. The review of medical

standards for fitness to drive has had an effect, and so has the proof of age provision for young people seeking licences. However, in the name of safety, and indeed of humanity, I urge the Minister to consider these two suggestions: first, that compulsory first-aid courses should be taken by all who are seeking licences; secondly, that the Road Traffic Act be amended to require those who have just obtained their driving licences; to carry, for a period of one year, a provisional plate on their vehicles, to act as a warning to other people on the road that they are driving in the company of someone who has not had a great deal of experience.

**Mr. EVANS (Fisher):** Since last year when I raised the matter of the pioneer village at Morphett Vale, the Minister of Education and others have looked at the project. The owner of the village has said that, if action has not been taken to have the property acquired by the end of March, with all the historic horse-drawn vehicles, furniture, and so on, he will be forced to place it at public auction, with the result that the equipment would be scattered throughout the country, with various people purchasing the items that can be removed, and the land being made available for subdivision or for any other purpose that would fit in with the zoning of the area. I ask the Minister of Education and the Government to acquire the village, which is too valuable to the State to be split up and sold and eventually lost to the community. It is a village with tourist appeal, retaining much of the history of the State. It is available for about \$225 000, and if the venture is placed on the market and sold piecemeal the owners will recoup that amount, and perhaps more.

I turn now to the plight of the less popular sports in our community, and the attitude to them of the community, the Government, and especially the news media. One sees in the papers that the greatest coverage goes to sports which involve gambling—dog racing, trots, or horse racing. No doubt they are good sports, occupying the minds and the recreation time of many people, and creating employment.

We hear about "Life. Be in it", encouraging people to participate in sports, developing healthy bodies and healthy minds, but many of our sports are left behind with little or no publicity. We need to show that we are interested in them and that they are important for community recreation and development.

We talk about the help Olympic teams from other countries receive from their Governments. In those countries, the news media provides greater publicity for Olympic sports and the development of persons who compete in them. How much do we hear in this State in the period coming up to the Olympic Games of fencing, of weight lifting, of athletics, pole vaulting, broad jumping? How much do we hear about women's competitive sports, and how much publicity do they receive? Swimming gets reasonable recognition, and basketball is recognised. Although hockey does not receive much publicity, an Australian hockey team competed in the Olympics on the last occasion. It failed to win a gold medal, but how much do we hear about it now?

The newspapers contain perhaps five pages or six pages relating to sports associated with gambling. Is the sport being promoted or is gambling being promoted? Why does one group receive so much publicity and others so little? Football, soccer, cricket, and tennis receive their fair share (and perhaps more) of publicity. More people play women's netball during the season than play soccer. As many people play netball as play Australian Rules football in season. I ask the Government to show some recognition of these less popular sports.

The table tennis group does not have headquarters, nor does the fencing group. If the weightlifters hold a national title in the Adelaide Town Hall, they must put supports under the stage in order to hold the weights as well as a false floor on top of the stage to protect the floor. That is not good enough.

If our competitors at the Olympic Games can bring home a gold medal we are all willing to cheer and say how wonderful they are. Then we are all willing to thank them but, if they fail, we are all, including the media, willing to condemn them. We are not genuine in our approach to the problem, and we tend to push these matters aside until the crunch comes and then say that the people involved should have done better and that the Government should have offered more money over a three-year period. That could be true.

If we gave these people greater recognition, I am sure they would achieve greater results for us, and we would have more young Australians entering the fields of athletics and other Olympic sports seeking to reach the top goal. I give one example to show where the Government is going wrong. I refer to the soccer team that was supposed to represent Australia last year. The Government made a large sum available to that team to compete in Yugoslavia and represent Australia. On December 6, 1977 (*Hansard*, page 1198), the Chief Secretary replied to my question of October 20 and stated:

... the main group arrived back on November 3, 1977. The tour was most successful.

I can tell the House how successful that tour was. The team won one match against a Yugoslavian village team. If that is being successful, I do not understand sport. I will now state the names of members of the team. Mr. Jakovljevic is the manager. This man is well known to the Premier. He has helped the Premier at times. Mr. I. Marusic was the captain/coach and was playing with the amateurs. Although he is 37 and was a top-class player in the past, he is now too old. Mr. Barlo plays somewhere in the fourth division amateurs; Mr. Stevanovic sometimes plays reserve goalkeeper for Beograd; Mr. Mladenovic is an amateur who is unknown and who is not in the federation records; Mr. Sisic plays for amateurs; Mr. M. Marusic is brother of the captain/coach and has played for first division Croatia, but is now not up to standard and is on the transfer list; Mr. Stojanovic is an amateur, as is Mr. Markov; Mr. Kalinovic is an amateur in the fifth division, as is Mr. Varga; Mr. Bozanic is a recognised player, who used to play for Polonia in first division but who is presently on the transfer list; Mr. Matovic is an amateur in fifth division; Mr. G. Spasujovic is an amateur; Mr. Marucic is a first division player for Beograd (he is the only first division player in the team); Mr. Jerosimic is an amateur; and Mr. Milosevic comes from Coober Pedy and I do not believe that he even competes regularly.

Those are the men who comprise the team for which we paid to play in Yugoslavia. That was not a soccer team; it was just a group got together to go on a tourist jaunt—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I think the honourable member has had enough to say, and his time has expired. The honourable member for Chaffey.

**Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** I take this opportunity to bring before the House a problem that is growing in concern in relation to the Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Act, which was passed in 1975. A number of representations have been brought to my attention about the way in which the Act is being interpreted by the Long Service Leave Board. If the interpretation of the Act by the board can be upheld, it is necessary that the Government amend the Act to clarify the situation. A

number of persons have made pro rata claims under the Act and, to give an example, I will refer to a copy of a letter I received. The letter is addressed to a constituent and states:

Dear Sir,

Re: Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Act, 1975-76.

The Long Service Leave (Casual Employment) Board has considered your application for the payment of long service leave under the provisions of the abovementioned Act.

Section 35 of this Act states that a worker who has accrued 84 months or more effective service can claim upon the board for a proportionate payment of long service leave provided that his service within the industry is terminated for one of the following reasons:

- (a) death (claim made on behalf of the former worker);
- (b) attaining the retiring age recognised within the industry—

there can be no argument about that—

- (c) in circumstances that suggest that he will not again become a worker.

A number of people formerly employed in the building industry have left the industry and have become self-employed. The letter continues:

You have been credited with 113 months effective service—

and section 35 of the Act refers to a worker who has accrued 84 months or more effective service—

However, I regret to advise that consideration for payment cannot be made. The board at its last meeting passed a resolution that a worker who leaves the industry to become self employed does not qualify for a pro rata payment of long service leave under section 35 of the Act.

That interpretation has been placed on section 35 by the board. In such circumstances, a person leaving the industry with a credit of 113 months service cannot receive that monetary benefit until he reaches the recognised retiring age for the industry of 65 years. In fact, he may have to wait for 35 or even 40 years to receive that benefit. During that time the board and the fund receives interest on that money that will also be paid to the fund. The point is that the work has been undertaken by an employee, and the employer, under the Act, must contribute a given percentage of the employee's salary to the fund, yet that money does not become available to the worker for, perhaps, 30 or 40 years.

I refer as an example to a small electrical contractor who employed an apprentice and paid a percentage of his salary into the fund. The apprentice did not reach the 84 months required, but the amount that was paid into the fund is not available to the apprentice until he retires. As he is an apprentice, he will not be retiring for at least 45 years. The money in the fund is accruing compound interest, yet there is no way that the employee can obtain the benefit of that compound interest or the contribution. That is why I believe that it is necessary for the Government to examine this practice closely and, if necessary, amend the 1975 legislation to provide that a person leaving the industry must receive a refund in the same way as we who are involved in the Parliamentary superannuation fund do if we leave Parliament before having served the statutory time to qualify for a pension.

By the same token, I believe that the contribution made on behalf of the employee should be refunded to that employee. In the event of his going back into the industry, he should either start from scratch or contribute back into the fund the contributions made previously on his behalf. To me, the situation is most unsatisfactory, and I cannot see how the Government can support what is happening at present. The persons being penalised to a real degree are those who can least afford it. It is virtually impossible for

the Long Service Leave Board effectively to determine section 35 (c) as it relates to circumstances that suggest that a person will not again become a worker. There is no way in which anyone can decide what will happen in the future to any one of us in the way of employment or future occupation in this country. The Act as it stands at present and the interpretation that has been placed on it by the board are way out.

When the Long Service Leave Act was enacted in 1957 (it was the first long service leave legislation enacted in South Australia), it was a clear requirement of the employer to accept that responsibility of providing out of his own business the necessary long service leave payments due to the employee when the time arose. Now we have the situation where the employer pays into the fund the contribution on behalf of the employee, but it appears that the Long Service Leave Board is now loath to pay out those funds once they have been paid in. The board is looking for excuses as to why the legitimate payment is not made to the person concerned.

**Mr. Bannon:** They might have to raise the levy if they have to make more generous payments.

**Mr. ARNOLD:** It is not a matter of more generous payments. The contribution is made as a percentage of the person's salary, paid into a trust account, and, when that person leaves the industry, the sum remains there accruing interest for perhaps the next 30 or 40 years.

**Mr. Bannon:** It's the employer's money.

**Mr. ARNOLD:** That is right. The employer has contributed that money on behalf of his employee. As it stood under the old Act, the employer was duty bound to provide out of his own business the resources to pay any employee the accredited long service leave due to him. I have had the experience of this situation in my own business where I have paid long service leave payments to employees. Now that it is in a fund, it appears that the fund is not keen to pay it out.

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

**Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport):** I have two subjects on which I want to grieve. The first relates to the answer I obtained today to a Question on Notice, namely, the reply to Question No. 344 on the Notice Paper. The question I asked related to terminal leave payments for a Mr. K. Crease, for Ms. A. Koh, and for Mr. John Templeton, all of whom were members of the Premier's staff. In the reply I obtained today, it became apparent that Mr. Crease was given a total terminal payment of \$7 008, of which \$2 084 was for pro rata leave and \$4 923 was for 12 weeks severance pay. Ms. Adele Koh was given pro rata leave payment of \$1 115, together with 12 weeks severance pay of \$4 333, making a total of \$5 449. Mr. John Templeton received a pro rata leave payment of \$3 211, a 12 weeks severance payment of \$5 168, making a total of \$8 379. I have rounded off the cents.

I raise this matter, as I was astounded to find that the wife-to-be of the Premier had received a total of \$5 449 because she had simply announced that she was to marry the Premier and, in so doing, she was forced to retire from the Public Service.

**Mr. Bannon:** She wasn't forced.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** She was forced, apparently.

**Mr. Bannon:** By whom?

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** In his reply, the Premier said that she was tied to the Australian Journalists Association award. I have checked that award, and severance pay is awarded only if someone is sacked. The award clearly states that the person must be sacked. I have checked up on the exact wording with the Commonwealth office. That

means that she must have been sacked by the Premier, if she received this severance pay. She did not ask to leave.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** The Government determined that, in the circumstances, it wasn't appropriate for her to continue working.

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

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** I find this absolutely astounding, having checked with the award. If she wanted to retire (and one would assume that she would have wanted to because, obviously, she could not work in that position), she could have handed in her notice. Having worked the appropriate three months, she could have gracefully retired or, if she could not work the three months, she could have retired without having to work. It is possible under the award for a person to retire without having to work three months, by mutual agreement, but that certainly was not the case.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** That was the case. Come on!

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** She must have been sacked, if the award was adhered to.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** She was prepared to give three months notice and continue working for three months.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister may answer in due course.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is all right for you to say that I am able to answer but, in the meantime, the honourable member is going ahead and spreading falsehoods about the Premier's wife.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** There's no point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! How long is it since the honourable member for Davenport makes decisions that should be made by the Chair? I have listened to the Minister's point of order and, whilst about to rise, the honourable member for Davenport says that there is no point of order. I will not stand that coming from any honourable member. There is no point of order.

**Mr. Mathwin:** Of course!

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Glenelg is out of order. The honourable member for Davenport knows as well as I do that, when the Speaker is standing, the honourable member must resume his seat.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** The point I make is that obviously her employment was terminated by the Government. It was not that she submitted a resignation or that any mutual agreement was reached that she could no longer work there. It must have been (and there was only one conclusion I could reach, having read the award) that her employment was terminated by the Government. Therefore, she was obviously sacked. I find it astounding that she should receive, as a research assistant, such a severance payment, I can appreciate that people who work as journalists under the A.J.A. award are entitled to severance pay, and that has been acknowledged both by Federal and State Ministers.

I do not question the amount paid to Mr. Crease and Mr. Templeton, except that even in their cases I believe that they obviously must have been dismissed; they could not have retired on a voluntary basis. As I understand it (and I have done some checking), where that severance pay is paid federally the Minister is dismissed and automatically the employment of the individual who was acting as a press secretary to the Minister receives severance pay. That was the whole condition under which the provision was put into the award. In this case we find that, in effect, the employer and the employee had the opportunity to part by mutual agreement, and so any need for severance pay could have been waived. That was not the case; they were apparently dismissed. I have the

gravest fear that this money has been paid out without the due care and consideration of this Parliament.

**Mr. Bannon:** They were paid out in accordance with the award.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** They certainly were not paid out in accordance with the award. I asked a question whether the Auditor-General had questioned these payments. I found that the Auditor-General had questioned the payment. Even more disturbing is that, according to the answer given today, the Premier is not prepared to tender documents, memoranda, or correspondence that passed between him and the Auditor-General. He claimed he would not table it because the Auditor-General's letter was marked "confidential" and his reply was accepted by the Auditor-General. In a delicate matter like this that is unacceptable. I think those documents should have been presented to this House. I certainly will not be satisfied until they are presented.

The second matter on which I wish to grieve relates to the large number of unemployed teachers currently in South Australia. When I asked a question several weeks ago of the Minister of Education he revealed that only 43 per cent of the graduates for 1977 from the various tertiary institutions, including universities and colleges of advanced education, who qualified as teachers, could get jobs. The number of graduate teachers was 1 672. Only 843 of those teachers were able to get jobs with the State Education Department. The actual number of people who applied for jobs with the Education Department (not just the graduates from last year but the total number of persons) was 2 599. Of those only 1 116 teachers obtained jobs; in other words, only 43 per cent were able to get jobs. That situation is grim.

I believe that the Education Department has known for some time that there would be a surplus of teachers. I was told about this by the University Council about 18 months ago, yet I find that it was not until February, 1977, that the Education Department issued any warning that there would be a surplus of teachers in the State. Equally, I find disturbing that apparently many teachers in this State are due to take their long service leave. Under the Education Act, they should take their long service leave, but that is not being enforced by the current Minister. Many of the teachers who are currently unemployed could get a job if those people took their long service leave, but they are denied such an opportunity. I think that it is unfortunate and deserves closer examination by the Minister. I hope in future he will enforce the provision of the Education Act.

**Mr. GUNN (Eyre):** I take this first opportunity I have had to correct some misleading statements made by Mr. Peter Murphy of Whyalla in relation to the Liberal Party. Mr. Murphy is a member of the Whyalla City Council and a prominent member of the Whyalla Labor Party. He wrote in a letter to the editor:

The result facing the people of Whyalla on arrival was—Liberal Party representation: Nil. Labor Party representation: Three senators, one Member of House of Representatives, one Member of Legislative Council, one Member of House of Assembly.

One is not surprised that members of the Labor Party were in attendance in large numbers at that meeting because they have a great deal to answer for.

I understand that the meeting was called to discuss unemployment, particularly relating to the closure of the shipyards. I think it is about time I refreshed the memories of members opposite and of Mr. Murphy as to just what the real facts are in relation to the Whyalla shipyards. I will read to the House a brief list of facts that I got from the library.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** Why weren't you there?

**Mr. GUNN:** It is all right for the member for Henley Beach to say that.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Henley Beach is out of order.

**Mr. GUNN:** He's never been in order.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair will decide that. On many occasions the honourable member for Eyre has been out of order, too.

**Mr. GUNN:** On December 18, 1973, the Whitlam Labor Government announced that the maximum subsidy of 45 per cent would be reduced to 25 per cent by 1981, and this referred to the ordering of new ships. This report stated:

Labor Government places orders for the following ships: *Australian Pioneer*—Sweden (bulk carrier); *Australian Purpose*—Sweden (bulk carrier); *Australian Prospector*—West Germany (bulk carrier); *Australian Progress*—West Germany (bulk carrier); *Australian Emblem*—Japan (cargo ship); *Australian Venture*—Bremen, West Germany (container ship); and *Tambo River*—Japan (64 000 ton conversion). Mr. Lance Barnard (Defence Minister) cancels Liberal Government DDL Plan to build destroyers in Australian shipyards.

Nothing has been said about that by Councillor Murphy, the member for Whyalla, Mr. Wallis, or Mr. Young, all of whom have been going up to Whyalla. Another report stated:

August 30, 1974—Memorandum of Understanding signed with U.S.A. by Whitlam Labor Government to build two FFG Plan ships (guided missile frigates).

Then we come to recent times. A report states:

November 28, 1977—Labor MHR Mr. Wallis admits in *Advertiser* that help for the shipyard by a Labor Government after December 10 will not include immediate injection of cash into the shipyard.

Just a few days before the election we saw a blatant attempt to win votes in Whyalla when a promise was made to provide funds. It was made with tongue-in-cheek, as the A.L.P. knew it was not going to win, anyway. Another report states:

December 1, 1977—Mr. Hawke states in *Advertiser* that he could not give a simple "Yes" or "No" to restoring the shipyards in Australia.

He was clearly indicating to the people of Australia that he was, at that stage, Leader of the Opposition.

What also has not been said by Labor Party speakers, or Councillor Murphy, is how many shipyards closed in Australia while Mr. Whitlam was Prime Minister. Was there one in Brisbane or two? There was one closed in South Australia. Nothing has been said about this by Labor politicians. No wonder they turned up at that meeting—they were trying to save their own skins! I make no apology for not being there. I answered the correspondence, and I am happy to go on any occasion to attend meetings in Whyalla if I receive an invitation first.

I have had some reports about this meeting, and my reports indicate that it was a most interesting meeting. I understand that one of the A.L.P. people walked out and others were disgusted at what went on. The meeting achieved very little. In the next few weeks I am going to follow up inquiries in relation to one or two other matters that took place. The whole thing was a fiasco, and nothing but an attempt by the Labor Party to use this concept of community council for its own purposes. I believe that the Labor party has much to answer for, because it is attempting, not only in that town but in other parts of South Australia as well, to use these community councils for Labor Party political purposes; that is the whole meaning of the exercise in relation to this matter. They should be ashamed of themselves.

Instead of using these organisations to improve the community and the situation facing individuals who are less fortunate in the community, they have set out to use them as agencies for the Labor Party. I would suggest to the honourable member and Mr. Murphy that they should consider the real problems about why the shipyards have closed at Whyalla and why industry is leaving Australia. Costs and lack of productivity are the problem, as is the attitude of unions in Whyalla. During the past few days, whilst researching this matter, I came across some interesting figures in relation to costs in this country, particularly on the wharves. I am sorry that the member for Florey is not here, because I am sure that he would have been interested in this matter. The costs to shippers and Government in Australia are as follows:

Recent figures show that the cost of handling a 20 ft. container in Sydney is \$154, and for a 40 ft. container \$308. The cost of handling the same size containers in New York is \$69, Rotterdam \$56, Hong Kong \$66 and \$94, London \$60 and \$90 and San Francisco \$53 . . .

That is one of the reasons why we have trouble in secondary industry in this country—high costs and lack of productivity. I think I have said enough on that subject.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. GUNN:** I am never surprised about what the Minister says. I want now briefly to answer a comment made by the Minister of Transport this afternoon in reply to a Dorothy Dixier from the member for Stuart. The Minister set out to denigrate Senator Jessop. It is well known that the Minister of Transport in this State has been luke-warm about the Stuart Highway. He has decided that he will not worry too much about the people in the North of the State—

*The Hon. Hugh Hudson interjecting:*

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

**Mr. GUNN:**—because he has transferred his allocation for roads to the southern freeway and has not been prepared to organise his department so that some of that money could be spent on the Stuart Highway. Had he shown any initiative he could have allocated some of those funds for the Stuart Highway.

However, being luke-warm, he told the people of South Australia that it is not the South Australian Government's fault but that it is the fault of those dreadful fellows in Canberra. He is like the spoilt child who, having spent all his money on lollies, goes back for more money but there is nothing left. The Commonwealth has woken up to the Minister and his double standards, and it is about time he faced reality.

**Mr. Russack:** Where did the \$15 000 000 go?

**Mr. GUNN:** He spent that. He submitted a set of priorities to the Commonwealth Minister when he knew full well that he would not get an allocation of \$18 000 000 but would get only \$15 200 000. He allocated all that money to the southern freeway, with the exception of a small allocation for the Spencer Gulf area, about which I do not quibble. However, the Minister should have organised his priorities so that people in the North of the State could have been given a fair go. The South Australian Government must answer to the people in the North of the State. It is all very well for the Minister to attack Senator Jessop, but Senator Jessop has for many years shown a genuine interest for the welfare of those people. That is something that the member for Stuart and others have not done.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** He has made more—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister is out of order. I hope that he will not continue interjecting.

*Mr. Keneally interjecting:*

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

**Mr. GUNN:** I am not surprised that the member for Stuart is interjecting.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair will decide that.

**Mr. GUNN:** After the Dorothy Dixier that he asked today, he should be ashamed of himself, because it was a weak effort. He tried to denigrate personally a man who has tried to serve the people of the northern parts of this State and will continue to serve them.

Motion carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1), 1978

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### APPRENTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

#### CLASSIFICATION OF THEATRICAL PERFORMANCES BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 22. Page 1736.)

**Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** I support the Bill, but with a slight reservation. It will in no way please the people, of whom there are many, who have already expressed considerable reservation about the manner in which the literature classification board works. On the other hand, this Bill does something that has been sadly missing in the case of theatrical productions—it provides some means of classifying a theatrical performance. It is the means of warning parents that certain productions may not be suitable for their children and, in fact, may not be suitable for adults who have reservations about salacious productions.

As the Premier said in his second reading explanation, this Bill is designed to deal with the classification of theatrical performance on the basis of the same principles that apply to the classification of films and publications. I note that the new board will comprise the members of the present Classification of Publications Board. I believe that legitimate theatre should be subject to as little interference as possible. I note that the board is not forced to classify all plays or theatrical performances but that it may, of its own accord or at the request of any person, meet to consider the classification of a theatrical performance. The criteria for classification are simply whether it would be a suitable production for children and whether it would conform to the standard of morality, decency and propriety generally accepted by reasonable adult persons.

The restricted classification placed on any film selected for such classification by the board would simply mean that, subject to conditions imposed by the board, children would not normally be expected to be present in the theatre where such a production was shown, although I note that there is no compulsory measure that the theatre management should take to remove a child from a theatre. It merely says that they may be removed.

There is a provision, however, for punishing any adults with a \$200 fine should they aid and abet children in

attending such shows. It fills a need, because at the moment there is no warning and no means of excluding children from productions which the public may consider quite unsuitable and improper. Whilst adults may be quite free to select what form of theatrical entertainment they attend, the Bill, therefore, takes the desirable step of enabling performances to be classified so as to exclude children between the ages of two years and 18 years from offensive productions.

We note that the board may refuse classification, in which case a production might be the subject of prosecution under the criminal law. Some branches of the theatrical world were rather afraid that the introduction of this Bill meant censorship, but in no way does it involve censorship, because, even if the board completely refuses to classify a production which it considers to be grossly improper and unsuitable for reasonable adult people to attend, the onus is still on the producer of the play to put it on show for public entertainment and to take the risk of possible prosecution under the criminal law.

One obvious problem in dealing with theatrical restriction is that in many shows there is a flexible script, with a good deal of ad-libbing in the course of the show. The Bill is intended to cover all types of theatrical performance before an audience. It is intended to cover the whole range of plays. "Theatre" is defined as being any place, whether enclosed, partly enclosed, or unenclosed, in which a theatrical performance takes place. By definition, a theatrical performance is any play, mime, ballet, dance, display, or other entertainment in which one or more live actors or performers take part and which is performed or is intended for performance before an audience.

I can see that any person who felt particularly vindictive towards night club performances, for example, might well bring such things to the attention of the board and ask it to consider classifying them. The scope of the board in the entertainment field under this Bill seems to be quite unlimited. On the other hand, I do not believe that anyone bringing such matters before the attention of the board and asking it to classify a show would in any way reduce its entertainment value or the audience potential. If shows that have been on the circuit in Adelaide are anything to go by, the more attention they get the larger the audience seems to be.

One pleasing aspect of Festival Theatre productions currently under way is that some form of voluntary classification is taking place. I attended the Polish ballet production at the Opera House last night. It was advertised quite voluntarily as being unsuitable for children—a warning to parents. However, I think the show was booked out for the week.

We have the problem of having some difficulty for the board in classifying those productions which are relatively unscripted. Instantly, what springs to my mind is the sort of thing that happens on "Blankety Blanks", in prime viewing time every evening in my home town. Children are watching the show at 6.30 p.m., and there is no end of innuendo for them to hear. One never knows what is coming next.

**Mr. Hemmings:** Isn't it what you're reading into it yourself? A 14-year-old child—

**Mr. ALLISON:** I do not think there is any question of innuendo. That sort of thing can go on in the theatre, and it would still be difficult for the Classification Board to put a classification on it and expect it to be the same show night after night with such flexible scripting. Whilst this may work very well in the legitimate theatre, where scripts are available and actors learn their parts by rote and where there is no change, I can see almost insurmountable

problems which make me think it is probably best to leave the legitimate theatre alone. If people choose to select certain types of entertainment, that is their responsibility. The Bill covers the problem area of children from two years to 18 years, and I support it for that.

I am not sure whether there is any cover in this Bill for child actors on stage, if they were to take part in an R classified performance. However, I assume that in reading the script and in viewing any rehearsal the board can impose such conditions as it deems necessary and that, in its wisdom, it would cover such circumstances. There is no specific mention of children on stage, although clause 18(5) contains provision for any person seeking admission to the theatre or who is in the theatre to state his correct age. I assume that that may cover child actors on stage. However, I do not know that it is extremely important, because of the powers of the Classification Board.

I support the Bill, not because it goes to any tremendous lengths in censorship or in control of the theatre but simply because it fills an existing gap and provides some security for children in preventing them from going to shows, plays, or productions which may have been classified by the Classification Board as unsuitable for them.

I do not envisage that this will mean a wholesale classification of every single play that has ever been written. I can see almost insurmountable problems in classifying Shakespeare, which is standard fare in the Western World for youngsters from second year to matriculation in high school. One thinks of the scenes of violence, with Gloucester having his eye poked out, and the mass murders in *Hamlet*. The mind boggles at the controls that might be imposed in the name of censorship. I do not think there is any intention that this measure should go to such extremes. I support the Bill.

**Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg):** I support the Bill. Earlier in this session, I had made inquiries about bringing in a similar measure as a private member's Bill, because I was concerned, as were other people in the community who had approached me about the situation in which people could find themselves. If people were not given notification of what to expect, a parent taking the family to the theatre, to what might look like a family show, could be embarrassed, or the children could be embarrassed by the show. It is only right that some classification should be given as an indication of what can be expected from certain theatres.

I understand that the Festival Theatre Trust has already classified some shows, demonstrating its concern in this area. Obviously, it must have had some indication from the public of the need for that classification, and I am pleased that it was done voluntarily. However, it is better that we should have legislation to cover the matter. I am pleased to see, in clause 4, the following definition:

"Theatre" means any place whether enclosed, partly enclosed, or unenclosed in which a theatrical performance takes place.

That is a much better definition than the one we had in the legislation covering films. We drew the Government's attention to drive-in theatres, and were not allowed to amend the Bill. Later, the Government realised that it had made a mistake, and amended the Bill to cover drive-in theatres. In this case, the Government has included outside theatres in the legislation, and that is a good move.

The only other reference I will make to the Bill is to clause 11, which sets the criteria to be applied by the board and which provides:

(1) In considering questions as to whether a theatrical performance is offensive, or suitable or unsuitable for children, the board shall have regard to standards of

morality, decency and propriety that are generally accepted by reasonable adult persons.

I support the Bill, because it provides for the classification of theatrical performances and because it will assist people by making them aware of what to expect.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 17 passed.

Clause 18—"Children between age of two and eighteen years not to be admitted to restricted theatrical performance."

**Mr. ALLISON:** Can the Premier say whether it was intentional that there was no reference to a child actor taking part in an R classified production? Does he envisage, for example, that a child may take part in a play and be on stage in acts 1 and 2, whereas all the undesirable element appears in the third act and, therefore, the child would be allowed to take part? Is that position covered?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer):** I think it unlikely that, if the cast included a child, the board would classify a performance at all if it was considered not to be suitable for children. One cannot really separate a child out between acts in a play adequately. Thinking back on the kinds of play where a classification would be sought, I cannot think of an instance of the kind of thing to which the honourable member has referred.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (19 to 23) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr. ABBOTT (Spence):** I express my concern at the problems existing in the Commonwealth Employment Service and in the Social Security Department. With unemployment at a record level, we can ill afford to have any dispute that can have an effect on the genuine unemployed. There are, of course, the dole blitz, the staff shortages, the long waiting periods for receiving attention, the plans that are being initiated for a more expeditious service, and numerous arguments over the eligibility for benefits.

I was most interested in a recent question asked of the Minister of Community Welfare by the member for Napier, concerning the Elizabeth social security office. He was rightly concerned at the enormous backlog of claims for unemployment benefits and that the additional staff acquired by the Elizabeth office had been working on the dole blitz ordered by the Prime Minister. It was most heartening to learn from the Minister's reply that he had already sent a telex to Senator Guilfoyle on the topic.

**Mr. Max Brown:** Do you think it will bring any results?

**Mr. ABBOTT:** It is risky, indeed. However, I join with the Minister in his appeal to the Opposition to use its good offices with the Commonwealth Government to ensure that people rightly entitled to unemployment and other benefits are not made to suffer the tremendous degree of hardship that is so often the case. I agree that some checking is necessary. However, where a person genuinely entitled to the benefit cannot get it because of some policy guideline or other, I object most strongly.

I have received many inquiries from unemployed people following termination of their benefits. Recently, a constituent of mine came to see me about some trouble he was having with the Social Security Department over the

loss of one week's benefit. He was retrenched from P.G.H. Industries Pty. Limited, at Renown Park, on December 7, 1977, after 19 years of loyal service with that company.

He applied for unemployment benefits on December 8 and received payment soon after. However, at the end of January he was informed that he would lose one week's benefit because he received his superannuation payment in a lump sum whilst in receipt of the unemployment benefit. The superannuation scheme was a joint one in which both the employer and employee contributed. My constituent had been contributing to the scheme in a small way for a number of years, and even if he had remained with the company until retirement the final payment of the policy would have been totally inadequate to cater for his requirements.

In my opinion, the superannuation payment was his entitlement, similar to long service and annual leave entitlements. The payment should not affect unemployment benefits in any way. All payments to the superannuation scheme by my constituent had ceased prior to his retrenchment but, because the company was late in finalising the payment and because my constituent was honest enough to notify the department of this income, as required by the regulations, his benefit was terminated for one week. On making inquiries of the social security office I was informed that the decision to stop payment for one week was in accordance with the strict guidelines which are used for eligibility purposes. I was further informed that my constituent could appeal to the tribunal, although it was the opinion of the department that he would not be successful.

What I am afraid of is that the recently announced dole blitz and the increased activity by the Social Security Department will see more and more genuine citizens who, like my constituent, are unemployed through no fault of their own and are deprived of the benefit of any income to support their families. The devastating effect of this is highlighted in a research project of the Brotherhood of St. Laurence. A report which resulted and which is titled "Rough Justice: the causes and effects of the termination of unemployment benefit" is written by Graeme Brewer and dated January 19, 1978. Chapter 1 spells out the background of the study. A portion of it states:

The number of unemployed people at the time of writing exceeds 350 000.

I point out that those figures were taken from the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations in November, 1977. They are now significantly higher, as the study predicted. The report continued:

There is little likelihood of this figure declining significantly in the near future. Despite the growing number of unemployed persons and the numerous and clearcut indications that unemployment is the product of forces beyond the control of individual workers and their families, aid given to the unemployed has remained at what could only be interpreted as a punitive level.

The present study, while an outcome of the Brotherhood of St. Laurence's continuing interest in, and commitment to the unemployed, is a direct result of new trends and changing circumstances in the unemployment situation itself and, specifically, of policy directions that have tightened eligibility for unemployment benefit and have led to witch-hunts for "underserving" claimants.

Thus, the current research was planned in order to throw light on the operation of the work test and the experiences of its application by the unemployed; the effects on the unemployed of failing the work test; the administration of the appeals system and the ways in which it is perceived.

As well as attempting to understand the operation of the

work test and the appeals system, the research is an endeavour to illustrate those structural and economic factors which are faced by claimants who lose their benefit. It is also necessary in the light of the continuing growth of unemployment, against a backdrop of contradictory statements statistics and policies, which continue to divide public opinion, that there be discussions which seek to provide an adequate interpretation of the reasons for the existence of the work test.

Chapter 5 deals with the effects of the denial of the benefits and states:

As a group, the unemployed are predominately semi-skilled and unskilled workers. As such, they are among the lower paid workers and frequently labour in the least congenial work situations. The present study confirms earlier research findings in demonstrating that most jobless persons have very meagre financial resources to draw on when they become unemployed. The low-paid jobs in which they previously worked offered little opportunity, if any, for savings.

The remainder of that chapter consists of a number of tables which show the amount of income from the last job before the current unemployment, housing costs, percentage of weekly net income prior to unemployment, housing costs as a percentage of unemployment benefit, weekly cost of hire-purchase commitments, type of goods on hire-purchase, the amount of savings at the time of interview in relation to this survey, and so on.

I felt that chapter 6, which deals with the conclusions, was most interesting. It states:

In the current circumstances, with the unemployed vastly outnumbering job vacancies, it is incongruous that the "work test" should be applied with unusual zeal and the guidelines for its application should be so broad. Logically, the "work test" has very doubtful relevance when jobs are so scarce. Much of the unemployment debate has, however, been peppered with unsubstantiated allegations about the prevalence of "dole bludgers" and has thus encouraged moves to ferret out these supposedly "work shy" individuals.

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

**Mr. BECKER (Hanson):** First, I register my protest at the arrangements made in relation to this adjournment debate. Normally, two members from one side and one member from the other side speak. This evening it is two Government members and one Opposition member. I would like to remind members of this House that, if all members do not use their full time in the debate, it should be available to any member to use without prejudicing his Party. If members opposite read Standing Orders, they will see that the adjournment debate shall last for 30 minutes. If a member does not use his time, any other member should be able to use that unexpired time without prejudicing his Party.

That arrangement has been broken. On November 4, 1975, the member for Gilles, the member for Kavel and the member for Semaphore spoke. About three or four minutes was left, and I used that unexpired time. On the following day, the member for Heysen, the member for Whyalla and the member for Light spoke, therefore following the rotation. The arrangement, as far as I am concerned, has been broken, and the Opposition tonight ought to have been allowed to have two speakers. Therefore, if there is not an arrangement it is about time the matter was cleared up once and for all.

I would like to answer one criticism made last Thursday by the member for Henley Beach when he had a crack at me and said that, if we were paid on performance, I would receive less than other members. I inform the member for

Henley Beach that I do a hell of a lot more work in the area than he does. He is concerned because our boundaries overlap. I will match him any day, and he knows it. That was a foul and unkind remark.

I refer now to an organisation called Home Air-Conditioners, of Prospect Road, Prospect. No matter how much we do and how much we consider consumer legislation, we never seem to be able to protect all the people in the community and to be able to stop unscrupulous business people, because this organisation cannot now be tracked down.

In June, 1977, my constituent signed a contract with Home Air-Conditioning for ducted air-conditioning for her house that was then under construction. She paid \$2 350 in cash in advance, which was the full price. A Mr. Townsend from Home Air-Conditioning visited the house regularly whilst it was being built. However, when it was time to install the air-conditioning unit it was not done. My constituent rang the company many times but there was always some excuse made by the company. At one time she was told that Mr. Townsend had been killed. After that she dealt with a Mr. Sabilla. However, she is quite sure that Mr. Townsend is still well and truly alive.

My constituent complained to the Public and Consumer Affairs Department and, after five weeks investigation, the department said it could not proceed as the company had promised to carry out the contract. I place no blame on the department; I think it did the right thing in trying to help my constituent. After all, if a company promises to undertake the contract that is as far as one can go. My constituent kept following up the matter and, as she had not received the air-conditioning unit, she went to a solicitor who issued a summons for her.

Following the issuing of the summons an air-conditioning unit was delivered to her property together with the appropriate fittings. However, it has not been installed and she has had no further response from the company. A technical officer from the department called to examine the unit and told my constituent that it was a new unit. My constituent had the unit inspected by the manufacturers, Fairey Australasia Pty. Ltd. The officer scratched off some paint and checked the number and was able to tell my constituent that the unit was not new and that it was third hand.

An officer from the Public and Consumer Affairs Department agreed that the facts as claimed by my constituent were correct. The department was informed by Fairey that the unit was a demonstration model and had been sold to Mr. Townsend. As further proof, the manufacturers, Fairey Australasia Pty. Limited, wrote to my constituent to confirm the age and type of the unit. The unit that was delivered to her was not the same model that was quoted in the contract. She was also informed that the examination of the ceiling area showed that the maximum clearance between the ceiling joists and roof rafters was 500 millimetres at the apex. The rafters and joists are set at 600 millimetre centres, which made it impossible to install that type of unit and associated duct work without considerable restructuring of the ceiling or roof areas. Part of a letter from Fairey is as follows:

In our estimation, to provide adequate air-conditioning to the area required now that the building is complete, will need extensive research and design so that the appearance of the home is least impaired.

The tragedy of this issue is that my constituent paid cash in advance on signing the contract. It was after considerable trouble that the unit was delivered to her. It is a third-hand unit, yet she was told that it was brand new. It was not the model that was stated in the contract, and Home Air-Conditioning cannot now be located.

My constituent is concerned that, with all the consumer legislation we have in this State, all the efforts of the Public and Consumer Affairs Department and the means available to it, there is little we can do to pin this company down to do the work. When my constituent came to me, I made three telephone calls to the company. In the end I said, "You have 24 hours to go out and see my constituent and do something about it or the matter will be taken up further with the department." We gave the company just over 24 hours, but next day when I rang, the company had left its premises and its telephone had been disconnected.

The Public and Consumer Affairs Department has little record about this company. The department said it had recorded only one complaint. An organisation like this can move from suburb to suburb. Originally, I believe that the company was down my way. However, a company can move and change its name, and the partners can still take advantage in many ways of unsuspecting people.

How to overcome the problem is simply a matter of education and no doubt the Government has a role to play in this area. Many years ago we criticised the department when it spent \$35 000 publicising the department and promoting the Attorney-General. That money could have been better spent in getting the message to people and warning them, rather than promoting the Attorney-General.

I believe that the Government must again try to do something in this respect. It should spell out once and for all that the public must be more careful about signing contracts and paying cash in advance for goods, articles, or services that cannot be supplied in the way that I have just outlined.

**Mr. SLATER (Gilles):** The matter that I desire to draw to the attention of the House relates to compulsory third party insurance. It is a matter of prime importance to the people of South Australia, particularly the motoring public. Since private insurers have vacated the compulsory third party field the State Government Insurance Commission has become the only compulsory third party insurer in South Australia. South Australian motorists are paying \$60 000 000 a year in third party insurance premiums, but much dissatisfaction exists regarding the present system. A proposed increase in the present premium of \$89 a year has been deferred only temporarily by the Third Party Premiums Committee. We all expect that that premium will be increased.

The cost of third party insurance has increased by about 50 per cent in the past two years. Even though South Australian motorists are paying \$60 000 000 a year in premiums it seems that those premiums are insufficient to cover the number of claims and the cost involved in meeting those claims. I understand that S.G.I.C. faced a \$10 000 000 underwriting loss on third party insurance last year. Our present system of third party insurance relies on the basis of apportioning blame, and cases can and have become extremely protracted, and courts at times face great difficulty in assessing damages and the amount of damages to be awarded. In South Australia we have proportionately (and that is not a good thing to say) more accidents than does any other State. That fact is shown by statistics provided by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. It would seem that our record of driving is not good and, consequently, claims are increasing each year.

**Mr. Bannon:** We might be honest in reporting accidents.

**Mr. SLATER:** That might be so. Of course, under law it is compulsory to report accidents to the police. However, I believe that that is not the case in point. South Australian statistics show that our driving record is not as good as records in other States. That brings me to the point of the

need for a change in the present system of compulsory third party insurance.

I have noted that schemes embodying a limited no-fault principle have been introduced in Victoria and Tasmania. Both schemes are perhaps a compromise between our present South Australian scheme and a total no-fault scheme. The no-fault scheme has operated in New Zealand since 1974, and seems to be working satisfactorily at a very low cost premium. I refer to an article which appeared in the *Bulletin* of December, 1977, under the heading, "Third party insurance can be cheap", by Alastair Morrison, as follows:

Third Party Cover for \$12.50. What a welcome headline that would be for the Australian motorist. Yet that is all motorists in New Zealand have to pay.

It is extraordinary that the successful establishment of a cheap and simple system of road accident compensation across the Tasman should arouse no interest here. The publication of the fifth annual report of the New Zealand Accident Compensation Commission has passed unnoticed in this country although the New Zealand system well repays study by any Australian motorist concerned at the high cost of compulsory third party insurance.

The New Zealand road accident scheme operates under the Accident Compensation Act, 1972. The Act covers all accidents of every description and also other matters such as accident prevention and rehabilitation of the injured. The road accident component of the act is self-financing and operates without additional cost to the New Zealand Government.

The New Zealand road accident scheme—now in its fourth year—operates on a completely "no fault" basis. It replaces CTP insurance and covers everyone injured in road accidents except for those so injured while at work. The latter are covered by a separate earners' fund which approximates to workers' compensation. The road accident scheme is financed by a levy paid into a Motor Vehicle Compensation Fund. The levy on private cars has been held at \$NZ14.20 (about \$A12.50) since the scheme commenced in April 1974.

The main form of benefit is 80 per cent of average earnings while incapacitated up to a present maximum of \$NZ240 a week payable to the age of 65. A dependent widow can qualify for half of this and there are additional amounts for dependent children. There are also various forms of lump-sum payment and provision for medical, hospital, and funeral expenses.

The benefits may seem modest compared to some of the CTP awards being made in Australia, but New Zealand awards are assured and promptly made. And as argued cogently by Mr. Justice Woodhouse, who presided over the Australian Commission of Inquiry on Compensation and Rehabilitation, apparent benefits in Australia are often illusory. It may take years for an award to be made and, apart from the strain and uncertainty of waiting, a large proportion of any award will be swallowed up in legal expenses.

A remarkable feature of the New Zealand scheme is that the whole problem of tort, that is, proving fault, on which our system is founded, and the opposition of a large vested interest in the legal profession, have both been overcome.

Delays in settlement which in Australia may often take up to five years (one recent case took 10 years) are also eliminated. And benefits cover an important section of the motoring public which in most Australian States can recover nothing when involved in a motoring accident.

The Australian motorist seems destined to soldier on—paying more and more and more. He will presumably continue to do so until road accidents come to be regarded as an inevitable concomitant of modern living for which common law remedies are no longer appropriate. It is a cloudy prospect but the cloud does have a kind of silver lining.

The article concludes by stating that the outlook is at least a very good one for many lawyers. It is obvious that we need to consider an alteration to our South Australian system. The present cost is \$89 a year for the motorist for third party insurance, and it seems that there will be an increase shortly.

**Mr. Groom:** Do you think Fraser will have a national compensation scheme?

**Mr. SLATER:** I hope the Commonwealth Government will consider a national compensation scheme, but I doubt whether the present Commonwealth Government would consider this. When the Labor Government tried to introduce such a scheme in the Commonwealth Parliament, much opposition was voiced by the Liberal Party

and the insurance companies. It seems necessary to consider an alteration to the present system in this State, and I believe this view is supported by most representatives of motoring organisations. I recall reading a statement by the retiring President of the R.A.A., who said that we needed to introduce some alternative system of third party insurance in this State. I believe we should consider a no-fault scheme similar to that operating in New Zealand. I think it would be of great benefit to the motoring public of South Australia.

Motion carried.

At 9.46 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, March 8, at 2 p.m.