

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, March 22, 1978

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

**SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HERITAGE BILL**

The **Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister for Planning)**: I have to report that the managers for the two Houses conferred together but that no agreement was reached.

*Later:*

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not further insist on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL, 1978**

At 2.2 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the House:

*As to amendments Nos. 1 and 2:*

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendments.

*As to amendment No. 3:*

That the Legislative Council amend its amendment by leaving out the word "twenty" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "thirty".

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

*As to amendments Nos. 4, 5 and 9:*

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendments.

*As to amendment No. 10:*

That the Legislative Council amend its amendment by leaving out the word "twenty" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "thirty".

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

*As to amendment No. 11:*

That the Legislative Council amend its amendment by leaving out the word "three" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "five".

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

*As to amendment No. 15:*

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment.

*As to amendment No. 24:*

That the Legislative Council amend its amendment by leaving out the words "fourteen days" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "ten days".

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

*As to amendment No. 26:*

That the Legislative Council amend its amendment by leaving out the word "twenty" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "thirty".

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

**UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

The **Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education)**: I have to report that the managers for the two Houses conferred together but that no agreement was reached.

*Later:*

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not further insist on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

**MOTOR FUEL RATIONING BILL**

The **Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry)**: I have to report that the managers for the two Houses conferred together but that no agreement was reached.

**ADOPTION OF CHILDREN ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

At 2.4 p.m. the following recommendation of the conference was reported to the House:

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

Clause 3, page 1, line 17—Leave out paragraph (c) and insert the following paragraph:

(c) a special magistrate and two justices (of whom at least one is a woman justice),

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

*Later:*

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

Consideration in Committee of the recommendation of the conference.

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

That the recommendation of the conference be agreed to.

I am acting on behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Community Welfare, who is unwell, and who, with others, managed the conference on behalf of this House. The effect of the agreement between the managers is set out in the recommendation, and I commend that to the Committee.

**Mr. WOTTON**: I support the final stages of this legislation. The amendment brought to this Chamber will serve a special need. I repeat that I welcome the legislation, and I hope that it will do well for the rights of the child, which must be supreme. I look forward to the assistance these measures will give to parents, especially regarding children to be adopted in the future.

**Mrs. BYRNE**: I was pleased to be one of the managers at this conference, which was conducted in an extremely good atmosphere, because of paramount importance in the minds of everyone was the welfare of the children concerned. I am sure I speak for other members when I express the hope that this legislation will prove to be in their interests.

Motion carried.

**PETITIONS: MINORS BILL**

**Dr. EASTICK** presented a petition signed by 42 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.

**Mr. WOTTON** presented a similar petition signed by 27 residents of South Australia.

**Mr. WILSON** presented a similar petition signed by 62 residents of South Australia.

**Mrs. ADAMSON** presented a similar petition signed by 167 residents of South Australia.

**Mr. RUSSACK** presented a similar petition signed by 441 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

**PETITION: BIRRALEE HOSPITAL**

**Mr. DEAN BROWN** presented a petition signed by 217 residents of Belair, praying that the House would request the Government to prevent Birralee Repatriation Hospital at Belair being used for any undesirable use and that the Government would consult with the residents of the area on the future use of the hospital.

Petition received.

**QUESTIONS**

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

**SEAFORTH HOME**

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

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The Public Buildings Department has provided sketch plans for the proposed modification of the shower area at the Seaforth/Brighton Community Complex to provide physiotherapy, occupational therapy, chiropody and hairdressing services. The estimated cost of this work, which includes demolitions, new walling, plumbing and fittings, hair driers, joinery, electrical work and floor coverings is \$14 500. Public Buildings Department has been requested to carry out the work, which is planned to be completed by August, 1978.

**POLICE ACCOMMODATION**

In reply to **Dr. EASTICK** (March 9).

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** When investigations were made into the provision of additional office accommodation for the Police Department no suitable space of sufficient area was available in the central business district of Adelaide. Because of the urgent need to release space in the Police Building for staff to administer the Firearms Act, 1977, and to augment facilities for operational policing, it became necessary to seek a building in a close suburban locality that would provide an area of approximately 20 000 square feet, preferably with exclusive use for the Police Department. Tara Hall, 202 Greenhill Road, Eastwood, with a usable area of almost 19 000 square feet, was the only appropriate choice, having regard to those criteria.

In negotiating to lease the space, rental comparisons were made in relation to other premises on Greenhill Road, and these ranged from \$6.50 per square foot per annum to \$7.25 per square foot per annum. Similar comparisons were made in relation to office accommodation in the King William Street—Flinders Street area of the city, where a figure of \$8.50 per square foot per annum was indicated. Additional comparisons were made with properties in the Unley and Brighton areas, and these ranged from \$7 to \$7.50 per square foot per annum. Approval to lease the space in Tara Hall was given on December 12, 1977, and, subsequently, negotiations were concluded for a rental of \$6.75 per square foot per annum.

**MURRAY RIVER**

In reply to **Mr. ARNOLD** (March 1).

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The flow in the Darling River due to the rains in Southern Queensland will not

provide a sufficient quantity of water to the Murray River to even offset the evaporation losses and discharges that have occurred since the Menindee Lakes were last full. Until further reasonable rains occur in the Murray River basin the flow to South Australia will be controlled to entitlement flows.

**SALINITY**

In reply to **Mr. ARNOLD** (November 22).

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** During the passage of a saline slug from the irrigation areas, weekly predictions are given to the Riverland press. The predictions state:

- (1) When the peak of the slug is expected at downstream stations.
- (2) What peak salinity is expected.
- (3) How long the slug is expected to take to pass a given station.

When salinity conditions are steady, no comment is made regarding salinity, but the Engineering and Water Supply Department continues to supply weekly predictions to the Minister of Works Office so that early warning of approaching slugs may be given. The above policy of making intermittent forecasts is the best system that can be devised, having regard to the generation of high salinity slugs upstream, and is regarded as being consistent with the practical requirements of the irrigators.

**NATIONAL WATER RESOURCES PROGRAMME**

In reply to **Mr. RUSSACK** (March 9).

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Contrary to the information which was previously supplied to the honourable member from memory, the Government has not as yet replied to the letter from the Prime Minister. However, the Government intends to apply for assistance under the national water resources programme, and the preparation of submissions which will supply information sought by the Commonwealth Government on projects to be nominated by the State is nearing completion.

**LOCK COAL DEPOSITS**

In reply to **Mr. BLACKER** (March 9).

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The investigation of the coal deposit at Lock is continuing and, as part of this, the relationship between the aquifers containing the saline water in the coal field and the fresh water aquifers in the Poldas Basin 20 kilometres to the west is being studied. The fresh water at Poldas results from local recharge into a bed of limestone, which does not extend into the coal field area. However, the limestone is underlain by the same sands that overlie the coal at Lock, and the sands at both Poldas and Lock contain saline water. The significance of this association is fully realised and is an important factor in assessing the feasibility of mining the coal. Should a decision be made to commence mining, dewatering the sands at the coal field would result in dropping water levels in the surrounding area, and tests are under way to predict the magnitude of this effect. If there is any chance of significant falls in water level as far as Poldas, a proportion of the water pumped out of the mine could probably be reinjected into the sands between the coal field and the Poldas Basin to buffer the effect, and thus ensure that the fresh water basin is unaffected.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ENVIRONMENT  
DEPARTMENT**

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** My statement concerns an inquiry into allegations concerning employees of the National Parks and Wildlife Division in the Environment Department.

On August 2, 1977, allegations were made by a Mr. J. B. Cox, who at that time was a temporary assistant ranger in the National Parks and Wildlife Division, concerning fellow officers who were involved in a bird trapping exercise. The letter containing the allegations was forwarded immediately to the Crown Law Office for inquiry and report.

A most detailed and extensive investigation then took place. Evidence was taken from many officers in the National Parks and Wildlife Division, and all officers had the opportunity to make a statement to the investigating officer. The report by a Government investigating officer was completed in February, and was made available for preliminary discussions between officers of the Environment Department, the Crown Solicitor's Office and the Public Service Board.

On March 2, this year, the Crown Solicitor submitted a report to the permanent head of the department. That report dealt with allegations of irregularities in the National Parks and Wildlife Division. Several officers were identified regarding these allegations, and other officers were mentioned in the report, because of evidence taken in the course of the inquiry.

I point out to the House that the nature of the allegations basically concerned the retention of some small numbers of birds by officers who were engaged in authorised bird trapping exercises for the department. The investigating officer found no truth in any allegation of illegal trafficking in birds. The investigating officer also found no truth in any allegation, nor is there any evidence of profit making or any attempt at profit making by the officers concerned.

However, the fact that there were a number of allegations and counter-allegations made, both by and against officers of the division, is disturbing. In considering what action should be taken as a result of the Crown Solicitor's report, the permanent head has given careful consideration to all these matters. Particular attention has been given to the procedures, staffing and training in the Inspectorial Section of the division.

The permanent head has taken the following action: Five officers have been given a severe reprimand, and a note concerning that reprimand has been placed on their file; the duties of three of these officers have been changed to avoid any opportunity of irregularities occurring on their behalf again.

**Mr. Nankivell:** Is that a public document?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Is the honourable member being facetious about this? If he is I am surprised, because he has been waiting for this reply for some time and I hope he takes it seriously. I repeat: the duties of three of these officers have been changed to avoid any opportunity of irregularities occurring on their behalf again. Action will be taken to tighten up procedures in the division, particularly in the inspectorial section; and it will be stipulated that no officer in the inspectorial section of the division will be allowed to hold a permit to keep birds.

The permanent head has decided that this two-pronged action; that is, reprimand and change of duties of

individual officers, and a tightening of procedures and regulations within the division, is the correct course to follow. He is also preparing, as a matter of urgency, a submission to me regarding the staffing and structure of the entire National Parks and Wildlife Division.

I agree with the permanent head that this review of the entire division is necessary, because there is evidence of inadequate staffing and of the need for more definitive procedures in the division. This submission must be very carefully considered and consequently, will take some time to prepare. However, I am confident that the permanent head will be making a submission as soon as practicable.

This inquiry has extended over a long time, and has resulted in allegations and counter-allegations which have not benefited morale in the National Parks and Wildlife Division and, indeed, they have not been to the benefit or morale of the whole department. The action taken by the permanent head against the officers concerned is firm, but gives due consideration to all the implications concerning the activities of the division raised in the Crown Law Report. Despite all the difficulties and short-comings, I am confident that the overwhelming majority of officers in the division are doing a good job, and reflect credit on the department. I hope, now this matter has been cleared up, that all officers in the department can get on with the job they are employed to do.

**Mr. Millhouse:** When are you going to start on the rest?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order. Each day this happens, and the honourable member is out of order once again. I hope he does not continue.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: INDUSTRIAL  
DEMOCRACY**

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** Last Thursday, the member for Davenport seemed most anxious to ask me a question about some alleged remarks of Mr. J. Thompson, New South Wales Secretary of the Vehicle Builders Employees Federation. He did not take the opportunity to do that. Instead, he appeared on 5DN radio and channel 7 news and claimed that the coming International Industrial Democracy Conference had a biased list of speakers, and that Mr. J. Thompson as a responsible trade union leader and a member of the Labor Party, was opposed to the industrial democracy policy of the South Australian Government. Both he and Mr. Laidlaw, M.L.C., in another place, pleaded with me to invite Mr. Thompson in order to provide balance to the programme of the International Conference. Mr. Laidlaw, in another place, also implied that Mr. Thompson believed that the Unit for Industrial Democracy's approach was too academic.

Mr. Thompson has now been contacted to ascertain what he had precisely said. Mr. Thompson expressed extreme annoyance that his views had been taken out of context and that the Opposition was attempting to make capital out of the report that appeared in the *Advertiser*.

I now wish to read the statement sent to me by Mr. J. Thompson, Secretary of the New South Wales Vehicle Builders Employees Federation, setting out his position, as follows:

It has come to my attention that a speech I gave in Sydney on Wednesday, March 15, was reported in the *Advertiser* on Thursday, March 16, in a way which distorts my views on industrial democracy, the South Australian Government's policy and the role of the Unit for Industrial Democracy. I

shall take each of these three points in turn.

First, I have some strong reservations about the usefulness and effectiveness of workers electing people to represent them on boards of management. However, these reservations should not be construed to mean that I am not a strong supporter of industrial democracy or worker participation. There are a number of different ways that employees and unions can, and should, influence decisions within their work organisations. I am a strong supporter of these moves and indeed believe that greater participation is both desirable and inevitable.

Australia, like many other Western countries, has a younger and better educated work force than in years gone by. The young people of today are not prepared to accept decisions without question, as many of us did in our younger generation. They want to be much more involved in matters that affect them and their future. It should also be noted that the coming restructuring of the manufacturing industry will usher in greater participation. If restructuring of industry is not done through participative means, then Australian society could witness some unhealthy conflicts in the industrial relations area.

Secondly, it is my understanding that the South Australian Government has been actively promoting a number of different forms of industrial democracy. I have indicated that I have some reservations about worker representation on boards, but it should not be implied from this that I am opposed to the South Australian Government policy. The South Australian Government, like the New South Wales Government, has been promoting greater participation by employees through works councils, joint consultative committees, joint management groups, processes of job enrichment, and semi-autonomous work groups. I strongly support these initiatives and believe that other Governments should do a lot more in this area.

Thirdly, the Unit for Industrial Democracy comprises a body of people who, under the direction of the Government, have promoted increased employee participation within industry. I have taken great interest in the work of this unit and support the realistic approaches that they have adopted. It should not be inferred from the criticisms that I have made of academics that these remarks in any way reflect upon the people within the unit. Almost all of the members of the Unit for Industrial Democracy have had ranges of working experience and are quite capable of giving solid practical advice. Some of the members have advised me with my work in New South Wales. I will even go further than this and state that I believe it is the duty of any responsible Government to establish a unit of the kind established in South Australia so that this new important area of industrial democracy and worker participation can be investigated, reported upon, and encouraged.

In conclusion, I should say that it should not have been necessary for me to have had to point out my exact position with regard to industrial democracy and worker participation. It is well known that I am freely available to be contacted by members of the press or any other members of the public. It disturbs me that only a part of my views in this area have been reported in the press and that, as a result, members of the Opposition in South Australia have attempted to make political capital out of the nature of that report. These members of the South Australian Opposition should understand that the destructive statements that they are making could undermine the massive need to update and modernise Australian industry in the near future. I hope that the remarks outlined above make it quite clear what my position is with regard to industrial democracy and the work of the South Australian Government. I do not support the backward approach of the South Australian Opposition. Since I have always attempted to be a reasonable man and

have attempted, where possible, to fit in with reasonable requests from members opposite, I now indicate that I propose to invite Mr. Thompson to attend and participate in the International Industrial Democracy Conference.

### HOTELS COMMISSION

**Mr. TONKIN:** Can the Premier say what value can be placed on assurances given by the Government, in the light of the conflicting statements recently made by the Deputy Premier about the proposed Government hotels commission? Will the Premier now seek his Deputy's resignation according to the principles he outlined to the House on February 7? On March 15, a Bill for a Government hotels commission was introduced in this House. On March 16, in this House, the Deputy Premier stated that suggestions had been made that a Bill had "been introduced in order to allow the Government to become involved in the Hotel Australia". He further said, "I make perfectly clear to members that it is not." He said later:

The Government does not intend to become involved in any transactions concerning the Hotel Australia.

That was the day after, and there was a considerable reaction in the community to the proposals. On March 21, the Deputy Premier is reported to have said that the measure had been introduced quickly into Parliament to cater for any Government involvement that might have been necessary over the Hotel Australia, the study into the hotel having not been completed at that stage. In the light of this blatant misrepresentation, the Government assurance that it would not introduce legislation for a casino must also be subject to further doubt. On February 7, the Premier said:

Should any member of a Government of this State deny this accountability, and mislead this House, the penalty is clear—resignation or dismissal from office.

Will he now indicate whether he will take that action or otherwise admit that he was himself misleading this House in espousing the principles that he purported to support in February?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** That is not a question: it is a political speech.

**Mr. Tonkin:** You won't take any action at all.

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

### PARLIAMENT HOUSE BELLS

**Mr. KLUNDER:** Can the Minister of Works have something done to decrease the loudness and the rapidity of beats in the ringing of division bells in this House? Several members of this House have from time to time complained about the noise of division bells, and I feel I must add my voice to theirs while I have still got enough hearing left to take in the answer. I have two basic complaints: one is that the frequency or number of beats per second has increased in the past few days or, to use the esoteric language of physics, it "Hertz" more. This more rapid ringing is unpleasant and could be done without. The second complaint is that the loudness or amplitude of the bells is greater than necessary. I can appreciate that the bells must be loud in offices in Parliament House just in case a member has nodded off during a session like the 12-hour session we had yesterday. I have not, however, seen members sleeping in corridors, and I believe that the noise level there could be decreased. In other places the noise level is also excessive, as some rooms in this building are

not carpeted but are tiled and the din in those rooms is quite excruciating and, I believe, considerably upsets members' concentration. We are fortunate that, like John Donne, we do not have to ask for whom the bell tolls, for the noise of the bells in this Chamber would make it impossible to hear the question.

**The SPEAKER:** Before the Minister of Works replies to the question, I would point out that this matter was brought to my notice by the Leader of the Opposition, and I spoke to the Minister of Works about it.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I have assembled an army of experts to investigate this matter closely.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** They've made the problem worse.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** They found that members were getting deafer and that, the deafer they got, the louder the bells had to be made. This is a problem; we do not know where to stop. I am saying that facetiously.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** What was wrong with the old bells?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Like the honourable member, they were worn out. I agree with the general observations made by the member for Newland about the nature and loudness of the system that warns people that the House is meeting, that a division has been called or that the House has adjourned. I did suggest to Mr. Guerin, the Public Buildings Department architect who is responsible for Parliament House, that if we could play music over the system, as I believe we can, perhaps it would be possible to record some very soft, pleasant bells. We could place in the system an endless tape so that, instead of having what is almost an Asdic ping, which, I think, is disturbing the members, we would have a ding.

Mr. Guerin suggested to me that, before he attempted to do this, he should lower the level of the pitch of the ping and decrease the frequency of the ping. For example, instead of the ping, ping, ping, it would go ping—ping—ping. However, Mr. Guerin informs me that the capacity of the system is not so great that that experiment has been successful. He is now trying to find some suitable bells that can be recorded on an endless tape. I hope that, by the beginning of the next session, the bells will be in order again and that members will find them better than the system that has been working over the past few months.

#### OUTER HARBOR TERMINAL

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Can the Minister of Marine say whether the Government's efforts to attract cruise ships to South Australia have met with any success? When the Minister has been questioned about the Outer Harbor terminal from time to time, he has stated that vigorous attempts have been made to attract cruise ships to South Australia. Indeed, the public relations officer of the Marine and Harbors Department (Mr. Veins) stated some time ago that the terminal had been used only once or twice a year since it was built in 1973, and that a Russian ship had called early this year at the Outer Harbor but that no other calls were expected. He reiterated the Minister's statement that vigorous efforts were being made to attract cruise ships. Can the Minister say what these efforts have entailed and what success they have achieved?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Mr. Veins's statement was not strictly correct, as the honourable member would appreciate. It was not the case that only one or two cruise ships a year had called at the Outer Harbor passenger terminal since it was constructed. I cannot recall offhand the exact number.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** One or two a year.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** He said that, but it is not correct. In some ways, it is a pity that we took up the

decision taken by the Hall Government to construct the terminal. I trust that the honourable member accepts that it was a decision by a Liberal Government to do this. At the time the construction commenced, there was a need for a better facility at Outer Harbor, the old facility being an absolute disgrace. The building work proceeded. A change occurred in the volume of traffic (and that was inevitable), but at the time the construction was commenced that was not the case. The honourable member could claim that we were not visionary enough to anticipate the change in that type of traffic. We were unable to do so, and neither are we able, I suppose, to anticipate any likely change in this area in the future except that it may well be that, as things change, this type of pleasure cruise will become very popular again, so that the facility would be required for that purpose.

The building, which is a valuable asset and a good structure, is not being wasted. We have very good value for money. The honourable member can shrug if he wants to, but that is the case. If he so desires, I will obtain from the department a list of the activities that take place in that building to show that use is being made of it. The bottom part of the building is used for general cargo, and the top part is used for passenger traffic. The top part has been used by schools, as a centre for conventions, for cabarets, and things of that nature, so it is not without some usefulness. If, indeed, the efforts of the Commercial Division (a new division of the department) are successful in attracting cruise traffic to the State again, the facility will be there and will be used for that purpose. In other words, I am saying that the purpose to which it is now being put can be quickly stopped and it can be turned to the real purpose for which it was constructed. The honourable member can crow about the white elephant, as he calls it, at Outer Harbor but, if he considers the matter closely, he will see that it is not a bad deal after all for this State.

#### JUNIOR EMPLOYEES

**Mr. KENEALLY:** My question to the Minister of Labour and Industry is supplementary to the question I asked the Minister of Education yesterday and arises from statements made by the Port Pirie Chamber of Commerce. Does the Minister agree with the chamber that juniors are being overpaid for their capabilities, that this is a definite deterrent to employers to train juniors, and that accordingly their wages should be reduced? The Port Pirie Chamber blames the economic ills of this country on youth and the education system. It claims that many young people leave work of their own accord to go on to the dole. If their wages were further reduced there would be no financial inducement for young people to find work, anyway.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** As I understand the question, the Port Pirie Chamber of Commerce has indicated that more jobs would become available if wages were lower for young people; is that the situation?

**Mr. Keneally:** Yes.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I do not know how that could apply. If one wanted to take as an analogy a country close to Australia one could refer to Indonesia, Hong Kong or Malaysia, where the average wage is far below what it is in Australia, whether for youth or adults. Yet in those countries the level of unemployment is much higher than it is in Australia. I do not see how the bare fact of just reducing wages for any section of the community, let alone the young section, would in fact create more jobs. I think that the availability of jobs is determined by the economy.

The only way the economy can be got going is to have a boost in confidence, which is lacking at this moment (and that is brought about by the attitude and policies of the present Federal Government)—

**Mr. Venning:** Rubbish!

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** There is no doubt about it. Not only I am saying this; almost every sensible person in the community now recognises that, unless the Federal Government does something about injecting some money into the economy to get it going and to restore the confidence of people, we are in for a much worse period than we are in now. That is the economic forecast; there is not any question about that. Economists are forecasting that: it is a plain fact of life. If we want to follow this suggestion of the chamber to its final conclusion, I suppose what the chamber would want to do is reduce everybody's wages; that is what the real answer would be. It is attacking the youth of this country simply because they are in a defenceless position at this moment, not being able to find themselves employment, so it is easy to pick on someone as being responsible for the ills of the economy created by the Federal Government.

The other point that the honourable member mentioned was the suggestion that if wages were decreased social service benefits would become more attractive. The situation could be that no-one would want to work. I think that everyone in this community is entitled to a reasonable and proper standard of living. I believe, by the same token, that everyone ought to give his best to produce within the community. It is a simple fact of life that if we pay wages and do not obtain production in return the economy must go down. I support the maintenance of wages. This Government solidly supports wage indexation, although that is not happening in this country at the moment. At the same time, I also support higher productivity because I think that is important for our country's economic welfare.

#### CAMPBELLTOWN COMMUNITY BUS SERVICE

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** Can the Minister of Transport say what are the arrangements for the future funding of the Campbelltown community bus service, and can he give an assurance that funding will be continued beyond the end of the current financial year when existing financial arrangements cease? The Minister will know that the service was introduced on an experimental basis, and it has proved of immense value to the local community. There is concern because there is no assurance at the moment that the service can continue to be funded on a recurrent basis.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** I remember very vividly going out to launch that community bus service as a pilot project. The Deputy Premier was with me at the time. When the service was launched, it was made abundantly clear to the committee and to the Mayor and the Town Clerk that it was a pilot scheme, that the Government was supporting it on that basis, that it was the sort of function that was suitable to be supported on a community basis, that the purpose of our intrusion into it at that stage was simply to get it off the ground, and that, at the end of the six-month pilot period, the service would be completely reliant on community support. That position has not changed.

#### STUDENT EMPLOYMENT

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Will the Minister of Labour and Industry investigate the possibility of providing legislation

to protect students in part-time employment? I have come across the situation at Elizabeth where 10 secondary school students who work at Coles Elizabeth store on Saturday mornings have been refused time off to attend a school excursion. I am told that, when the students asked for time off, they were told they would have to resign. It seems that it is management policy to allow students leave only in case of sickness and during summer holidays, and in no other circumstances will the management allow students leave. I find this a very unsatisfactory state of affairs, especially in an area such as Elizabeth, where many students find it necessary to take part-time employment to pay for their education. In this instance, Elizabeth West High School has organised an excursion to Wardang Island to allow the biology, geology, and geography students to complete the practical section of their course for their examination. It is a very important part of the students' preparation for their examinations, and the results of the students certainly will be affected if they do not attend the excursion.

The school, understanding that the absence of 10 workers at one time would cause problems for Coles, has offered to arrange the excursion so that all 10 students would not be absent at the one time, but the Coles organisation apparently has refused all such offers and seems determined to sack the 10 students. I am informed that Coles stores are quite happy to reap the cost benefit of employing students, without any consideration at all for the special needs of students. Other employers at Elizabeth, such as Woolworths and John Martins, employ students, using a roster system which allows some flexibility for students who need time off.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** This is the first time such a circumstance has been drawn to my attention. If the honourable member provides me with the details, I shall have the matter examined and report to him on the situation.

#### SHEEP EXPORTS

**Mr. VENNING:** What has the disillusioned and confused Minister of Labour and Industry to report to the House from his meeting with the people associated with the shipping of live sheep, purported to have taken place this morning? I have had telephone calls from people all over the State (I am referring to those areas where farmers still have some sheep left), expressing concern about the delay that has occurred with the consignment of sheep that is at Cavan at the moment. The Minister may not be aware that this scheme has been a great help to many primary producers in South Australia and throughout Australia, because the type of sheep being exported live is not favoured by the affluent society of Australian people. Consequently, it is an area in which the primary producer can get a reasonable return for such sheep.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** If the honourable member considers that I am disillusioned and confused, so will he be after I give him this report. He will certainly be disillusioned—there will be no question about that—and probably confused as well. It is true that through my own efforts I had arranged a conference this morning (I suppose that is more than any member on the other side has done) to try to solve the problem in this dispute.

**Mr. Mathwin:** Do you want a medal or something?

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** No, but I do not want you beefing and carrying on like an idiot all the time, either.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It is "the honourable member", not "you".

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** One becomes used to the

conduct of the honourable member for Glenelg. There is no question where he is going, and it will not be very long either, I would think. I will now get back to the important point. This is one of the most difficult disputes in which I have had to try to assist since I have been Minister of Labour and Industry. There is absolutely and completely a stand-off position on both sides of the fence at this moment. I do not know what the final solution will be. I was at the conference for some two hours this morning. It was the first time I have had the opportunity of really having an in-depth discussion with the parties involved. At least I now know much more about it than I knew yesterday. I think I understand it and its complications, of which there are many: there is no question about that. There are tremendous complications on both sides. On the one hand, absolute fear is emanating from the work force within the abattoirs, not only in this State but also in others, that because of live sheep exports to other countries in the world, particularly to the Arab countries, there will be no jobs available for the employees here. That has not just emanated from the hierarchy of the union; it is quite evident, and the work force believes that that is the situation.

**Mr. Chapman:** What—

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** If the honourable member for Alexandra continues in this vein I will sit down; if he wants to hear what happened at the meeting this morning, he will listen.

**Mr. Chapman:** Come on!

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** That is his conduct all the time; he wants to interject and carry on all the time. On the other side of the arena there are the growers, the exporters and the agents, who have put certain propositions to me, which off the top of my head I would be a fool to say that I understand. I would be a fool to say that they could work. I have asked for the submission, which Mr. MacLachlan made to the A.C.T.U. 10 days ago, to be examined. It sounds credible to me, but I am not going to say that it will be an answer to the situation. I was impressed by what he had to say about the future of the industry if certain things did not take place. I will not place it any higher than that. It needs to be examined; it is a complex question. I am not able to tell the House at this moment that there is a resolution just around the corner, because there is not.

**Mr. Venning:** Did you get in touch with Bob Hawke?

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** Yes, that has been done. The A.C.T.U. has been involved in this situation for some period. Only 10 days ago a meeting of the type that I had this morning was held in the A.C.T.U. office. I understand that Mr. Hawke was not there himself but that he arranged for somebody else to be there, and I understand also that this submission has been given to the A.C.T.U. for comment. I will have it examined to see what this means economically for Australia, and particularly South Australia. There is not much more that I can add. The situation has not changed since yesterday: there is still a stand-off position.

I learned this morning that the West Australian Liberal Government last year introduced a quota system to operate from within Western Australia for the export of live sheep. That must have been properly determined by that Government for it to introduce such a system. I understand that the Government has done things similar to those that I did this morning, and has arranged a conference for tomorrow in Western Australia, at which time I imagine the quota system will again be discussed. Whether or not the Government is prepared to go as far as it did last year, I do not know. I am finding out about the agreement which existed to help me in my deliberations on

this matter. I intend later this afternoon or tomorrow to have consultations with the Minister of Agriculture, who would be in a much better position to gauge that situation than I am.

#### CHINESE LANGUAGE COURSE

**Mr. GROOM:** Is the Minister of Education aware that there is a proposal to discontinue the Chinese III course at Adelaide University during 1979? Have there been any negotiations with the Commonwealth Government concerning the course, and what is the likelihood of the course's continuing in 1979? The ending of the Chinese III course would be a serious blow to the teaching of Asian languages in South Australia, and it would also mean that students at universities would have their courses interrupted and that many school students may now feel disinclined to commence the course if they cannot major in it at university. I believe that the possible ending of the course is due largely to a lack of Federal funding, and there is a real risk that other third-year Asian language courses could also be discontinued because of a lack of Federal funding.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I was not aware of the current proposal, and I thank the honourable member for drawing it to my attention. However, the fear that Asian language courses at third year level may be discontinued has been current at the university for over 12 months now. The matter was first drawn to my attention by the Principal of one of the private schools in South Australia when he wrote to me about this matter and expressed the fears of that school, which is strong in Asian languages. Obviously, some of the students at that school wish to pursue these studies at university level.

From memory, I think the Premier wrote to the Prime Minister about this matter, but we were able to get no assurance at all beyond the normal mechanism that applies, that the Universities Commission would have to consider the Adelaide University's case in the normal way. We were very disappointed with that decision: it illustrated that, within the general so-called 2 per cent growth rate in real terms for universities, established universities such as Adelaide University had had a real cut-back, because some of the newer universities in Victoria, for example, had to have a real growth rate much larger than 2 per cent as they are still in a developmental stage. We therefore made our protest to the Commonwealth at that time on behalf of the Adelaide University, but we were unsuccessful.

Subsequently, I was given to understand that the university would attempt, by some reallocation of resources within the university, to keep the courses going. That was the last I had heard about the matter until the honourable member drew it to my attention. I should be pleased to take up the matter again with the Vice-Chancellor to see what may be done. However, it gets back to the fact that there has been a virtual standstill in university financing on the part of the Federal Government through the Tertiary Education Commission. That is quite disastrous for some of our young people who have commenced these courses and have perhaps done one or two full years' study on them but will now be unable to proceed to the major degree level.

#### PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

**Dr. EASTICK:** Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say what contingency plan the Government has formulated to permit the effective use of this State's liquid

hydrocarbon production in the regrettable event of the next Australian petro-chemical facility not being sited in South Australia? The Minister would recall that about three or four weeks ago I indicated the distinct belief that the next petro-chemical facility would be near Laverton, not far from Altona, Victoria. Everyone in South Australia would want to see our hydrocarbon production utilised, so I suggest to the Minister that we cannot have a situation where the Government is considering only the development of Redcliff and not a contingency plan, which should be well and truly in the pipeline in the event that Redcliff does not proceed.

The original delay was the result of Mr. Connor's intrusion and the requirement that the liquid petroleum gas be turned into motor spirit. The end result was going to be a product of considerable cost, needing a great deal of subsidising. In fact, the cost of the plant to effect this transfer increased the cost of the unit beyond the I.C.I. consortium's possibility of involvement. It is on this basis that I seek from the Government an indication that there are contingency plans and that they are advanced, and I also seek from the Minister an indication of what they are.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** Ever since I have been Minister in charge of this matter I have insisted that not only the petro-chemical scheme but also what is now known as the modified liquid scheme (or a C3-plus scheme) be studied. Since that time, various investigations have taken place into this kind of alternative. The basis of our submission to the Commonwealth for support for infrastructure is argument very much in terms of the kind of conclusions we have reached about the various options. The basis of our argument is that the rate of return which is possible on a modified liquids scheme (that is, leaving the ethane in the town gas, but processing the L.P.G. and the heavier fractions) does not make it viable. Indeed, the rate of return on the petro-chemical scheme that gets much greater value out of the ethane is viable only if there is Government support for the major items of infrastructure and if the lower interest rate and longer depreciation period associated with Government-provided infrastructure are built into the scheme.

We have also pointed out to the Government that the net impact of a full petro-chemical scheme on Australia's balance of payments is well in excess of \$200 000 000 a year while, on the other hand, the net impact on our balance of payments of a modified liquids scheme (if that were to get off the ground) is only \$70 000 000 a year. In addition, we have pointed out that, if neither the petro-chemical scheme nor a modified liquid scheme is feasible, all that will happen will be that liquids in the Cooper Basin as they are produced will be flared off as waste, and part of our basic reserve of hydrocarbons will go up in smoke. I think that everyone must understand that liquids in the Cooper Basin are produced largely as a consequence of the production of gas for Sydney and Adelaide and that the production schedules for getting into the wetter wells can be postponed only so long.

As a consequence of the gas being produced for Sydney and Adelaide, we would end up by producing liquids of a potentially commercial level. Those liquids, together with ethane, give rise to the possibility of a full petro-chemical scheme. It needs to be understood that one of the reasons why the modified liquids scheme is less profitable than the full petro-chemical scheme, particularly from the producer's point of view, is that the level of investment on the field by the producers is still much the same. It is slightly less than the \$300 000 000 or so that would be required by the Cooper Basin for a full petro-chemical scheme, but with only a slight reduction in expenditure on the field there is a very substantial reduction in the value

of the product, because ethane, instead of being used for petro-chemical production, stays in the town gas and stays at a much lower price.

All of these things have been pointed out and, in a sense, they form part of the substance of the case that South Australia has made to the Commonwealth; namely, that in the national interest the impact on the balance of payments of the petro-chemical scheme at Redcliff is greater than that of any alternative open to the Commonwealth. I think that fact is now recognised. Secondly, without Commonwealth Government support for the infra-structure the project is not likely to be viable. There is then a grave danger that the liquids in the Cooper Basin will be wasted altogether.

It is not correct that any decision has been taken to proceed with the Victorian alternative for a petro-chemical complex. It seems as though the current position is that I.C.I. has gone cold on Botany Bay as a proposition, which probably just leaves Altona and Redcliff in the running, and it may be that I.C.I. is involved in some back-up position in relation to Altona and that certain things have been done in order to maintain the potential for that back-up position. We are hoping that the inter-departmental committee of the Commonwealth will report to the Commonwealth Minister by the end of this month. I have written recently to a number of Commonwealth Ministers emphasising the urgency of the whole matter, bringing home once again, to the best of my ability, what I consider to be the main points relating to the matters that the Commonwealth must consider and before Dow could even be in the position of determining whether it could give a green light to further expenditure on the proposal.

We are still waiting on that overall position, but I think it is worth saying, and worth saying in public, that if the petro-chemical scheme does not go ahead there is a grave danger that the hydro-carbon reserves in the Cooper Basin will be wasted altogether and not be available for use in Australia, because on our assessment the rate of return that is available on a modified liquids scheme involving L.P.G. and the heavier fractions is not sufficient to justify its development by ordinary commercial enterprise. Of course, in those circumstances the Commonwealth would have to do more in order to get a modified liquids scheme off the ground than it has to do to get a full petro-chemical scheme off the ground.

#### SCHOOL ENROLMENTS

**Mrs. BYRNE:** Can the Minister of Education inform the House of this year's school enrolment figures and, if possible, how they compare with previous years?

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I have those figures with me. I point out that the primary school figures that I will be giving are as a result of the so-called "ring-in" from the schools, whereas the secondary figures are a result of the survey (the "write-in", if you like), so the primary figures could still be subject to some modification. The secondary figures, however, could be regarded as pretty accurate. The figures, as I have them, are that the primary enrolment is 146 650 compared with 146 716 at the beginning of the 1977 school year. The secondary enrolments are 84 350 compared with 84 991 at the beginning of last year. So, there has been a marginal decline in enrolments in both cases. The figures in both cases exclude enrolments for the correspondence courses. I do not have an accurate figure, but I understand it will be of the order of 780 enrolments.



## MONARTO

**Mr. WOTTON:** Can the Minister for Planning provide the House with a report on the Government's present policy regarding the use of land in the immediate future and the general policy regarding the eventual development of the city of Monarto? Much concern has been expressed by people in the Murray Bridge area about the use of land set aside by the Government for Monarto. I seek this information to enable people interested in future development in Murray Bridge and the surrounding districts to have confidence in such development and so that they may have a clear picture and be made fully aware of the Government's intention regarding any future development at Monarto.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The Monarto project, as the honourable member would know, is deferred. That deferment will be for at least a five-year period.

**Mr. Millhouse:** "At least a five year period"? More like 50 years, as you would well know.

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

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The boy genius, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Millhouse:** You—

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

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** If only I could provoke another interjection from the honourable member, Mr. Speaker!

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I hope the honourable Minister will not.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** As the member for Murray will appreciate, there has recently been, because of the extension of the freeway, some subdivisional activity in the Callington area of a sort that would be almost impossible to support in terms of the provision of public services of any description. Studies have been undertaken into the question of whether or not subdivision could occur on the Monarto site, treating that as if it were a suburb of Murray Bridge, or whether there is any potential on the Monarto site for the development of areas that would be suitable for rural living.

In the latter case, of course, the arrangements that would be made for sewerage would be the ordinary septic tank variety and any headworks expenditure on that score would disappear. I will find out how the studies are progressing and, when I am in a position to make a further report on the matter, I will do so and see that the honourable member is informed about it.

**Mr. Wotton:** Will the Government encourage further future developments in Murray Bridge?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I think that will take place naturally. The extension of the freeway through now to Callington, and by the end of April next year through to Swanport, means that Murray Bridge is as close in time to Adelaide as is Noarlunga. Undoubtedly, that will provide a stimulus to people who want to live at Murray Bridge and commute to Adelaide, so we expect there to be, particularly because of the deferment of Monarto, some considerable pressure on Murray Bridge that will be difficult to cope with unless there are other means of relieving that pressure. All of these matters have to be taken into account and, when I am in a position to give further information to the honourable member, I will. Was that an interjection I heard, Mr. Speaker?

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

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The other matter is that expenditure is still proceeding this year on tree planting at

the Monarto site. The possibility of establishing a zoo on the site is also being considered. What also has now to be under review is the question of how much further expenditure should take place in relation to any other tree planting or activities of that nature on the site as against leasing out of the land for agricultural purposes in the period while the deferment applies.

## WINGFIELD DUMP

**Mr. OLSON:** Can the Minister for the Environment say what precautions are taken against the dumping of industrial waste at Wingfield? It has been brought to my attention by constituents that numerous firms are depositing caustic acid, fluorocarbons and hydrocarbons, and plastics by disposal tankers on this site. It is claimed that, owing to the burning of rubbish on this material, gases from the acids are entering the atmosphere, to the discomfort of residents of LeFevre Peninsula and adjacent areas.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Offhand, I cannot give the honourable member a reply. I shall refer the question to the department and get a considered reply which I will convey to him by letter. I view with great seriousness the statements made by him, because although I know that provision has been made for the disposal of toxic wastes, I do not know what arrangements exist in relation to Wingfield. As a matter of urgency, I shall call for a report and let the honourable member have the information as soon as possible.

## BOLIVAR OPEN DAY

**Mr. BECKER:** Did the Minister of Works approve the State Water Laboratories open day for 1978 at Bolivar, on Friday, April 28, and can he give the estimated cost involved and the Budget line from which the money will come? I understand that no additional funds have been made available for replacing staff and that there has been a cutting down on work, maintenance, and research at Bolivar. I am informed that the open day will involve quite an extensive programme and that an officer has been working full time on this project since January last, with various departments being required to prepare working displays and photographic displays. Because of the need for continuing research in this area, can the Minister say how this can be justified?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** It is typical of the honourable member to raise such a question. I cannot recall whether or not the approval has been sent to me formally as yet, but certainly the Director and Engineer-in-Chief and also the Chief Chemist, Mr. Lane, discussed with me the open day to which the honourable member has referred. I agreed to this proposal, because the laboratory at Bolivar is one of the finest of its kind in the world. I think it is proper for the Government to give other Government departments and members of the public of South Australia an opportunity to view this facility and to gain for themselves some knowledge of the work carried out. Recently, extensive modifications were made to the laboratory. They have been completed, and I was so impressed that I readily agreed to the open day suggested. Does the honourable member suggest that we should not do this at Roseworthy College and other places where such occasions occur?

**Mr. Becker:** Would the money be—

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The honourable member can go on with that line. What a line it is to pitch! It is

something to grab a headline, and the honourable member knows it. I do not know whether his allegations regarding lack of staff, and so on, have any basis in fact, but I shall check them out, too. Obviously, someone has talked to the honourable member, perhaps not appreciating what is going on, or perhaps something has happened to put their snout out of joint and they have blurted it out to the honourable member. I shall check to see whether or not there is a need to do as the honourable member suggests and not spend the amount of money, which is probably not great anyway. I shall find out, and let him know.

#### WAGE INDEXATION

**Mr. ABBOTT:** What future does the Minister of Labour and Industry see in wage indexation following the decision of the A.C.T.U. to campaign for wage losses resulting from Arbitration Commission decisions to grant less than the full c.p.i. increases?

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

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

#### REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister for Planning)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Real Property Act, 1886-1975; and to make consequential amendments to the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1977. Read a first time.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I move:

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

The proposed amendments to the Real Property Act contained in this Bill deal with the division of land and buildings by cluster and strata titles, respectively. In introducing this Bill, it is the Government's intention to lay the Bill on the table of the House so that it can be available to all interested parties for examination and comment during the early period of the Parliamentary recess. Following consideration of submissions which are made, the Government will be looking to enact the legislation during the next session of Parliament. As members will see, the Bill is a complicated measure covering some 43 printed pages. It deals with difficult matters relating to the Real Property Act, and obviously it is essential that the people who would be concerned with this Bill should be given the maximum possible time to examine both the Bill and the second reading explanation.

**Mr. Gunn:** Are you going to refer it to a Select Committee?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** It is not initially appropriate to put it to a Select Committee. It is likely that representations that will be made to the Government will produce legislation broadly acceptable to the industry and to local government, and in those circumstances we should be able to proceed with the legislation in the normal way. However, it is only proper that before even that stage is reached the opportunity should be taken to consult with those involved in the industry. By laying the Bill on the table, this becomes the most effective way of consultation, because the Bill then becomes public property.

The second reading explanation sets out in detail the Government's reasons for the introduction of the Bill and its preparation. I have provided a copy for the Opposition.

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

The Bill proposes the repeal of the present Part of the Real Property Act which deals with strata titles, and the enactment of a new Part dealing with three aspects: namely, strata titles, cluster titles, and, thirdly, the various matters which are common to both strata and cluster titles, including the common property, the corporate management body and new provisions for a Commissioner of Unit Schemes.

The major new measures proposed in the Bill are those designed to cater for cluster housing developments. Today cluster housing subdivisions are becoming increasingly popular. Cluster subdivision is a form of land development which dispenses with the rigid requirements of conventional subdivision, and allows free siting of houses and their private gardens.

In conventional development, the system of control is based on the assumption that one organisation will be responsible first for the subdivision of land, and that, subsequently, another organisation, or organisations, will be responsible for house design and construction. As a result, certain standard requirements, such as those for minimum allotment sizes, minimum road frontages, and building setbacks are laid down and in effect determine in advance the manner in which buildings are later sited.

By contrast, cluster development provides for concurrent planning of the subdivision and building layout by the developer, thereby making many of the usual standard controls superfluous. Since the development to be constructed is known in advance of the land subdivision procedure, and the layout, buildings and landscape are planned as an integrated whole, variations from the usual requirements for road frontages, lot sizes, etc., should be allowed, indeed encouraged, so as to ensure the best use of the particular site.

To date, integrated developments have relied on the strata title legislation for implementation. The strata title system was originally designed to permit those owning a flat to obtain as good a title as those owning detached houses on their own allotment. Naturally, the building must be completed before titles of the units contained in the building can be created.

The strata system is unsuited to cluster development, because all the houses have to be completed before any titles can be issued. The developer is unable to obtain an early cash flow by selling houses as they are completed and accordingly integrated developments are more costly than developments using the standard subdivision system.

The cluster provisions will allow the advantages of the strata legislation to be applied to the cluster subdivision of land without requiring the completion of buildings on that land. Essentially, this results in strata titles being defined by reference to buildings, while cluster titles are defined by reference to land.

The South Australian Government is anxious to promote cluster development for several reasons. The environmental implications are important. With cluster developments site planning can make the most effective use of natural features of the site, preserving valuable areas of the existing landscape and avoiding areas of expensive development. Maximum advantage can be taken of views, and houses can be sited so that living areas are sheltered from the worst of the summer sun, but receive the benefits of warmth and light in winter.

Cluster schemes can allow more economic and intelligent use of metropolitan land and would permit increased densities without any disadvantages to the existing urban residential environment. In particular, the integrated design process dispenses with the many unusable bits of land which the application of standard setback regulations inevitably produces. Consequently some savings in land are possible. Increased densities in existing and new urban areas are desirable in terms of the present world-wide trend towards conservation of energy resources. They will benefit the people who live there because they will be closer to social and community facilities, public transport and employment.

However, the possibility of increasing densities is certainly not the only objective of this legislation. For example, there is no reason why cluster housing developments should not be allowed in R1 zones. A development that provides detached family housing at low densities would in no way be detrimental to the fabric of an R1 zone. Indeed, it could be enhanced with the provision of more usable open space and integrated design.

Finally, cluster legislation could be used in rural areas to advantage. Some hobby farmers want the advantages of country living but do not necessarily want to manage a 10 or 20-acre farm themselves. They also want the provision of some of the services that urban dwellers have. Cluster titles could allow hobby farm houses to be sited on reasonably small areas of land close to one another while the original property could be managed as a single operation by the corporate body.

I now will deal with the procedure for obtaining approval for cluster developments. In order to avoid overlapping development control systems, an essential feature of the Bill is that the normal requirement for planning approval will apply to cluster developments. Given the present planning laws, this can be achieved quite simply within the city of Adelaide, and within those parts of the State where interim development control applies under the Planning and Development Act.

However, within most of the metropolitan area and some country centres where zoning regulations apply, cluster developments are not so readily accommodated. Nevertheless, local councils have considerable discretion to waive the normal requirements and grant consent to acceptable proposals. Alternatively, councils or the State Planning Authority may recommend exemptions from the regulations for worthwhile developments.

Until the current inquiry into the control of private development is completed, and new measures have been enacted, councils and the State Planning Authority are encouraged to give sympathetic consideration to requests for exemptions for cluster developments. To assist developers and councils to design and assess cluster proposals, the State Planning Authority is discussing with interested bodies a residential design guide, which identifies the essential ingredients of a satisfactory residential environment.

In addition to the Bill's provisions for strata and cluster developments respectively, it also provides for composite strata and cluster schemes, and for staged developments. The Bill also incorporates a proposal for the establishment of a Commissioner of Unit Schemes, that is, for strata and cluster schemes. The proposal for a commissioner arises from the recommendations of the State Titles Review Committee and from public submissions recognising the need for an arbitrator to settle disputes between a unit owner and the corporate body of a strata or cluster scheme.

The Strata Titles Review Committee also recommended

various changes to provide for strata titles for buildings erected prior to 1940, to improve the provisions for corporate body management and insurance, and to improve various other technical provisions of the legislation. These matters are also dealt with in the Bill.

In summary, the amending Bill before the House replaces Part XIXB of the Real Property Act which dealt with strata titles. The new Part XIXB, by Division II provides for division of land by strata titles, and by Division III provides the new cluster title legislation. Division IV makes provision for the corporation which is required to hold the common property under both strata title and cluster planning. The corporation is also the means by which the rights and obligations of the unit holders *inter se* are provided. The provisions of this division apply equally to strata and cluster titles.

Division V provides for the appointment of a commissioner with power to settle disputes between the corporation and a unit owner. Division VI provides for the cancellation or variation of plans deposited with the Registrar-General and Division VIII allows a developer to make his development of a site in separate self-contained stages. This facility applies to both strata and cluster titles and will for obvious reasons greatly reduce the initial cost of developing a large area.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 repeals the existing Part XIXB of the principal Act and inserts new provisions in its place. New section 224 contains the definitions necessary for the purposes of the new Part. New section 225 is a transitional provision of which the main purpose is to allow those who have, upon the commencement of the new Part, begun, but not completed, proceedings leading to the deposit of a strata plan, to continue and complete those proceedings. Division II deals with the division of land by deposited strata plans. New section 226 establishes the right to divide land by strata plan. New section 227 sets out the criteria with which strata plans must conform. New section 228 sets out the manner and form in which an application for the deposit of a strata plan is to be made. New section 229 deals with the granting of a certificate by a council in respect of a strata plan.

New section 230 deals with the unit entitlement of strata units. New sections 231 and 232 deal with the deposit of a strata plan in the Land Titles Registration Office. New section 233 provides for the issue of certificates on the deposit of a strata plan. Division III deals with the division of land by deposited cluster plans. New section 234 establishes the right to divide land by cluster plan. New section 235 sets out the criteria with which a cluster plan must conform. New section 236 prescribes the manner and form in which an application for the deposit of a cluster plan is to be made. New section 237 deals with the unit entitlement of cluster units. New sections 238 and 239 deal with the deposit of a cluster plan in the Land Titles Registration Office. New section 240 deals with the issue of certificates upon the deposit of a cluster plan. New section 241 prohibits building on land except in accordance with the prescribed approval.

Division IV (comprising new sections 242 and 249) deals with the powers, functions and duties of corporations established upon the deposit of plans of unit subdivision. Division V establishes the office of Commissioner of Unit Schemes and sets out his powers to arbitrate in disputes arising between unit holders and the corporation in strata/cluster schemes. New section 250 provides for the appointment of the commissioner. New section 251 is a power of delegation. New sections 252 to 257 set out the arbitral powers of the commissioner. New sections 258 to 260 set out the procedure for making applications to the commissioner and deal with the manner in which he may

investigate the subject matter of complaints.

Division VI comprising new sections 261 to 263 provides for the cancellation or variation of plans of unit subdivision. Division VII provides that a unit comprised in a cluster scheme may constitute the parcel for a strata scheme. Thus it would be possible to have composite strata/cluster schemes. This will permit both vertical and horizontal subdivision. Division VIII permits staged development of strata/cluster schemes. Division IX (new sections 266 to 273) contains miscellaneous provisions dealing with plans of unit subdivision.

Clause 4 renumbers sections of the principal Act following the new Part. Clause 5 repeals the twenty-fourth schedule of the principal Act which sets out the old form of strata title. Clause 6 amends the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1977, to ensure that Part VI of that Act dealing with subdivision will not apply to strata and cluster titles.

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

### REGISTRATION OF DOGS

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government):** I move:

That the report of the working party in containing, control and registration of dogs be referred to a Select Committee for inquiry and report with recommendations to the House on the form of proposed legislation for containing, control and registration of dogs.

I have laid on the table a copy of the report and moved that it be printed. Subsequently, copies will be available for all members. At this stage the numbers are limited, but I understand that one or two members who have specifically requested it are having a copy made.

The report arises out of what has obviously been a need for some considerable time to review the existing provisions of the Registration of Dogs Act and the Alsatian Dogs Act. In November of last year I established a working party to look at the problem of a new Act and to take into account the problems that had been raised by the Town Clerks Association, which made quite a comprehensive submission, and in an internal report emanating from the Minister of Health's area.

I pay due respect to the members of that committee, who did a very creditable job in producing the report, which has been produced in what will appear to honourable members at first glance and members of the public as a draft Bill, together with draft regulations. However, I stress that the report is that of the working party and is not a draft Bill.

The principal feature of the proposals of the working party is that there needs to be a different approach altogether from that which was previously applied regarding the care and control of dogs. First, it is proposed that dogs will no longer be able to roam at large and at will; they will be controlled at all times. Secondly, dogs will have to carry more than just a registration disc, as presently applies. They will need to have tags indicating the name and address of their owners, so that, irrespective of the time of day or night, the owner of a dog can be immediately traced. At present the owner of a dog can be traced through local council records, but if the council office is closed one has to wait until the next day or, if a weekend is involved, until Monday. If it is a public holiday period, an even longer wait is involved.

The next point worthy of a mention is that it is proposed that there be a central Dog Advisory Council responsible for the general overview of the whole of the dog legislation from now on, and that this council will be responsible for the establishment and maintenance of homes or pounds

for stray dogs, something that is badly needed at the moment. Of course, to do this additional funds are necessary. Whilst on the financial question, I think it is widely recognised by all who are involved in any way that the present fee of \$1.25 payable to local government for the registration of a dog provides insufficient funds for councils to make any impact in this area at all. The net result has been (and I am not being critical of councils when I say this) that councils have neglected to do the policing that I believe is necessary, and this is so because they have not had the funds to do it and they do not feel obliged to use general ratepayers' revenue to police matters relating to dogs when that ought to be financed by the legislation.

**Mr. Mathwin:** There is a shortage of dog-catchers, too, isn't there?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** That is so.

**Mr. Gunn:** It is very difficult to get somebody to do the job.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** I might ask the Minister of Labour and Industry whether he can get an apprenticeship for dog-catchers! Whilst there is probably a shortage, I think that, if local government had the funds and decided to launch into a campaign of employing dog-catchers, suitable people who could at least be trained would come forward. Also, it is proposed that the central Dog Advisory Council would pay 2½ per cent of the fees it will receive to the R.S.P.C.A. for the maintenance of a veterinary aid voucher research scheme for pensioners and other dog-owners in necessitous circumstances. It is acknowledged that, if local government is to do the things I am outlining, obviously additional funds are necessary. That is why it is proposed to increase the fees to \$15 for each dog, but with a 50 per cent reduction for a sterile dog. The registration fees for pensioners will be half those paid by other people.

The other important point is that it is hoped that, by tackling the dog problem in this way, we will rid the streets of the large number of ownerless dogs which presently roam them and which present themselves as a real nuisance and threat to life and limb. Children and elderly people are frequently worried by dogs.

**Mr. Gunn:** And door-knockers.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** It might help them, although they are within a person's property and I am not sure that one needs to do very much there. The other matter that I think may create some public discussion is that, from the time the legislation becomes effective, any dog-owner who permits his dog to defecate in a public place and does not remove and dispose of the faeces that results will be capable of being fined up to \$100. There will also be fines of \$100 for abandoning dogs.

The proposition brought to the House will create a deal of public discussion. It is overdue and I think will be generally accepted, but every opportunity must be given to the general public to express its view. It is with this in mind that the Government proposes that this measure be referred to a Select Committee during the recess of Parliament. This will provide an opportunity to those people who wish to express an opinion to do so, and for the Select Committee to report to Parliament its recommendations on the steps to be taken from there on.

**Mr. EVANS (Fisher):** I support the motion. I was aware of the Town Clerks Association's report and recommendation, which was in the form of a draft Bill really, before the Minister's working party worked on the matter. I have not seen a copy of the working party's report but, from the Minister's description of it, it follows along some of the lines of the Town Clerks Association's recommendations.

I congratulate both bodies, even though I have not seen the other report. I believe that, by the setting up of a Select Committee, people will be encouraged to come forward and give evidence.

Last year I expressed my concern about this matter by trying to introduce a Bill to rewrite the Registration of Dogs Act. When I was told that the Government intended to do the same thing during this session, I accepted that, but it did not happen. At least the matter is before us now, so it will be considered by us in the early part of the next session. I was personally so involved in this matter because I found that, in places where the metropolitan area was beginning to merge into the rural community, there was definitely a need to protect the responsible dog owner and his dogs but, at the same time, there was also a need for legislation to try to convince the irresponsible dog owner that he has certain responsibilities and that he should look after his dog and protect his neighbours' rights and property. I hope that the Select Committee can follow that course right through with its recommendations. I am sure that it will. If an irresponsible dog owner does not accept his responsibility, there is no alternative but to give councils or courts the opportunity to impose severe fines on that owner.

One could not dispute that a fee of \$1.25 is insufficient for councils to raise the necessary revenue to employ the policing services that are necessary to control the dog nuisance in a community. Regarding dog nuisance, I am not just talking about a dog attacking a neighbour's pets or stock; I am talking about cases where children have been bitten at shopping centres and public places by dogs that are allowed to roam free. I am also talking about the pollution on people's lawns and gardens and pollution in the street.

It is worth noting that, in a city like Amsterdam, Holland, signs are actually painted every 150 metres along the footpath in the shape of a dog in a squatting position with the following written underneath "In de goot", which means "Put your dog in the gutter if it is going to carry out that act". Many countries in the world are experiencing the problems that we are experiencing here. I am not suggesting that \$15 should be the fee charged for this purpose, which I am sure that the Minister is not suggesting, either: I am sure that he will wait for the recommendations of the Select Committee to see what fee is recommended, and I hope that Parliament will accept that recommendation.

Neighbours of people who own dogs are concerned about noise made by those dogs. I am disappointed that we have been unable to control that aspect by the provision of the Noise Control Act. The Minister under whose control that legislation lies is now in the House, and I hope that he will take action during the time that Parliament is not sitting to enable neighbours who live next door to noisy dogs to take action in relation to those dogs if they do not continually stop barking.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** Debarking?

**Mr. EVANS:** Some people are having their dogs debarked. I do not agree with that. I believe that a dog that barks all the time is either unhappy or is just a pest and will never get out of the habit. Not much can be done about that, apart from getting rid of the dog. I support the reference of the report to a Select Committee. I am sure that, if we come up with a solution to half the dog problems in my community, my constituents will thank the Minister, the Parliament, and the Select Committee and, hopefully, their member for getting rid of those problems.

**Dr. EASTICK (Light):** I support the motion. Regrettably, many aspects of this matter will be treated

emotively. I need refer only to the front page of this afternoon's *News* to indicate that that is the issue that has come to the fore in the following:

\$15 dog fees. Tough new laws proposed.

Be that as it may, the important issue and the only way in which this report can be put into effect is contained in a small paragraph in that press report as follows:

But the proposals also suggest dogs could be identified by a tattoo on the inside of their ear.

I predict that, unless the public appreciates fully that it will be essential for dogs to be individually identified, whether it be on the inside of the ear, in the lip, the flank, or some other convenient place, the whole scheme will fail. Another comment that is made in the report is to the effect that dogs would have to wear collars containing their name and the address of their owner on them. That will not work. Such a practice would be to no avail because of the ease with which a collar can be slipped off. Positive identification by tattoo is the issue on which legislation will pivot. One can positively identify a desexed animal only by the presence of a registered tattoo. That procedure will be of benefit in such an identification, as in some instances it is not physically possible to tell whether an animal, particularly a female, has been desexed. That can be done only by the registration of a tattooed animal, because then the matter will be beyond doubt.

**Mr. Chapman:** Won't that be a feast for veterinary surgeons?

**Dr. EASTICK:** A number of registrars among the coursing dog fraternity are now authorised to tattoo dogs. It will be necessary to have authorised tattooers, but they need not necessarily be veterinarians. The important issue will revolve around that positive identification. I hope that the measure will be thoroughly canvassed before the Select Committee without undue delay and that the desirable features associated with the measure can be introduced for the benefit of all people in this State.

**Mr. RODDA (Victoria):** In my district there has been some heartburning about the keeping of dogs. I hope that the people concerned will avail themselves of the opportunity to place before the Select Committee the problems that they have experienced. In the main, those problems relate to public nuisance that has been occasioned in some country towns. A number of cases have occurred where large numbers of dogs have been kept in towns, and it is not easy to control them under the present legislation. There have been two cases about which I know in separate towns where barking dogs have kept people awake all night and where nothing could be done about the problem. I hope that the proposed Bill will cover that aspect.

I understand that a by-law was introduced by Naracoorte council, but, because of the gamut that by-laws must run, it has not yet come into being. Generally, the control of dogs must be stepped up. I noticed in today's newspaper report that about 5 000 dogs a year were being destroyed. This can mean only one thing: the members of the public keeping them are not responsible for them. The member for Light has a professional understanding of the need for identification. I am sure that, with members such as he in the Parliament, the Select Committee will be responsible for bringing a Bill to the House during the next session of Parliament that will make for effective control of dogs. I am pleased that the Minister has seen fit to move his motion, which I support.

**Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** I confess that I do not know very much on this subject. The motion has been moved only today. Like most other members, I have had

no opportunity to read the report the Minister has tabled, and the most information I could glean is from today's *News*. On a quick reading of the report contained therein, it appears that the \$15 dog registration fee is to apply to all dogs. I am not too sure just how wide are the implications, but I express some concern, on the evidence available, on behalf of primary producers, because whether the dogs are male, female, or desexed, this appears to me to be a costly burden on that section of the community, particularly when one considers that primary producers, with multiple employees on their property, have several dogs. Realising that the matter is to be referred to a Select Committee, I know there is no need to debate it at length at this stage. However, I wish to comment briefly on the remarks made by the member for Light, who would probably be more aware of the veterinary details applicable to animals, including dogs, than would any other member. I respect the depth of his address on this subject this afternoon. I agree wholeheartedly with his recommendation that the identification of dogs should be by means of an ear mark or ear tattoo, rather than it depending on movable collars or bands.

It is reasonable also to point out that the actual practice of desexing dogs causes considerable inconvenience to owners who are genuine about having their dogs and other animals, including cats, desexed, as it causes them considerable expense. It was put to me recently that perhaps we ought to be considering establishing Government clinics in which this work could be done without charge, simply as a public service to the community. I shall be interested to hear the Minister's comments on that aspect; indeed, I trust that it will be ventilated before the Select Committee.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** I'm sure that the Select Committee will consider it. It'll be told by a vet that it's about \$35 a serve.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** I am not aware how much veterinary surgeons charge for this practice, but it seems that a considerable number of animal owners in the community are anxious to co-operate but simply cannot afford the fee. If the fee is nearly as much as the Minister has suggested, namely, \$35 a cut, or whatever is required, it would be beyond the pocket of a large section of the community. I look forward with interest to the Select Committee's findings, and I may even consider appearing before it and seeking to place on record some evidence on this subject.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO** moved:

That a committee be appointed consisting of Messrs. Evans, Harrison, Hemmings, Mathwin, and Virgo; that the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, to adjourn from place to place, and to sit during the recess; the committee to report on August 8.

Motion carried.

## CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

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

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

Leave granted.

### Explanation of Bill

It makes miscellaneous amendments to the Crown Lands Act and it will be convenient to explain it in terms of its various clauses. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3

amends section 9 of the principal Act which sets out the powers of the Minister. This clause empowers the Minister to develop and connect services to Crown lands for any residential, commercial, industrial or other purpose. To meet demand, particularly in country areas, the Lands Department must provide subdivided land for various purposes but has no authority, except in irrigation areas, to develop and service these subdivisions to the degree required of private developers under the Planning and Development Act. Justifiably, this generally attracts criticism from local governing authorities and appears inequitable to private developers.

Clause 4 amends section 53 of the principal Act by extending the Minister's present authority to resume leasehold land. This clause is to be read in conjunction with clause 19 of the Bill. In most localities there are insufficient vacant Crown lands available which are suitable for subdivision and development to meet the increasing needs of the community for serviced residential, industrial and commercial sites. It is therefore necessary to either resume leasehold land or acquire freehold property. Currently, resumption is permitted only where the land is required for mining, for public purposes or for sites for towns. Freehold land can be acquired in terms of section 260 of the principal Act provided it is proclaimed a town pursuant to that Act, but such action is often impractical. The principal Act provides for the payment of compensation in both cases.

Clauses 5 to 19 amend various sections of Part VIII of the principal Act which relates to the Lyrup Village Settlement. Clause 5 amends section 85 of the principal Act by extending membership of the Lyrup Village Association from lessees of horticultural blocks only to all lessees of land within the district subject to qualification by the rules of the association. The effect of this amendment is that all lessees who are supplied with water in commercial quantities will have a say in the administration of the association. However, where a lease is held by two or more persons, this clause restricts membership to the lessee whose name appears first in the lease.

Clause 6 amends section 87 of the principal Act which requires that land within the district can be set apart only for horticultural or commonage purposes or for irrigation headworks. It is considered expedient that certain land within the district be made available for leasing for caravan park purposes while other land could be set aside for recreation or other purposes.

The present requirement whereby the Minister shall cause the lands to be subdivided in a specified manner is no longer applicable. The clause makes provision for land within the area to be used for any purpose and for any subdivision of the land to be approved by the Minister.

Clause 7 provides for amendments to section 88a of the principal Act which are consequential to earlier provisions in this Bill relating to extended membership of the association, the use of the land for purposes other than horticulture, commonage and irrigation works, and to subdivision of the land. The clause also deletes other redundant provisions. Clause 8 repeals sections 90 to 93 of the principal Act. These sections refer to valuations which were carried out many years ago following the original subdivision of the area and have no further application.

Clause 9 makes further consequential amendments to section 94 of the principal Act and strikes out unnecessary provisions. Clause 10 repeals the unnecessary provisions of section 95 of the principal act. Clause 11 makes further consequential amendments resulting from extended land usage as provided earlier in this Bill.

Clause 12 repeals sections 97 and 98 of the principal Act. These sections refer to payment of the amounts of the

valuations referred to previously and, as payment has been completed, they are now redundant.

Clause 13 makes more consequential amendments due to the earlier provisions which lift restrictions on land use. Clause 14 repeals section 100 of the principal Act. This section deals with the execution of leases and sufficient provision is made elsewhere in the Act to ensure that any new leases are signed by the appropriate party. Clause 15 is necessary due to the new provisions relating to the eligibility of membership of the association.

Clauses 16 and 17 are complementary. Section 104 of the principal Act mainly refers to the association's management of the irrigation works but it also empowers the association to charge its members for the use of those works. However, no authority is provided whereby the association can make a charge on its members and the occupiers of land within the district to offset the administrative and other expenses incurred. Clause 16 deletes the reference in section 104 of the principal Act to the charge which can currently be made for any use of the irrigation works. Clause 17 enacts section 106 of the principal Act. This section not only provides the authority for the association to make various charges and require the payment of contributions from its members and other occupiers, but it also provides the necessary machinery to recover any outstanding amounts.

Clause 18 amends section 107a of the principal Act to provide the association with further financial assistance by way of a grant of \$15 600. This grant is to enable the association to complete the rehabilitation of the irrigation headworks and to assist with the provision of main drain facilities and the upgrading of the domestic water supply. Clause 19 inserts a new section 228aa in the principal Act intended to ensure that all lands developed by the Minister under paragraph (1a) of section 9 are disposed of as freehold land.

Clause 20 is complementary to clause 4 and extends the provisions of section 260 of the principal Act to authorise the acquisition of freehold land for development as residential and other sites. Clause 21 amends section 271d of the principal Act to enable owners of freehold land encumbered by a registered lease to transfer that land to the Minister of Lands. Prior to the introduction of the Planning and Development Act, 1966, owners of freehold land who were unable to obtain approval to subdivide their land into separate allotments were able to achieve much the same result by selling long term leases, up to 999 years, for a lump sum. In many instances holiday homes have since been erected on the land contained in these leases. Upon registration of the leases in the Lands Titles Office, the lessees, for all practical purposes, became the owners of the land. In order to overcome the problems relating to the payment of land tax, clause 21 further provides that these lessees shall be liable for the payment of land tax as if the leases were perpetual leases. The clause also provides that the Minister shall succeed to the rights and obligations of the original lessors and may recover any outstanding rates or taxes from the lessees.

Clause 22 enacts section 271e of the principal Act. In terms of the Irrigation Act, land may be withdrawn from an irrigation area by proclamation. However, there is no existing machinery whereby leases issued pursuant to any of the Irrigation Acts can be converted to leases issued in terms of the Crown Lands Act following any such proclamation. Clause 22 provides the authority for the cancellation of irrigation leases and the issue of new dry lands leases where land ceases to form part of an irrigation area. It also provides for the new lease to be issued subject to all interests which were registered on the cancelled lease. Clause 23 extends the provisions of section 288 of

the principal Act. The clause provides for the making of regulations whereby fees can be levied against lessees to offset the costs incurred in collecting rents and maintaining tenure records and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSACK secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### NARCOTIC AND PSYCHOTROPIC DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from March 21. Page 2394.)

Mr. WILSON (Torrens): In his second reading explanation, the Minister said that the Bill sought to amend the principal Act in two minor respects. That may well be so but, if urgency is a measure of importance, these amendments are certainly not minor.

The Bill seeks to correct an anomaly concerning the regulation-making powers under the principal Act. What has happened is that certain regulations already in force (and I do not intend to canvass them now) may, because of previous amendments, now be subject to challenge. I have contacted the Health Department and officers in the Public Health Department, and they have assured me of the urgency of this measure. I do not have to spell out the importance of the measure, when one considers what type of drugs are controlled under the principal Act.

The Bill also seeks to streamline the parent Act by deleting section 7 (2), which is antiquated by present-day standards. The final amendment merely allows for the fact that, as regards the power of entry or inspection, upon the advent of the Health Commission, its employees will cease to be officers of the Public Service. The Opposition supports the Bill and will co-operate to give it a speedy passage.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare): I record my thanks to the member for Torrens, especially in regard to the sensible and sensitive manner in which he has handled certain aspects of the Bill.

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

#### ROADS (OPENING AND CLOSING) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from March 21. Page 2395.)

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I have had a chance to look at the second reading explanation and I have spoken to my colleagues in the other place about this Bill. There is no problem about members on this side of the House supporting it. The only relevant portions of the Bill, apart from a few formalities, are to allow the Government to acknowledge road openings and closings without the signature of the Governor being required. It is a speeding up procedure that has been carefully investigated by my colleagues in another place. With their assurance, and after my rather quick perusal of the second reading explanation, the Opposition is prepared to support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Duties of Surveyor-General on receiving plans."

Mr. CHAPMAN: The requirement of the Governor to

sign documents was cited in the second reading explanation, and those particular clauses clearly indicate the procedure to be adopted in future. I repeat, it does seek to speed up, quite properly, the official closing and opening of roads and the acquisition of land by the respective authorities as a result of closing roads. The Opposition supports that move.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (9 to 23) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier)** moved:

That the Standing and Sessional Orders be so far suspended as to enable Orders of the Day, Other Business, to be taken into consideration forthwith and to enable in each instance, where proceedings have reached such a stage, the question to be put forthwith without further debate.

Motion carried.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Hemmings:

That this House condemns the Federal Government for deploying large numbers of Social Security Department staff on "dole blitz" duties at a time when thousands of genuinely unemployed continue to suffer unnecessary delays in receiving unemployment benefit entitlements.

(Continued from March 1. Page 1868.)

Motion carried.

#### UNLEY TRAFFIC

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That the Regulations under the Road Traffic Act relating to Traffic Prohibition (Unley), made on the 27th October, 1977 and laid on the table of this House on the 1st November, 1977, be disallowed—(February 15, 22, March 1)—(Mr. Mathwin).

(Continued from March 1. Page 1872.)

Motion negatived.

#### ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Gunn:

That in the opinion of the House the provisions of paragraph (c) of section 83 of the Constitution Act unduly inhibit the Electoral Commission in making an electoral distribution and accordingly these provisions should be repealed.

(Continued from March 1. Page 1877.)

Motion negatived.

#### ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Groom:

That this House commends the State Government for continually refusing to permit extensions of the Adelaide Airport beyond its present boundaries and for its insistence that the present flying time curfew be retained and obeyed.

Which Mr. Becker had moved to amend by leaving out the word "Government" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "members of Parliament concerned" and by leaving out the word "its" second occurring, and inserting in lieu thereof the word "their".

(Continued from March 1. Page 1878.)

The House divided on the amendment:

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

Noes (25)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, and Broomhill, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan, Dunstan, Groom (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, Klunder, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mrs. Adamson. No—Mr. Max Brown.

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; motion carried.

#### CADET CORPS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Mathwin:

That this House congratulates the Federal Fraser Government for re-establishing the Army Cadet Corps and in particular for the formation of the first open unit in Australia, viz., the Warradale 27th Cadet Unit, giving great benefits to those young people who feel inclined to take this advantage.

(Continued from March 1. Page 1878.)

The House divided on the motion:

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

Noes (25)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, and Broomhill, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan, Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally (teller), Klunder, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mrs. Adamson. No—Mr. Max Brown.

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Slater:

That this House condemns the economic policies of the Federal Government in creating widespread unemployment within the Australian community, particularly affecting the young people seeking to enter the Australian work force.

(Continued from February 15. Page 1561.)

Motion carried.

#### ELECTORAL DISTRIBUTION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Gunn:

That in the opinion of the House the South Australian Constitution Act should be amended to allow people who wish to appeal against the findings of the Electoral Commissioners to lodge an appeal with the commissioners



and that the commissioners shall take into consideration any such appeals before making their final judgment in relation to redistribution of electoral boundaries.  
(Continued from February 15. Page 1567.)

Motion negated.

### INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Dean Brown:

That this House expresses grave concern at the attempts by the State Government to introduce industrial democracy to further the cause of socialist politics rather than to improve job consultation and participation to achieve better human relations within industry.

(Continued from February 22. Page 1723.)

The House divided on the motion:

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

Noes (25)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon (teller), and Broomhill, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan, Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hoggood, Hudson, Keneally, Klunder, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mrs. Adamson. No—Mr. Max Brown.  
Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Enfield Community Welfare Centre,  
Lonsdale-Hallett Cove Trunk Sewers Scheme.

Ordered that reports be printed.

### CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 2465.)

**Mr. RUSSACK (Goyder):** The Opposition supports this measure which covers some miscellaneous amendments to the Crown Lands Act and which varies certain provisions in order to assist local government in relation to the subdivision of land. Mainly, it provides for the Lyrup Village Association. I do not wish to say anything concerning that matter, as the member for Chaffey will deal with that.

Apparently there is a need for land to be acquired by the Government in certain areas, and it will then be prepared for redistribution and for sale. I understand that it will be for residential purposes in a freehold state. The measure concerning the Lyrup Village Association has been wanted for a long time. It is necessary for the Bill to pass before this session closes.

**Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** I support the Bill. Principally it deals with amendments relating to the Lyrup Village

Association, but it also makes a number of other amendments to the Crown Lands Act, particularly in relation to Crown lands. Within the Lands Department irrigation areas, the department and the Minister of Lands have the authority for subdivision and for making available all areas of land for residential, industrial, and other purposes.

There has been a restriction outside Lands Department irrigation areas in relation to Crown lands. This measure will eliminate that restriction and make it much easier for subdivision for those purposes. Principally, clauses 5 to 19 deal with the Lyrup Village Association. In the past, that association has had a number of restrictions on its activities. It is on a different basis from the other irrigation trusts that have been established in South Australia, since it is referred to in the Crown Lands Act. Separate Acts relating to the Renmark Irrigation Trust, the Pyap irrigation area, and other areas.

These amendments will enable greater administrative flexibility for the Lyrup Village Association, enabling the village to provide land for caravan parks and other purposes. The measure will also give residents of the area who are involved in the activities of the district and ratepayers of the Lyrup Village Association a voice in the administration of that association. That is an important provision. Most of the provisions in the Bill have been sought by the association for a considerable period. It is necessary that those provisions proceed.

Clause 18 is an important provision, since it provides for an additional grant of \$15 600 to the Lyrup Village Association for the completion of the upgrading of its irrigation headworks. I am pleased that the Bill has reached this House before the Parliament rises. People in the Lyrup area will, in the main, be satisfied with the provisions that have been provided in the Bill, as they are in the interests of the district concerned.

**Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee):** I support what the member for Chaffey has said. I represented Lyrup for seven years until the last redistribution. During that period problems arose as a result of the Lyrup Village Association falling within the Crown Lands Act, whereas all the other settlements along the river were given a degree of autonomy and independence. In some ways that inclusion helped the Lyrup Village Association when it came to the installation of its new irrigation scheme, because the Government provided a large grant to the association for that purpose. The association was thereby able to update its irrigation system and, I think, probably put itself on a far better footing in that sense than since the inception of the scheme.

There have been many problems as a result of the common ownership of land. There have been arguments and threatened litigation over the ownership of capital improvements other than the land. When the original association was formed certain people were named as members of the association. At this time, the only survivor of those original association members, has tended to take advantage of that situation, as he believes that in some way he is the sole owner of all those capital works. I understand that legislation that has been passed previously has clarified that situation. The Lyrup Village Association has been seeking this measure for a long time. I am pleased that it has been introduced because it will put into effect the wishes of the association in giving it an extra degree of autonomy that it has needed in order to administer adequately its affairs. I would support the Bill even if it related only to that aspect. I have not considered the other aspects of the Bill. These amendments are long overdue and will be greatly appreciated by the village

association. I strongly support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Special powers of the Minister."

**Mr. RUSSACK:** Until now the Lands Department has had the right to dispose of land but not the authority to do so as a private subdivider would do it, by establishing the various services. Does this clause give the Crown the right to do that, or will the department just sell land in its natural state?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works):** There has been criticism in the past that the Lands Department, which has provided subdivided land for sale, has not had to meet the same requirements as private developers must meet and that therefore the department was at an advantage. That procedure was an encumbrance on local councils because they were left to provide the sorts of thing that would normally be provided by a private developer under the Planning and Development Act. This clause rectifies that situation and the department will now be required to do the same as a public developer is required to do.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 17 passed.

Clause 18—"Advances to association."

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

To insert clause 18.

It is necessary for me to move this motion because the Bill was introduced in another place and contained money clauses, which are set out in erased type.

Clause inserted.

Clause 19—"Certain lands to be sold at auction."

**Mr. RUSSACK:** This clause was inserted in another place, and I understand that it removes the possibility of leaseholding. Does it give approval so that a person can purchase the land by auction, on cash terms, or by calling for applications for agreement to purchase? Can the Minister explain the true intent of the clause?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The purpose of the amendment is to ensure that, where any land is developed and serviced by the Government under the provisions of this Act, eventually the purchaser of that land must obtain a freehold title.

Clause passed.

Clause 20 passed.

Clause 21—"Transfer of land to Minister."

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

To insert clause 21.

Clause inserted.

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

Page 5—After line 17 insert paragraph as follows:

(ba) by striking out subsection (7) and inserting in lieu thereof the following subsection:

(7) In this section—

"certificate of title" includes land grant:

"unencumbered" in relation to land means

unencumbered by any registered—

(a) mortgage;

(b) charge;

(c) lease; or

(d) encumbrance of any other kind, whether statutory or otherwise.

The reason for the amendment is that it was not clear in the existing clause whether or not these mortgages, charges, leases, etc., were registered, and the amendment puts this matter beyond doubt.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (22 and 23) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

*Later:*

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendments.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL, 1978

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

Consideration in Committee of the recommendations of the conference.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government):** I move:

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to. First, the conference was one of the most co-operative conferences I have had the pleasure to sit on, and I express appreciation for the attitude of the other managers. The end result was that a conclusion was reached that was fairly satisfactory to all concerned.

Amendment No. 1 sought to prevent a petition's being reconsidered for five years after a petition had been dealt with; in other words, there was to have been a five-year moratorium. Whilst I am not unsympathetic towards the thinking behind a proposition of that nature, I am far from sure that such a proposition would be desirable; in fact, it could well work against the very interests it was seeking to protect. What I assured the conference, and what I want reported in *Hansard*, is that my officers will thoroughly investigate the difficulty that prompted the amendment's coming forward, to see whether we can find a way of preventing unnecessary repetitive petitions being presented.

Amendment No. 2 sought to decrease from 15 per cent to 10 per cent the number of people required to petition. Following discussion, the Legislative Council's managers agreed that they would not persist with that alteration. As a result, the 15 per cent will remain. Amendment No. 3 was the Legislative Council's proposal to reduce to 20 per cent the present 40 per cent required to defeat a proposition. The compromise, which is obvious, was 30 per cent, and that compromise was reached.

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5 were to clauses that sought to restrict the Local Government Advisory Commission's activities, whereas the spirit of the Bill was to broaden the area in which the commission could operate. The Legislative Council is not now further insisting on that in the light of the rearrangement of the 40 per cent to 30 per cent.

Amendment No. 9 was the reduction from 15 per cent to 10 per cent and, in keeping with amendment No. 2, that is not now being pressed by the Legislative Council. Amendment No. 10 was again the 40 per cent to 20 per cent argument, whereas 30 per cent prevailed.

Amendment No. 11 was to require the Minister to report to the Parliament, under the original Bill, within 10 days. The amendment moved both by the member for Goyder in this House and by a member in the Legislative Council was to make it within three sitting days. We reached agreement by tossing the coin, I think, and came down with five, which is quite satisfactory.

Amendment No. 15 restricted the third person being appointed to the audit committee to being a person who must not be employed within the State Public Service. The Legislative Council, after explanation and discussion, agreed not to proceed with that amendment. Amendment No. 24 required a petition to be presented the day following a meeting of ratepayers. It has to be presented the following day. The Legislative Council sought to amend that to within 14 days and the agreement that was

reached was to make it within 10 days. Finally, the 20 per cent to 40 per cent problem in amendment No. 26 was resolved by fixing 30 per cent, as it was in amendments Nos. 3 and 10.

When we discussed the question of the percentages, I drew attention to the fact that it was desirable that there should be a degree of consistency. Section 45a, deals with amalgamations. Where the consent of two councils is required, to defeat them there must be a poll, and those opposing the amalgamations must be not less than 40 per cent. I am anxious to try to keep some degree of uniformity in this area. We have now introduced another factor because of the figure of 30 per cent and, whilst it is not possible in these amendments and this report to amend section 45a, I gave the conference an undertaking that I now repeat that, on the next occasion the Local Government Act is before the House, I will seek to amend section 45a so that it conforms with the agreement we reached at the conference.

**Mr. RUSSACK:** I support the remarks of the Minister in saying that it was a congenial and good conference. He mentioned that members were co-operative at the conference. I believe that the Minister was co-operative, too. On this occasion it was a well conducted conference, with the Minister in the chair. I think both points of view were presented with an understanding of what was wanted. I am sure that there was consideration of the other side's points of view. The outcome was a well accepted compromise.

In relation to the amendment moved by another place to the effect that, after there had been a decision made, there should be a five year moratorium, although this amendment was not accepted, the Minister said that he would consider the matter at a future time, and he mentioned that this afternoon.

Regarding polls and petitions and the percentage regarded to get a result from those polls, the figure has now been made 30 per cent. The Minister said that, when the Local Government Act was again considered in this place, he would do something about amending section 45a to bring it in line with the other provisions by bringing it back from 40 per cent to 30 per cent.

The conference was a profitable experience and I am sure that the Bill will now improve the Act and will enable local government to continue with the progress that it is making. There is no doubt that local government in South Australia is on the upgrade. When things are not considered by the Opposition to be correct, we will make our presence felt as effectively as possible. I believe that, if we can experience the co-operation this conference experienced, local government will be all the better for it.

**Mr. HARRISON:** As one of the managers of the conference, I support what has already been said. We are not hard to get on with, particularly when common sense prevails.

**Dr. EASTICK:** I would like to indicate my support for the decisions taken and point out that there are those two areas still to be discussed. In particular, I highlight the position relating to the frequency with which approaches, attacks, annexations, cessations, come what may, can be made in a particular council area. I believe that everyone at the conference was sympathetic to the problems that the Munno Para council has experienced in recent times. They recognised that the approaches made to them have been from a variety of sources and that on occasions the reason for the approach has been entirely different from the previous reason.

That council, because of the number of attacks on it over the past three years, has had to spend an inordinate period of time in counteracting the approaches that have

been made. It has had to spend a considerable amount of ratepayers' funds to protect its position and, whilst it has been successful and whilst many people in that area are happy with its success, it has still been a cost against better local government. I am not suggesting that I am not sympathetic to the case that has been put by several of the other councils and individual groups which have made representations. Most certainly, it is a matter which needs to be considered in a balanced way. I accept the Minister's undertaking that this matter will be considered in some depth and, if there can be written into the Act a degree of protection for all local governing bodies in the future, this place will have the opportunity of considering that matter.

I refer to the reduction from 10 days to five days of the period within which the Minister must advise the Parliament of any action taken under the defaulting council clause. The Minister has been quite open throughout the debate, indicating that, although 10 days was the period specified in the Bill, it was necessarily the best time. The compromise reached was not unreasonable. The important issue is not the number of days in which the report will be made but the clear recognition by future Ministers that the earlier a report is made to the Parliament the less likely are we to have untoward motions, questions, grievances, and so on, from the Opposition of the day.

Whilst accepting the five-day maximum, I expect that in normal circumstances, unless the event had been so recent that it was impossible for the Minister to lay on the details on the first day of sitting, Parliament could expect to see the laying on of that information without delay. That would be in the best interests of local government. The Minister accepts the point, and a realistic approach is necessary. I am sure that that can be expected from the present Minister and from any future Ministers. Local government will benefit from the measures contained in the Bill, and anything which advances the cause of local government, when the demands on it are ever increasing, is a worthwhile improvement. I support the motion.

Motion carried.

[Sitting suspended from 4.58 to 10.32 p.m.]

#### OUTBACK AREAS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TRUST BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:

Page 5 (clause 15)—After line 15 insert subclauses as follows:

- (3) A regulation shall not be made for the purposes of subsection (2) of this section unless the Minister has certified—
  - (a) that a notice prepared by the Minister setting out the substance and effect of the proposed regulation was published in a newspaper circulating throughout the area at least one month before the proposed date of the making of the regulation:
  - and
  - (b) that the Minister has considered the objections (if any) made to him in relation to the proposed regulation.
- (4) A regulation made for the purposes of subsection (2) of this section shall come into force—
  - (a) upon the day next following the day on which the time for disallowance of the regulation expires;

or

(b) upon the day fixed in the regulation as the day on which it will come into force, whichever is the later.

Consideration in Committee.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government):** I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to. The amendment inserts two subclauses, both of which are acceptable to the Government.

**Mr. GUNN:** The Opposition supports the amendment. The Legislative Council has again proved the great value of having two Houses of Parliament by the enlightened amendment which it has put forward and which will give further protection to my constituents in the North of the State. I sincerely hope that the whole measure will benefit those people.

Motion carried.

#### NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### ART GALLERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2), 1978

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 4, line 4 (clause 5)—Leave out "on a specified day".

No. 2. Page 6, line 7 (clause 8)—After "against" insert "a regulation under Part XXIIA of".

Consideration in Committee.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government):** I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to. These are minor amendments, which will have no detrimental effect on the Bill.

Motion carried.

#### PROROGATION

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier):** I move:

That the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday, May 2, 1978.

In so moving, I pay a tribute to the people who have served the Parliament and its members during this session. First, I refer to the Clerks at the table. They have a difficult and exacting task, which is not made easier at times because we tend to chop and change. Only this afternoon I saw certain people trying valiantly to record what was happening in the Chamber.

I especially appreciate the advice and service I have been given by the Clerk of this House, Aubrey Dodd. He has been a most valuable adviser, especially to me as Leader of the House. I want him to know—and I know that he will pass some of this on to his staff—that I appreciate very much indeed the cordial relationship I

have had with him and the service he has provided to me. I want to mention, too, the Joint House Committee and the catering staff.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** Some of the members of the committee are dubious.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** They do give us some trouble occasionally. They annoy me intensely by putting up the price of beer from time to time, and at times they close the bar a little early! With every other member of this House, I pay a tribute to the Joint House Committee, and particularly to the catering staff, to Evelyn Stengert and the girls under her control. She does her work very well, and she and her staff provide a tremendous service to members. I am sure that every member of this place would openly express appreciation of the work of the catering staff under the control of the Joint House Committee.

One thing we can do to reward Evelyn Stengert for her great service—and the suggestion was made not by me but by the Leader of Opposition, and it is a suggestion with which I readily agree—is to see to it that she can go overseas to see what happens in other Houses of Parliament, and bring back to this House the results of what she sees. I do not think she can improve the position, but I think, because of the service she has given us, she should be able to make the trip, and I am sure the Leader of the Opposition would agree.

The Library staff have demonstrated to every member their dedication and readiness to assist any member with any query. I include, of course, members of the research staff who assist in every way possible to make our task easier. I express to them my grateful thanks.

I want now to talk about *Hansard*, that wonderful bunch of people who make sense out of our speeches, and who do such a magnificent job. When I read in *Hansard* what I have said, I know that I could not possibly have put it as well as it appears in the report. I am most grateful to them all.

Whilst dealing with *Hansard*, I wish to mention George Hill especially. I remind all honourable members that on March 28, at 3.30 p.m., a presentation will be made to George Hill on his retirement. It will be made by Don Banfield, from another place, and I hope that every member from this Chamber will try to be available on that occasion.

There is no doubt that George Hill has given outstanding service to this Parliament. He has had almost 46 years of service (I was three years old when he started working). I have the record of George Hill's service, and I will give it to the House, because I think it is important.

George Hill commenced his duties in the Public Service in May, 1932, as a Junior Clerk in the office of the Commissioner of Public Works. (I guess he was lucky that I was not the Minister of Works then.) He served as a Clerk in other departments until, in 1945, he was appointed Clerk and Reporter in the Industrial Court. In July, 1947, he was appointed to the position of *Hansard* Reporter, and in December, 1959, he became Assistant Leader of the *Hansard* staff, until his appointment as Leader in 1975. For the past 18 years, he has been in charge of the reporting of debates in the Legislative Council. That probably accounts for the fact that he was reported in the *Advertiser* the other day as saying that Ren DeGaris was one of the wittiest members he had encountered.

George Hill is a character. He has a wealth of knowledge of the events of Parliament. He really epitomises the great dedication and assiduous attention that *Hansard* Reporters give to members in this Parliament.

I now come to the messengers. I see one of them now

fussing around the place and doing what he has to do. They perform their duties well and unobtrusively. Bob Harrison's father was here before him. Bob is a credit to his father, who is still going well. I pay a tribute to all the people who have serviced members during this session, and I sincerely trust that every member will join me in expressing to all of those people sincere and grateful thanks for what they have done for us.

**Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition):** Obviously it is with great pleasure that I support the remarks of the Deputy Premier. I also add the thanks of the Opposition to all members of the staff, who have helped to make this a most effective and pleasant Parliament in which to work. I believe that the number of people involved and the number of staff whom we take for granted in this place to make it work so well is amazing. It is very pleasant (although we have appreciated the work they have done) that we have finally gone through a session without having members of the Public Buildings Department putting finishing touches on the renovations that seem to take so long. I believe that they could be back again at some stage, but at least we have not heard the jackhammers working on the walls and throbbing through the building as we have previously.

I am pleased to hear that the bells will be attended to soon. There are a number of people, all of them dedicated to helping members discharge their duties to the community, and the Deputy Premier has referred to them, namely, the officers at the table, people performing administrative and secretarial duties, and our electoral secretaries, all of whom give superb service.

The Parliamentary Counsel (Mr. Daugherty) and his staff deserve our thanks. I predict that Mr. Daugherty will go a long way in the service of the State. We also thank the Parliamentary Library staff, the Librarians and the research officers, the messengers, Miss Stengert (and I was pleased to hear what the Deputy Premier had to say this evening about her), the catering staff, the maintenance officers, and the air-conditioning engineer, who has had to deal with the vagaries of the air-conditioning system, which does not worry Government members as much as it worries Opposition members, because we are much closer to the roof, where it is warmer. All of these people give us tremendous service, and I add my thanks to those expressed by the Deputy Premier. The police officers, who look after us so well on a temporary basis, together with our permanent police officer, do a great job for us.

I pay a particular tribute to the reporting staff and to George Hill, who has been a superb servant of the Parliament and of the public generally. What the Deputy Premier did not say was that some years after George entered the Public Service he applied for the position of Secretary to the Leader of the Opposition (I think the Leader was Bob Richards then), but he was unsuccessful, which may or may not have been a good thing at a turning point in his life; I do not know. He has given tremendous service, particularly in the Industrial Court under Mr. President Morgan (later Sir Edward Morgan). I know that he has had his ups and downs as a *Hansard* Reporter, and even in his most senior position was guilty of dropping a notebook close to the President's head.

There is a story told about him and his dilapidated old car. At one stage, the then Minister of Works (Hon. Malcolm McIntosh) said that he could not park it outside,

because it was so dilapidated that it somewhat detracted from the tone of Parliament House generally. George Hill, being the resourceful fellow he is, had the car spray painted, put a new hood on it, and took great pleasure in parking it next to Mr. McIntosh's car from then on, and the Minister did not object in the slightest way.

George is a member of the Brighton Bowling Club and a keen bowler. He has also become a keen cyclist, and I understand that he will be cycling to Parliament House periodically to keep an eye on things and make sure that everything is going as it should. We wish him well in his retirement, and on behalf of the people of South Australia thank him for his superb record of service to the community.

It has come to my attention today that the Premier's wife is far from well. I express on behalf of the Opposition and of all members the hope that she has a speedy recovery from her illness. In the absence of the person who normally does this, I finally wish everyone a happy and holy Easter.

**The SPEAKER:** I support the remarks of the honourable Deputy Premier and the honourable Leader of the Opposition. Although I have made a few errors during the course of my term in office, I have tried my utmost to do the best I possibly could. I hope that at all times I have satisfied honourable members, but I am unable to do this without the aid of the Clerks of the House and the staff of the House.

Having travelled with the Joint House Committee, I can say that in no way can it be said that the staff of the House of Assembly and of the Legislative Council do not do their job: they do it very well. At times, as with members of Parliament, it becomes difficult for them, but they are always cheerful.

I have had a few ups and downs whilst in the Chair, and I must thank honourable members for the way they have treated me during this session. I hope that we will all be friends for the next two sessions. All in all, I thank all honourable members for the way they have treated me. I do not want to mention all the staff, who are first-class, and it is a wonderful thing to be able to work with them.

George Hill, during the bowling season, played bowls with the Parliamentary team after we allowed presiding officers to play, and he enjoyed playing. He has been here for a number of years, and I have always found him considerate and willing to move towards something better. I think all honourable members will notice that during the course of this Parliament changes have been made in the *Hansard* pulls. This has been brought about by George coming to us and asking, "Can we do this?" I must report that I am told this has saved us \$50 000.

I hope that all honourable members will enjoy the recess and come back full of vigour. After they have had that rest, I would like to see the same faces back again for the next session.

Motion carried.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 11.12 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, May 2, at 2 p.m.