

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

21 April 1978

Tuesday 15 August 1978

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

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following written answers to questions on notice and questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: questions on notice Nos. 1, 56, 73, 133, 217, 224, 225, 251, 254, 262, 263, 272, 282, 290, 294, 296, 300, 329, 331, 332, 334, 337, 344, 346, 347, 350 to 356, 359 to 364, 366 to 371, 385 to 388, 393, 394, 398, and 404.

INDUSTRY ASSISTANCE

1. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. How many companies made application for assistance from the Industries Development Corporation during each of the financial years 1974-75 to 1977-78 and what number received support?

2. What is the name of each of the companies which received support during the period 1st July, 1974 to date and what is the nature and amount of support either by guarantee or otherwise?

3. Have full financial statements relative to the trading arrangements of each of the supported industries been provided regularly since the assistance has been operative and to whom is the report directed for assessment and either acceptance or question?

4. If any client organisation has failed to lodge any financial statements, which are they, and what particular action has been taken or is being taken in each case?

5. Are any of the supported operations suspect as to continuing viability, management skill or general conduct and, if so, which are they and what are the specific details?

6. What amounts of money have become payable by the Government since the inception of the scheme and what are the individual details of the amounts, the date, the name of the company and the circumstances leading to the Government having become responsible for the payment?

7. How many, if any, companies have prematurely discharged the Government from further responsibility at any time from 1st July, 1975 to date, which are they and what has been the reason in each case for the companies changed circumstances which has permitted the earlier than expected improvement?

8. Have any businesses previously under an arrangement of guarantee discharged the guarantee by having been financially accommodated by either—

- (a) the State Bank of South Australia;
- (b) The Savings Bank of South Australia; or
- (c) the State Government Insurance Commission; and, if so, what are the details?

9. Have any companies which changed from a guarantee situation to having been accommodated by a Government instrumentality entered into receivership or liquidation since obtaining the alternative financing facilities and, if so, which are they and what are the details?

The **Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN**: The information sought by the honourable member was given in the letter forwarded to him by the Acting Premier on 21 April 1978 (in answer to question on notice No. 497), as follows:

Dear Dr. Eastick,

In the absence of the Premier I forward the following reply to your Question on Notice (No. 497) regarding the Industries Development Committee.

I assume that the reference to Industries Development Corporation means the South Australian Development Corporation. I have previously stated in answer to questions of this nature that details of arrangements between the Corporation and its clients, in common with other responsible lending institutions, should be confidential between the parties involved. It is important that businesses seeking financial assistance can be assured their approach will be treated in confidence for obvious reasons. It would be quite improper for me to make public judgments on the financial stability or management capability of companies in receipt of assistance. Detailed investigations of these aspects are carried out prior to assistance being granted and recipients are continually monitored during the currency of such assistance.

On that basis the following specific answers are provided.

1.	Year	Applications	
		Received	Approvals Given
	1974-75	53	21
	1975-76	26	11
	1976-77	27	14
	1977-78 (to date)	47	6

2. This information is considered confidential for the reasons expressed earlier.

3. The degree to which recipients of assistance are required to report varies with each case. All are required to furnish annual accounts and most are required to report at more frequent intervals.

Additionally, in many cases, consultants are in regular contact with recipients and report back regularly. In other cases, directors may have been appointed by the Corporation to the Boards of the companies and they furnish regular reports to the Corporation.

Financial reports provided by companies are examined by officers of the Corporation. If further detailed examination appears warranted, outside consultants may be retained to conduct detailed examinations and report back to the Board of the Corporation.

4. No client organisation has failed to lodge financial statements when requested.

5. Many companies which come to the Corporation for assistance have liquidity problems or suffer from inadequate management. Where the Corporation is satisfied as to their profitability or potential to become profitable it recommends assistance which in some cases may only be the injection of management expertise.

I am unable to nominate these organisations for the reasons given earlier.

6. A few companies in receipt of assistance have gone into receivership or liquidation since the Corporation was established in 1971. Those where a loss has been incurred or is anticipated to be incurred are listed below.

Company	Situation
Zeke McCoy Pty. Ltd.	\$6 000 loss incurred.
Ceramic Tilemakers Ltd.	Receivership still in progress. (A loss of over \$200 000 anticipated.)
O.D.L. Pty. Ltd.	\$30 000 loss anticipated.
Forelental Trout Farm	\$15 000 loss anticipated.

These probable losses represent a very small proportion of the total amount loaned by the Corporation (over \$5m) since its inception.

Your attention is also drawn to the Auditor-General's Report in which information on these matters is contained.

7. Four companies have repaid their loans ahead of schedule since 1 July 1975.

The reasons are as follows:

1. Refinancing on more favourable terms.
2. Surplus of cash due to success of business.
3. Sale of business.
4. Death of owner on whom Corporation had a keyman insurance policy.

8. It is not believed that any companies in receipt of guarantees have discharged the guarantee by being accommodated by either the State Bank, The Savings Bank of S.A., or S.G.I.C. No absolute assurance can be given on this point, however, without a detailed examination of each company which has discharged its guarantee and cross-checking with each institution mentioned.

9. See 8. above.

In regard to item 1, I am now able to advise the final figures for 1977-78, viz., 55 applications received and 11 approvals given.

TRADESMEN'S STATISTICS

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

1. Do the records available to the Minister's department show that workmen's compensation for bricklayers, carpenters, plasterers, and labourers cost 4.7 per cent of pay in the first quarter of 1971, and that for the second quarter of 1977 the cost was 19 per cent of pay, and, if not, what do the records show?

2. Do those records show that for plumbers the cost was 3.8 per cent of pay in the first quarter of 1971, that for the second quarter of 1977 the cost was 12.4 per cent of pay, and that for painters it rose from 2.4 per cent in 1971 to 8.9 per cent in 1977 and, if not, what do the records show?

3. Do the records available to the department show that pay-roll tax payable on wages earned by bricklayers, carpenters, plasterers, labourers, plumbers and painters was 2.5 per cent of pay in the first quarter of 1971 and 5 per cent of pay in the second quarter of 1977 and, if not, what do the records show?

4. Do those records also show that annual leave payable to those tradespersons and labourers was 120 hours pay a year in the first quarter of 1971 and 160 hours pay a year in the second quarter of 1977 and, if not, what do the records show?

5. Do those records also show that in the first quarter of 1971 the annual leave loading was nil and that in the second quarter of 1977 it was 17½ per cent of 160 hours pay a year and, if not, what do the records show?

6. Do the records available to the department show that the sick leave entitlement for tradespersons and labourers in the building industry was 64 hours pay a year in the first quarter of 1971 and that in the second quarter of 1977 the sick leave entitlement was 80 hours pay a year and, if not, what do the records show?

7. Do those records show that the long service leave entitlement for those persons in the first quarter of 1971 showed an average a year of 34.7 hours, in those few cases where entitlement was established, and that in the second quarter of 1977 it was 52 hours average a year paid by the Long Service Leave Board to all employees, the leave being portable and, if not, what do the records show?

8. Do those records also show that in the first quarter of 1971 there was negligible provision for long service leave due to few workers gaining entitlement, and that for the second quarter of 1977 it was 2½ per cent of pay and, if not, what do the records show?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows: I am not sure to which records the honourable member is referring. However, my colleague, the Minister of Labour and Industry, has given the following response in respect of entitlements of workers in the building trade categories referred to in the question.

1. The honourable member will recall that the premium rates for workmen's compensation insurance are negotiated in accordance with a number of factors included among which are:

- (a) the nature of the industry and the occupation of employees;
- (b) post claims experience;
- (c) the total wage bill of the employer.

It must also be remembered that the premium rates recommended by the Insurance Council of Australia are advisory only and subject to negotiation. It is therefore misleading for the honourable member to quote precise percentages as he has in his question.

2. See (1) above.

3. Yes.

4. Yes.

5. Yes.

6. Yes.

7. Yes. In addition, it must be emphasised that prior to the introduction of the requirement of the 2½ per cent levy, prudent employers would have made provisions covering at least this amount for future long service leave commitments.

HEATHFIELD TREATMENT WORKS

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

1. What action does the Environment Department propose to take in regard to the environmental effects of discharging treated effluent into the Sturt River from the proposed new sewage treatment works at Heathfield?

2. What plans has the Government to ensure that the headworks planned for this new plant are the most up-to-date possible, with due regard to the latest studies done overseas, in view of their long-term use?

3. What plans have been made to ensure that there is maximum use, and re-use, of the valuable resources present in community wastes?

4. What plans have been made to ensure that the supply of such an amenity to hills-dwellers in the Stirling, Stirling East, Aldgate, Bridgewater and Piccadilly areas, will not lead to over-population in this scenic and valuable area which comprises some of the catchment areas for the reservoirs which supply Adelaide's drinking water?

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

1. The Environment Department is presently monitoring the water quality and the natural environment. Monitoring will continue when the works begin operation.

2. The latest technology will be incorporated using the expertise gained by departmental officers visiting overseas establishments, the study of published literature and information supplied from manufacturers of process equipment.

3. Effluent will be available for use direct from the stream. The availability of sludge for various uses is being investigated.

4. Even without the sewerage scheme it is anticipated that the area will ultimately become completely developed. The sewerage scheme will ensure that present and future community liquid wastes are removed from the catchment so that the water resource is adequately protected.

GOVERNMENT NURSERIES

133. Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How much has been spent on public advertising of Government nurseries?

2. How is this cost made up?

3. Why has this advertising been undertaken?

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

1. By the Woods and Forests Department 1977-78, \$10 547. By the Environment Department, nil.

2. By the Woods and Forests Department:

	\$
Television advertisements	12
Press advertisements	7 287
Telephone directories	2 096
Poster "Let's Plant Trees"	1 152

3. To foster an awareness of the value of trees to the community and inform the public of nursery services provided by the Woods and Forests Department.

LEASES

217. Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. What is the policy of the Government towards applications by people who wish to convert:

(a) miscellaneous leases to perpetual; and

(b) perpetual leases to freehold,

and what are the present charges and fees applicable if approval is granted in each case?

2. Is it possible to alter pastoral leases which occur in agricultural areas to perpetual leases or freehold and, if so, what fees or charges are applicable?

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

1 (a) Applications to convert miscellaneous leases of rural lands to perpetual leases are generally approved where:

1. there is no foreseeable government or public use for the land;
2. the land is of an adequate area for the locality or it can be worked with other land held by the lessee and the combined area becomes an adequate area;
3. the lessee is actively using the land or a satisfactory degree of development compatible with existing or potential land use has been undertaken to prove his bona fides; and
4. there is no continuing need to restrict land use, e.g., to grazing only, in order to protect the ecological balance of the environment; or
5. where special circumstances exist which justify that action.

The fees applicable to such a transaction are:

Application fee—\$25

Surrender form and registration—\$25

Preparation of new lease and registration—\$24

Stamp duty—\$1 for each \$100 of the rental.

1. (b) Applications to convert perpetual leases to freehold are favourably considered only where:

1. the land is in or adjacent to a town and can be considered as a normal residential, business or industrial site, or;
2. where special circumstances exist which justify that action.

Feeholding of broadacre lands, irrespective of land use is generally not permitted except where the conditions of the lease include a right to purchase.

The fees applicable are:

Application fee—\$25

(no fee charged if lease contains a right to purchase)

Surrender form and registration—\$25

Preparation of land grant and registration—\$35

2. Yes, but not directly. The pastoral lease must first be surrendered and then the land being Crown lands could be allotted under miscellaneous lease in terms of the Crown Lands Act. The Act provides for the surrender of that lease for a Perpetual Lease or freehold. However, in terms of present policy, surrender for freehold would not be permitted and a surrender for perpetual lease would be subject to the restrictions set out in 1 (a).

Both the Pastoral Board and the Land Board would need to be satisfied that any change in tenure was merited having regard to conditions of climate, soils, productive potential, etc., of the subject land.

The fees as set out under 1 (a) would be applied twice, i.e., once for the surrender of the pastoral lease for a miscellaneous lease and again for the surrender of that lease for a perpetual lease.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE

224. Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What was the total cost of telephone calls and rental for Parliament House for the financial year ended 30 June 1977, and the cost to date for the financial year ended 30 June 1978?

2. Has the Government considered control of S.T.D. and trunk calls on all public accessible phones in Parliament House and, if not, why not?

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

1. 1976-77, \$94 508.57, and 1977-78, \$93 172.93.

2. Yes.

GOODS IDENTIFICATION

225. Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Does the Government propose to require retailers using their own brands of goods to be marked with the name of the original manufacturer and packer for easier consumer identification and, if not, why not?

2. If the Government has not examined this suggestion, will it do so forthwith and report its findings to this House as soon as possible?

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

1. Not at this time, as the matter is under consideration by the Trade Practices Commission.

2. Yes.

TRADE PUBLICATION

251. Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. How many copies were produced of the June edition of *The Australian Trader Look Ahead at South Australia* and:

(a) what was the total cost of production; and

(b) how many complimentary copies were distributed?

2. Who has the distribution rights and what commission or monetary return will the distributor receive?

3. Were any departmental employees engaged in the editing, writing or photographic work for the production and, if so:

(a) were they paid for overtime or given direct payment for any of the work carried out; and

(b) what were the names of any such persons?

4. Were advertising fees charged and, if so:
 - (a) what was the total rate for advertising; and
 - (b) who receives the revenue from advertising, the State Government, the publisher or printer?
5. If commission was paid for obtaining the advertising, what was the total amount and by whom was it received?
6. In what parts of the world is it expected that publication will be:
 - (a) sold; and
 - (b) given away?
7. How many people does Exportad Pty. Ltd. employ in South Australia?
8. Why was the publication given to an operator based in an Eastern State to publish?
9. Why was the printing given to the Highlight Printing Co. Pty. Ltd. of Surry Hills, N.S.W.?
10. Who made the decision to give the contract to Exportad Pty. Ltd. and to the Sydney-based printing company?
11. What was the total amount of money paid to Exportad Pty. Ltd. from State Government sources and through advertising, respectively?
12. What was the total amount paid to Highlight Printing Co. Pty. Ltd.?
13. Was the opportunity given to South Australian publishers and printers to produce the publication and if not, will the Government in future encourage South Australian enterprise by doing all in its power to keep such work within the State?
14. What are the conditions for having extra copies of the publication printed if it is considered necessary?

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

The booklet *Look Ahead at South Australia* was produced as a supplement to the *Australian Trader* magazine issue of June 1978. The latter magazine has approximately 6 000 subscribers located in all parts of the world, and most, if not all, have an active interest in international trade. The South Australian supplement was automatically distributed to all subscribers of the *Trader* at nil distribution cost by the publishers.

The Economic Development Department ordered 3 000 additional copies for promotional purposes, and these have been distributed to the Agent-General's Office, all Australian Government Trade Commissioners and Embassies, where they will be made available to inquirers interested in purchasing Australian goods. A few hundred copies have been retained in the department for gratis issue to overseas visitors, trade missions and the like.

It was decided to take advantage of the existing typesetting and layout of the general information section of the booklet to print run-off copies of a 12-page leaflet at a very small cost. Copies (5 000) of this smaller leaflet will be used to answer requests for information on South Australia from a wide variety of sources at a fraction of the cost of preparing a separate booklet. Copies have, for example, already been made available to the Adelaide Convention Bureau for use in promoting South Australia to convention organisers.

The total cost to the Government of \$5 650 is most reasonable when one considers that 6 000 copies have been placed in the hands of overseas buyers and trade agencies, and additional copies are on hand for personal promotional use by State and Federal Government trade and investment representatives. This publication was enthusiastically supported by the State's manufacturing companies who paid for advertising space and who have since reported that they are pleased with the final result.

If a South Australian printer or publisher produces a magazine with such good distribution and of such appeal to overseas buyers as the *Australian Trader*, of course, the

Economic Development Department would be happy to discuss arranging a similar supplement. I repeat this booklet represents excellent value for the costs involved.

1. Two versions of the June 1978 edition of *S.A. Profile*, captioned "Look Ahead at South Australia" were produced. 9 000 copies of version A, containing 64 pages, including 47 full pages of advertising (of which one was subscribed by the Economic Development Department and 4 pages of export trade directory advertisements. 5 000 copies of version B containing 12 pages (being a reprint of version A) with the department's advertisement on the 12th page.

- 1.a. *S.A. Profile* is produced annually by Exportad Pty. Ltd. as a supplement to the *Australian Trader*. This is the sixth year of publication. The Economic Development Department does not pay for production, only for the advertising and editorial pages booked and for the required number of completed copies. It should be noted that the *Australian Trader* is published by Exportad and printed by its subsidiary company, Highlight Printing Pty. Ltd., under the auspices of the Federal Trade and Resources Department.
- 1.b. All copies of *S.A. Profile* are complimentary. Of version A, 2 000 were purchased by the Trade and Resources Department; 3 000 were mailed direct by Exportad to subscribers to *Australian Trader*; 3 000 were purchased by the Economic Development Department for free distribution, 1 000 were purchased by the S.A. Education Department for use in schools. All 5 000 copies of version B are currently being used as low cost, give-away literature by the Economic Development Department, by the S.A. Agent-General in London, by S.A. Trade Representatives in Melbourne and Sydney, by trade correspondents in Singapore and Hong Kong, and through the State Information Centre.

2. There are no distribution rights. Distribution is handled by the publisher. The department has limited stocks for distribution on request.

3. The Publicity Officer of the Department, Mr. I. F. Drysdale, wrote the editorial matter on South Australia. Photography was from the photographic library of the Premier's Department, Publicity and Design Division. No overtime or other payments were involved.

4. Advertising fees were charged by Exportad, who received all revenue from advertising.

Rates were:	\$
full page, 4 colours	550
full page, 2 colours	440
trade directory with logo	50
trade directory	40

Some advertisers were eligible for a cash rebate of 85 per cent from the Export Market Development Grants Board.

5. Exportad have a sales representative in Adelaide: Mr. L. Schleim. He would have received a commission from the publishers. The amount is not known.

6. *S.A. Profile* is distributed throughout the world. It is a supplement to the *Australian Trader*.

7. None.

8. Exportad publish a range of publications under the auspices of the Trade and Resources Department. No similar service offering world-wide distribution exists in S.A.

9. Highlight Printing is a subsidiary of Exportad and undertakes the printing of all *Australian Trader* publication in several languages.

10. The decision to publish *S.A. Profile* was authorised

by the Permanent Head, Economic Development Department.

11. The total amount paid to Exportad by the State Government was \$5 650.

12. See No. 11. This includes payment through Exportad to Highlight Printing.

13. No, for the reason given in No. 8. If a S.A. publisher offered similar arrangements, as provided by Exportad, it would certainly be considered.

14. Version B only could be reprinted at \$450 per 1 000.

It should be noted that this is the first time in six years that the S.A. *Profile* supplement was larger than the "mother" publication, the *Australian Trader*, due to big response from South Australian manufacturers seeking an effective, low-cost export advertising medium. For this reason, the *Australian Trader*, had to be placed inside its own supplement, which then had to have postage category placed on it to keep postage costs low.

RAILWAY SERVICES

254. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. On what dates were passenger services withdrawn from each of the following rail services—

- (a) Eudunda to Morgan;
- (b) Riverton to Spalding;
- (c) Roseworthy to Eudunda-Robertstown;
- (d) North Gawler to Angaston-Truro; and
- (e) Bowmans to Kadina-Wallaroo-Moonta?

2. Prior to ceasing passenger operations, what alternative arrangements, if any, were considered for each of the services and, in each instance, why was the particular replacement service accepted in preference to any alternatives?

3. What amounts, if any, has the Government contributed to maintain any of the services and what are the individual details?

4. Does the Government believe that the services currently provided on each of these routes are satisfactory and, if not, why not and what action does the Government contemplate taking to alter, upgrade or otherwise influence the services on each of these routes?

5. Does the Government have an attitude to integrated bus/rail services involving any or all of the services and, if so, what is that attitude?

6. Is there an attitude to any other existing passenger service in this State which envisages replacement by a co-ordinated bus/rail service or alternative arrangement and, if so, what are the details?

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

- 1. (a) 15/3/65.
- (b) 24/5/54.
- (c) 23/9/62.
- (d) 16/12/68.
- (e) 28/4/69.

2. (a), (d) and (e) Arrangements were made to ensure that bus services were available to the townships affected.

(b) and (c) Arrangements were made for co-ordinated bus services to replace the cancelled rail services.

The replacement services were considered the most desirable in the circumstances.

3. Payments by the Government in the last three years to maintain the co-ordinated bus service between Riverton and Spalding were:

	\$
1975-76	35 700
1976-77	43 400
1977-78	46 400

The co-ordinated service from Roseworthy to Eudunda-Robertstown was withdrawn on 16/12/68 due to lack of patronage. Details of the revenue from these services and payments prior to 1975-76, are not readily available.

4. The services provided are considered to be reasonable having regard to the demand and economic considerations.

5. and 6. Responsibility for the non-metropolitan railways and associated services passed to the Australian National Railways Commission as from 1/3/78. In the case of the proposed cessation of the Glanville-Semaphore rail service, which remains under the control of the State Transport Authority, a replacement co-ordinated bus/rail service will be provided.

PUBLIC SERVICE APPOINTMENT

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

1. When did Mr. Bill Isbell resign as Director of Tourism, Recreation and Sport?

2. Has another person been appointed to that position and, if not, has the position been advertised and, if so, how many applications were received?

3. If the position was not advertised, what were the reasons for not advertising?

4. When is it expected the position will be filled?

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

1. 12 May 1978.

2. G. Joselin has been appointed in an acting capacity since 16 May 1978.

3. The requirements, duties and responsibilities of the position are being evaluated.

4. No firm estimate can be made as to when the position will be filled.

LITTER

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

1. Do departmental surveys show that there has been an increase in the number of glass containers, particularly beer bottles, discarded in public places since the introduction of legislation providing for deposits on cans, and if so:

(a) is this of concern to the Minister and the department; and

(b) what action will be taken to rectify the situation?

2. Is the legislation working as effectively as the Government anticipated and, if not, what action will be taken to correct deficiencies?

3. Has consideration been given to repealing the Act and seeking support from industries which create pollution-potential material by contributing to a fund to carry out an on-going education and clean-up programme?

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

1. The surveys that have been taken by the Environment Department, at this stage, only show the residual amount of glass along selected areas. By carrying out successive surveys over the same areas, it will be possible to estimate the rate at which glass containers are being discarded. To be able to judge whether this is increasing or decreasing it will be necessary to take several surveys, and this will take some months. It is the impression of the officers taking the surveys that there has not been a dramatic increase in the number of bottles being discarded.

2. Yes.

3. No.

ST. KILDA CHANNEL

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

1. Has work commenced on upgrading the St. Kilda channel and if not:
 - (a) when will it be commenced; and
 - (b) what are the reasons for any delays?
2. When is it to be completed?
3. Has any money been made available for the work by any local government authorities and if so, which and how much has each contributed?
4. What other bodies have made moneys available and how much from each?
5. What is the estimated total cost of the work to be carried out?
6. Will the channel be closed off for the full period of time the work is being carried out and is this period of time the shortest possible period in which that work could be completed?
7. Will the work continue outside normal working hours and if so, to what extent?

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

1. No.
 - (a) Presently unknown.
 - (b) The work of upgrading the St. Kilda channel has been deferred until a review has been made of proposals submitted by a private developer in which public boating facilities would be included.
2. Vide No. 1 (b).
3. Yes. The city of Salisbury has agreed to contribute \$60 000.

NORTH-WEST PARK

282. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Does the Department for the Environment intend to alter in any way the size of the north-west national park and, if so, what plans are envisaged and for what reasons?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is not intended in any way to alter the size of the north-west conservation park at this stage.

S.G.I.C.

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

1. Are any S.G.I.C. life insurance risks being re-insured and if so:
 - (a) what is the total amount of risk being re-insured;
 - (b) with whom; and
 - (c) what is the total amount to date paid for such re-insurance;
 and if not, why not?
2. How much of these premiums are being invested in South Australia by:
 - (a) S.G.I.C.; and
 - (b) the re-insurers?
3. Has any of S.G.I.C.'s advertising of life insurance been in contravention of the Trade Practices Act and if so:
 - (a) which advertisements; and
 - (b) what action was taken to remedy the situation?

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

1. Yes.
 - (a) Each risk is treated on its merits and, if necessary, reinsurance is arranged accordingly.
 - (b) As is normal practice, this information is confidential and the name of the company cannot be given. However, the reinsurance is

effected with an Australian reinsurance company.

(c) \$477.72.

2. (a) As the commission's Life Department has been operating since the 1 March, 1978 only, no investments have been made to date.
 - (b) The commission has no authority to seek information from the reinsurer on this matter.
3. No.

SALTIA CREEK CATCHMENT

294. **Mr. TONKIN** (on notice): Has a feasibility study been made of the Saltia Creek catchment area and, if so, what is the finding regarding its suitability to hold water?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. Cost benefits of damming Saltia Creek catchment were considered uneconomical relative to the benefits to water supply.

MEAT AUTHORITY

296. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Does the Government intend to set up a statutory Meat and Livestock Corporation and, if so, what are the reasons and who would control the corporation?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

329. **Mr. BLACKER** (on notice): What policies have been established in the Government negotiations with Dow Chemical which will ensure that the fishing grounds adjacent to the proposed petro-chemical plant will be protected?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A considerable amount of environmental work and studies have been done in connection with the Redcliff petro-chemical proposal. The Environment Department has copies of these studies on its files. The Redcliff project, as previously proposed, was also the subject of a public inquiry in November 1974. That inquiry concluded then:

On the assumption that the plant will meet the emission and effluent discharge performance specified in the progress report, no significant environmental damage from the construction and operation of the Redcliff petro-chemical complex has been identified.

The possible impact on the fishing grounds adjacent to the then proposed plant form part of the deliberations of that inquiry.

HOUSING INDUSTRY

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

1. What was the detail given by the Premier to the meeting with the Housing Industry Association on 27 June regarding the Commonwealth/State housing agreement and the State Government's financial position in relation to housing finance?

2. What initiatives is the Premier looking at to stimulate the industry in the future and when will announcements be made?

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

1. I told the industry that—

- (1) total Commonwealth funds to the State for 1978-79 had been cut well in excess of \$30 000 000 over even the most pessimistic projections of

- the State Treasury;
 - (2) the great majority of that reduction occurred in relation to capital funds for construction rather than revenue funds; and
 - (3) that \$10 000 000 in money terms had been chopped from the Commonwealth-State housing agreement funds.
2. These matters are under consideration.

CRIMES OF VIOLENCE

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

1. What statistics are currently available, in respective categories for the year ended 30 June 1978 dealing with offences for:

- (a) robbery and stealing from the person;
- (b) assault with intent to rob;
- (c) robbery with violence; and
- (d) demanding money etc. with menaces by force and with intent to steal?

2. How do these figures compare to each of the previous three years?

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

1. Final statistics for the fiscal year ended 30 June 1978 have not yet been collated. However, the following figures for the 11 months ended 31 May 1978 are available:

(a) Robbery	43
Stealing from the person	145
	188

(b) Assault with intent to rob:
Separate figures are not available; they are included in the above.

(c) Robbery with violence	61
(d) Demanding money, etc. with menaces . . .	31

2. Statistics for the three preceding financial years are as follows:

	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77
(a)	8	8	13
	61	92	66
	69	100	79
(b)	Included in above figures.		
(c)	192	172	183
(d)	11	15	13

VEHICLE ACCIDENTS

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

1. What action has been taken or will be taken to reduce the incidence of motor vehicle accidents at the top 15 accident-prone intersections in the metropolitan area, as outlined in a study carried out by the Highways Department in 1975?

2. What accident trend has continued at these intersections during the past three years?

3. What is the approximate total number of traffic lights damaged in motor vehicle accidents each week for the past 12 months?

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

1. The 15 metropolitan intersections at which most accidents were reported in 1975 are all heavily trafficked locations. In relation to the volume of traffic passing through these intersections, the number of accidents does not indicate exceptionally hazardous traffic conditions in many cases. Where investigation has shown that remedial works at these intersections are justified and feasible, improvements such as better channelisation arrangements

for traffic and modifications to traffic signals are planned. Works have been completed at some of these locations.

2. The situation concerning reported accidents has improved, the figures for 1977 being 14 per cent below those for 1975.

3. These statistics are not readily available in weekly totals. Monthly figures are as follows:

Month	Traffic Signals	Pedestrian Crossings	Total
July 1977	27	5	32
August	26	9	35
September	23	6	29
October	28	5	33
November	45	5	50
December	22	4	26
January 1978	10	6	16
February	23	9	32
March	37	4	41
April	32	6	38
May	34	1	35
June	39	4	43

MOTOR VEHICLES BUILDING

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

1. What was the final cost of the Motor Vehicles Department building in Wakefield Street?

2. Is a further building or accommodation required elsewhere and, if so:

- (a) where;
- (b) for what reason;
- (c) who will be the owners of such building;
- (d) what is the estimated annual rent and area involved; and
- (e) how does this compare with commercial rates?

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

1. The final cost is not known at this stage. The estimated cost is \$5 700 000.

2. No, not in the foreseeable future.

ADOPTION MATTERS

337. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): In respect of adoption matters involving the Community Welfare Department for each year ended 30 June 1967 to 1978, respectively:

- (a) how many orders were made for adoptions by placement;
- (b) how many placements were made;
- (c) how many applications were made;
- (d) how many such applications were refused;
- (e) how many appeals (under regulations 25 and 26) were made to the Adoption Court contesting refusals and what were the outcomes;
- (f) how many approvals were revoked;
- (g) how many appeals were made (under regulations 25 and 26) against such revocations and what were the outcomes; and
- (h) how many approved applications were subsequently withdrawn by the applicants?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows: Applications and Adoptions by Placement (including children placed from overseas countries and children previously placed for fostering).

Year ending 30 June 1967:—

- (a) 643.
- (b) 662.
- (c) 688.
- (d), (e), (f), (g) and (h). Statistics are not available

without considerable research, the cost of which would not be warranted.

Year ending 30 June 1968:—

(a) 618.

(b) 662.

(c) 887.

(d), (e), (f), (g) and (h). Statistics are not available without considerable research, the cost of which would not be warranted.

Year ended 30 June 1969:—

(a) 654.

(b) 670.

(c) 1 112.

(d), (e), (f), (g) and (h) Statistics are not available without considerable research, the cost of which would not be warranted.

Year ending 30 June 1970:—

(a) 653.

(b) 695.

(c) 1 094.

(d), (e), (f), (g) and (h) Statistics are not available without considerable research, the cost of which would not be warranted.

Year ended 30 June 1971:—

(a) 705.

(b) 685.

(c) 1 053.

(d) 2.

(e) 2, (1 dismissed; 1 upheld).

(g) Nil.

(f) and (h) Statistics are not available without considerable research, the cost of which would not be warranted.

Year ending 30 June 1972:—

(a) 548.

(b) 587.

(c) 832.

(d) 2.

(e) 2, (upheld).

(g) Nil.

(f) and (h) Statistics are not available without considerable research, the cost of which would not be warranted.

Year ending 30 June 1973:—

(a) 467.

(b) 461.

(c) 856.

(d) 9.

(e) Nil.

(f) Nil.

(g) Nil.

(h) Statistics are not available without considerable research, the cost of which would not be warranted.

Year ending 30 June 1974:—

(a) 394.

(b) 444.

(c) 808.

(d) 9.

(e) 2, (1 upheld; 1 withdrawn).

(f) Nil.

(g) Nil.

(h) Statistics are not available without considerable research, the cost of which would not be warranted.

Year ending 30 June 1975:—

(a) 347.

(b) 440.

(c) 1 005.

(d) 10.

(e) 1, (upheld).

(f) 1.

(g) Nil.

(h) Statistics are not available without considerable research, the cost of which would not be warranted.

Year ending 30 June 1976:—

(a) 305.

(b) 317.

(c) 696.

(d) 14.

(e) 1, (upheld).

(f) 2.

(g) Nil.

(h) Statistics are not available without considerable research, the cost of which would not be warranted.

Year ending 30 June 1977:—

(a) 381.

(b) 263.

(c) 487.

(d) 12.

(e) 2, (upheld).

(f) Nil.

(g) Nil.

(h) Statistics are not available without considerable research, the cost of which would not be warranted.

Year ending 30 June 1978:—

(a) 337, (preliminary figure).

(b) 214.

(c) 436.

(d) 3.

(e) 1, (withdrawn).

(f) Nil.

(g) Nil.

(h) 68.

RAILWAY CROSSINGS

344. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. What is the programme of railway crossing alarm systems to be installed in South Australia this financial year, and what is the anticipated cost, date of commencement, and date of commissioning?

2. How many other crossings are listed for consideration in future, where are they, and what is the order of priority?

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

1. With the transfer of the State's non-metropolitan railways to the Commonwealth the responsibility for railway level crossings in the non-metropolitan area passed to the Australian National Railways Commission. The State Transport Authority's programme for railway level crossing alarm systems in the metropolitan area for 1978/79 covers the following locations:

	Anticipated Commencement	
	Cost \$	Date
Belair Road, Glenalta	26 000	July 1978
Hove	22 000	Expected August 1978
Belford Avenue, Dudley Park	30 000	Not yet determined
Gedville Road, Taperoo	30 000	Not yet determined
Pym Street, Dudley Park	30 000	Not yet determined
Magazine Road, Dry Creek or Howard Street, North Gawler	23 000	Not yet determined
Sixth Avenue, Penfield	25 000	Not yet determined

The commissioning dates for all of the projects listed above are not yet known.

2. There are 106 protected level crossings in the metropolitan railway system and it is intended to upgrade 36 of these on double or multi-track locations with automatic boom barriers. The priorities of the various locations have yet to be determined on the basis of road and rail traffic counts.

CRIME STATISTICS

346. **Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice): In relation to the staff in the office of Crime Statistics:

- (a) what are the names and qualifications of each person; and
- (b) how many are employed by contract, for how long is each contract, and what are the other terms?

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

- (a) The Director of the office of Crime Statistics is Mr. Peter Grabowsky, whose academic qualifications are B.A., M.A., Ph.D. Apart from an office assistant (Secretary/typiste) no other appointments have been made.
- (b) None.

Mr. P. GRABOWSKY

347. **Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice):

1. Was the appointment of Mr. Peter Grabowsky made before the Government freeze on the Public Service?
2. What was the date of appointment?
3. Was it a contract of employment and, if so, for how long and what are the terms?
4. Are any additional staff to be appointed as a result of Mr. Grabowsky's appointment?

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

1. Yes.
2. 22 June 1978.
3. No.
4. Yes.

STUART HIGHWAY

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

1. Has the Government received moneys from the Federal Government for the purposes of upgrading the Stuart Highway and, if so:

- (a) how much;
- (b) when were such moneys received; and
- (c) have such moneys been spent and, if so, how?

2. Is it expected that further moneys will be received from the Federal Government for such purposes and, if so, when, how much and how will it be spent?

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

1. The Federal Government provides money to the States in predetermined amounts for expenditure on national highways in accordance with the National Highways Acts, 1974 and 1977. The State then determines its priorities which are then forwarded to the Federal Minister for his approval. Over the last four years approximately \$300 000 has been spent on the investigation to select an improved route for the Stuart Highway.

2. In 1978-79, it is expected that further Commonwealth funds will be allocated to upgrading the Stuart Highway. However, the level of these funds, which will in turn determine the nature and extent of work carried out, is yet to be resolved with the Commonwealth Minister. The position with respect to future Commonwealth

allocations to the Stuart Highway will depend on the attitude of the Commonwealth Government.

GOVERNMENT BUILDING

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

1. What are current estimates for the cost of constructing the Wakefield Street Government Office Building and what was the cost of the land?

2. When will the building be ready for occupation?

3. How many Public Service employees will occupy the building?

4. What is the differential, if any, between the original estimate of:

(a) cost (\$10 900 000); and

(b) occupancy,

and the projected figures?

5. What will be the saving in rental costs as a result of the construction of the building?

6. What are the estimated costs of operation and maintenance of the building?

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

1. \$9 500 000.

\$470 000.

2. March 1980.

3. Not known at this stage.

4. (a) Reduction of \$450 000.

(b) See 3.

5. Nil.

6. Estimated maintenance cost \$250 000.

Estimated operating cost \$220 000.

RAILWAYS STAFF

352. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. Has the State Transport Authority determined any reasons why staff working the Adelaide to Gawler line should be at greater risk from attacks than other staff and, if so, what are those reasons?

2. Will preference in installation of two-way radio equipment be given to rolling stock working the Gawler line and, if not, why not?

3. What is the present strength of railway security staff, what is their deployment, and is it intended to supplement the force?

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

1. No.

2. Yes.

3. 18, throughout the metropolitan railway system. It is not proposed to supplement the force.

ROAD WORKS

353. **Mr. RUSSACK** (on notice):

1. Was the amount of \$40 400 000 received from the Commonwealth Government for roadworks in the year 1977-78 fully expended and, if so, what were the amounts allocated to the following categories:

(a) urban local roads;

(b) urban arterial roads;

(c) rural local roads; and

(d) rural arterial roads?

2. Does the Minister regard the 1978-79 Commonwealth Government grant of \$43 207 000 for road works as being in the category of "tied grants" and, if so, what are the individual amounts applicable to the specific road grant categories, including those listed in part 1?

3. Has the \$43 207 000 been received and, if not, when is it anticipated it will be received?

4. If the whole amount has not yet been allocated, when will this be done?

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

1. The only Commonwealth funds not expended as at 30/6/78 were approximately 3 per cent of the allocation for Minor Traffic Engineering and Road Safety (MITERS) projects, which can be spent up to 31/12/78.

- (a) \$2 200 000.
- (b) \$4 600 000.
- (c) \$6 700 000.
- (d) \$7 000 000.

2. Yes. The following amounts represent the original allocations for 1978-79 *vide* the Commonwealth Government's roads legislation, plus indexation adjustments since advised by the Commonwealth Minister:

	\$
(a) Urban local roads	2 353 000
(b) Urban arterial roads	4 920 000
(c) Rural local roads	7 165 000
(d) Rural arterial roads	7 486 000
(e) National highways (construction) ...	16 133 000
(f) National highways (maintenance) ...	2 032 000
(g) National commerce roads	1 300 000
(h) MITERS	1 818 000

There could be further adjustments to these amounts at the request of the Commonwealth Minister.

3. No. Commonwealth grants are paid monthly on a pro rata basis. The final amount is not received until the end of the financial year.

4. The only amount not allocated to projects is in the urban local road category. It is expected that these funds will be allocated shortly.

MINING EXPLORATION

354. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Will the Minister inform the House what measures are being taken to protect potentially valuable archaeological and Aboriginal sites which are known to exist in the area covered by large numbers of mining leases in the Roxby Downs and Lake Torrens Plains areas from the damaging effect of mining exploration, which is active in this region?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In close co-operation with the Aboriginal and Historic Relics Unit of the Department for the Environment, and with the Curator of Archaeology and Anthropology, S.A. Museum, suitable conditions are inserted in each exploration licence to afford adequate protection of archaeological and Aboriginal sites of cultural importance. This procedure applies to Exploration Licences granted in any part of the State. In order to comply with these conditions, the licensee is required to liaise with the appropriate officers prior to commencing operations in the licence area to familiarise himself further with these areas of importance. In the case where exceptional significance is placed upon a particular location, a declaration of environmental factors is required to be submitted by the licensee before intensive exploration activities are undertaken and, following assessment of this declaration, additional safeguards and controls may be imposed.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

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

1. Will the Minister outline his department's involvement in community development?

2. Of the total budget of his department, what percentage of staff wages and money spent on programmes, respectively, is allocated to community development?

3. How does the Minister define community development?

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

1. The department's involvement in community development has been to assist communities to develop skills and other resources so that local people can take greater responsibility for meeting needs in their own areas. It has promoted public involvement and self-help as a means of overcoming social problems. Its involvement has been directed towards meeting the objectives set out in section 7 of the Community Welfare Act.

2. Most activities of a community development nature are integrated with, and regarded as part of, the department's community welfare activities, and the expenditure cannot be separated. Social workers employed by the department have professional training in community development skills. The only specific allocations for community development are for the functioning of 26 Community Councils for Social Development, the salaries of seven Community Development Officers working with community councils and four staff of the department's Community Development Branch. Expenditure on these activities during 1977-78 represented approximately 1 per cent of staff wages and 0.4 per cent of other expenses. The process is subsidised with grants from the Community Welfare Grants Fund.

3. A process of assisting local communities and groups to define their needs and to develop skills and resources to meet those needs.

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

1. Will the Minister outline the involvement of the Local Government Office in community development?

2. Of the total budget of his office, what percentage of staff wages and money spent on programmes, respectively, is allocated to community development?

3. How does the Minister define community development?

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

1. The Local Government Office is not directly involved; local authorities are. The office works with local government and its organisations to encourage and assist the strengthening of the community development process.

2. No funds or staff are directly allocated to community development.

3. A process of assisting local communities and groups to define their needs and to develop skills and resources to meet these needs.

HOUSING TRUST

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

1. How many applications does the Housing Trust have before it at present?

2. What proportions of the applications relate to the type of housing and purchase plans offered?

3. On average, based on the previous two months, how many applications a week are:

- (a) received; and
- (b) granted?

4. How many houses were completed by the trust during the first six months of 1978?

5. Is there a delay in fulfilling applications and, if so, what is the cause of this delay?

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

1. 20 526.

2. The applications are made up as follows:

Rental:

family-type accommodation 15 836

pensioner accommodation 3 075

Purchase 1 615

3. (a) The average number of rental applications received each week for the two months ending July 1978 was 178 per week, and for the same period purchase applications averaged 40 per week.

(b) The average number of rental allocations granted each week for the two months ending July 1978 was 89 per week, and for the same period purchase allocations averaged 21 per week.

4. During the first six months of 1978 the trust completed 685 houses.

5. The delay in fulfilling applications varies according to the type of housing units required and location. The demand for rental housing remains at a high level and in meeting this demand the trust relies upon its ability to provide new accommodation as well as from vacancies occurring in its existing houses.

BENEFICIAL FINANCE BUILDING

360. Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. How many floors of the Beneficial Finance building, Franklin Street, were rented by the Government as at 30 June 1978?

2. Saving 1977 or 1978, has any of this rented space been vacant and, if so, what floor area has been vacant and for what periods?

3. What rental a square metre is currently being paid for this accommodation?

4. Did certain Government sections move from this building to the Grenfell Centre and, if so, on what dates and when was the vacated area re-used again?

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

1. Five.

2. All floors (5-9 inclusive) were unoccupied for approximately seven months whilst commissioning work was being undertaken.

3. \$63.52 per square metre per annum.

4. No.

INDUSTRIAL PROPERTIES

361. Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. How many factories are currently owned by the South Australian Housing Trust for rental to industrial clients?

2. What was the estimated value of these factory buildings at 30 June 1978?

3. What industrial projects were completed or were still under construction during the year 1977-78, and what is the value of the work involved?

4. What was the total revenue collected from the rental of industrial properties during the year 1977-78?

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

1. The South Australian Housing Trust presently owns 42 factories.

2. The trust does not presently maintain a record of the contemporary market value of these factory buildings. It is estimated that the cost at 30 June 1978 was \$25 001 050.

3. The following factories and extensions were under construction or were completed during the 1977-78 year and the estimated cost is \$1 524 500: Smithers-Oasis Aust. Pty. Ltd.; S.A. Fisherman's Co-operative Ltd., The Visador Co. (Aust.) Pty. Ltd., Fairey Australasia Pty. Ltd.

4. The total revenue collected from the rental of industrial properties during the year 1977-78 was \$3 273 000.

RAILWAYS TRANSFER

362. Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. To 30 June 1978 what has been the total value of money received from the Commonwealth Government for the transfer of the South Australian Railways to the Commonwealth, and how much money was received in each of the 1975-76, 1976-77, and 1977-78 financial years?

2. What is the anticipated receipt of money for the transfer for the 1978-79 financial year?

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

1. Approximately \$117 000 000 made up in years as follows:

	\$ million
1974-75	10.0
1975-76	29.8
1976-77	35.5
1977-78	41.7

Total 117.0

2. About \$45 800 000.

HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT

363. Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. How many residential properties are currently owned by the Highways Department in the metropolitan area?

2. What number of these properties have been rented out for residential or other purposes?

3. What is the total annual rental received for these residential properties?

4. What is the average daily occupancy rate of all these residential properties available for rental?

5. What was the estimated cost of purchase of all these residential properties?

6. How many of these houses and flats were vacant on 30 June 1978?

7. How many non-residential properties are owned currently by the Highways Department in the metropolitan area?

8. What number of these non-residential properties have been rented out?

9. What is the total annual rental received for these non-residential properties?

10. How many of these non-residential properties were vacant on 30 June 1978?

11. What was the estimated cost of purchase of all of these non-residential properties?

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

1. 895 as at 30 June 1978, excluding staff housing.

2. 829 as at 30 June 1978.

3. Approximately \$1 620 000 in 1977-78.

4. Approximately 92 per cent.

5. This information is not readily available and would require considerable research to obtain. Such an exercise is not considered justified.

6. 66.

7. 298, excluding vacant land.

8. 272 as at 30 June 1978.

9. Approximately \$1 000 000 in 1977-78.

10. 26.

11. See 5.

ADELAIDE PLAINS

364. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. What is the name of each of the inspectors responsible for monitoring bores in the Adelaide Plains Underground Water District, how long has each been so employed, and what was their occupation immediately preceding appointment to this role?

2. What are the names of any officers who have resigned or otherwise vacated this role since 1 July 1977 and what was the reason for leaving the service in each case?

3. What "in-service" or "pre-service" training is provided and what is the nature of such training?

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

1. R. Mitchell—approximately 2½ years—meter reader.

G. Burnard—approximately 6 months—underground water irrigator.

2. C. Rodgers—transferred to administrative clerical position.

S. Coronica—resigned to take up private enterprise venture.

3. Appointments are made from applicants with appropriate background and experience. In-service training is provided in relation to legislative provisions and administrative procedures.

RIVER TORRENS

366. **Mr. WILSON** (on notice): Has the Minister altered the terms of reference of the current Torrens River study, being carried out by Hassell and Partners, to accommodate the Government's recent decision to place a light rapid transport system along the river and, if so, what are the altered terms of reference and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No; they are considered wide enough in their present form.

REFUGEES

367. **Mr. TONKIN** (on notice):

1. How many refugees from South-East Asia are expected to come to South Australia in the next twelve months?

2. What relation does this number bear to the number of refugees expected to enter Australia in that period?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The matter raised is the responsibility of the Federal Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, who determine the allocation of refugees admitted to Australia on the basis of resources in each State. On the best information obtainable, the answers to the questions are:

1. Hostel accommodation primarily regulates the number of refugees who come to South Australia from South-East Asia, and in this financial year accommodation could be available for up to 500 persons.

2. If 500 refugees come to South Australia, this would be in relation to approximately 9 000 people expected to enter Australia.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

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

1. When was the new gap study for industrial development in South Australia commenced, who is carrying it out, what are the terms of reference and when is

it anticipated that it will be completed?

2. How does this study vary from the Industrial Opportunities Study, 1971-72?

3. Why will the Premier not release publicly copies of the Industrial Opportunities Study, 1971-72?

4. What other initiatives are being taken by the Government to attract new manufacturing industries to South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:
1. New directions as to studies on South Australian resources were given in March this year. It is not a single study, with specific terms of reference, but a provision for ongoing studies.

2. See above.

3. The study is quite out of date. See 393.

4. The department is continuing to seek new manufacturing industries. (See 1. above.)

VEHICLE ACCIDENTS

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

1. How many motor vehicle accidents have occurred at the intersection of Belair road, Springbank Road and Kays Road, Torrens Park, during the last three years, and how many persons have been seriously injured in those accidents?

2. Will the Minister install traffic lights at this intersection as soon as possible and, if not, why not?

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

Year	No. of Reported Accidents	No. of Persons Injured*
1975.....	60	9
1976.....	61	4
1977.....	90	2

*These are the number of persons reported to have required treatment.

2. Yes.

PREMIER'S TRIP

370. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Did the Premier stay at Claridges Hotel in London during his latest trip to the United Kingdom and, if so:

(a) who was in the party from South Australia staying with the Premier at this hotel;

(b) how long did each person stay at the hotel and what were the dates; and

(c) what did it cost at this hotel for—

1. accommodation;
2. entertaining expenses; and
3. any other expenses?

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

(a) The Premier's wife, Mr. and Mrs. G. J. Inns, Mr. and Mrs. W. L. C. Davies, Mr. S. R. Wright, Mr. A. Hodgson. It should be pointed out that while Mrs. Inns and Mrs. Davies were staying at the hotel they paid their own expenses in full.

(b) All except Mr. and Mrs. Davies stayed at the hotel for eight days from 28 April to 6 May 1978 inclusive. Mr. and Mrs. Davies stayed at the hotel for seven days from 28 April to 5 May 1978 inclusive.

	A\$
(c) (i) Accommodation	3 184.20
(ii) Entertainment	124.32
(iii) Other expenses (meals, laundry, telephone, telex, etc.)	1 086.33

WATER COSTS

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

1. What are the criteria for assessing the costs of water from rainwater tanks to enable such costs to be compared with the costs of mains water?

2. Is a rainwater tank assumed to have a limited life and, if so, how long is that life?

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

1. The size of tank and the material with which it is constructed; fittings appurtenant to the tank, such as roof, overflow pipework and stop cock; the catchment area of the system; rate of water use from the tank; allowance for losses due to roof shape and material, and leakage in gutters; rainfall statistics (for various areas in metropolitan Adelaide) over 50 years; and discount rate on capital investment; same rate used as for costs of mains water.

2. Yes. Galvanised tank approximately 20 years. Precast concrete tank approximately 40 years. *In situ* concrete tank approximately 100 years. Galvanised squatters tank approximately 15 years.

MURRAY RIVER

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

1. How often has the River Murray Commission met during the past five years?

2. What is the procedure of the commission for reporting to Governments?

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

1. 26 occasions.

2. The commission reports formally to Governments by way of its annual report which is tabled in the four Parliaments.

FORK LIFT TRUCKS

386. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice): What are the criteria to be used to determine fees for registration of fork lift trucks?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The power mass of the vehicle is calculated in accordance with the formula in regulation 13 (2) under the Motor Vehicles Act. Having established the power mass, the registration fee is then calculated in accordance with regulation 62 (7).

WEST BEACH

387. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice): What was the original estimate of the consultancy fee B. C. Tonkin & Associates were to charge for the West Beach *en suite* caravan park project?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It was \$24 000.

TORRENS COLLEGE

388. **Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice):

1. Were tenders called for the original installation of a P.A.B.X. telephone system at the Torrens College of Advanced Education?

2. In relation to the system installed:

- (a) what was the make;
- (b) what was the type;
- (c) when was it installed;
- (d) what was the expected life;
- (e) who recommended the purchase; and
- (f) what was the cost?

3. Is it to be replaced in the near future and, if so:

- (a) when;
- (b) why;
- (c) what make is the replacement;
- (d) what is the cost of the replacement; and
- (e) what is to happen to the old system?

4. Is it to be reinstalled in a new location and, if so, where, what is the estimated cost of removal and the cost of reinstallation?

5. Were tenders called for a replacement and, if so, how many tenders were received and who was the successful tenderer?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Torrens College of Advanced Education is an autonomous body and therefore not responsible to the State Government. I suggest the honourable member address his question to the Director of the college.

INDUSTRIAL STUDY

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

1. What was the total cost of the Industrial Opportunities Study, 1971-72?

2. Who prepared this study?

3. When did the Government decide that the study was not a "good" study?

4. When did the Government reject the strategy for industrial development for South Australia as outlined in this study?

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

1. The cost of the study was \$25 630.

2. P.A. Management Consultants.

3. The Gaps study was considered to be a reasonable study in the context of the industrial conditions of that time, though it had some deficiencies. Subsequent changes, especially in Australian tariff policy and world trading conditions, have reduced the relevance of many of the findings of that study. Any useful methodology followed in the study has been incorporated in the department's approach to new industry identification.

4. The main recommendations from the study were acted upon and the suggested strategy was followed to the extent possible given the financial and manpower constraints.

LINCOLN HIGHWAY

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

1. Is it planned to upgrade the Lincoln Highway to Iron Baron road and, if so, when will this work take place?

2. Is it planned to bituminise this particular road and if so, when?

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

1. Yes. Subject to the availability of funds it is proposed to construct and seal this road in the 1979-80 and 1980-81 financial years.

2. See 1.

STATE'S ECONOMY

398. **Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice): Will the Premier make public the monthly report on the state of South Australia's economy prepared by the Department of Economic Development and if not, why not?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. The report is a confidential analysis for the use of the Government. It has never been written for publication. In addition, it often

includes material obtained in confidence from individual business organisations within the State which it would be improper to divulge.

deferred pending the receipt of the report from the committee of inquiry.

Mr. R. LYONS

404. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Was Mr. R. Lyons appointed to the office of Forestry Adviser, Woods and Forests Department, under section 57 of the Public Service Act and, if so, why?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Mr. R. G. Lyons was appointed to the office of Forestry Adviser, Woods and Forests Department, under section 57 of the Public Service Act. There is an increasing need to evaluate the extent to which State forest areas, reservoirs and related lands can and should be used for recreational purposes. Mr. Lyons is well qualified as a forester, environmentalist and recreationalist and is considered particularly suitable to perform duties of an advisory nature in relation to the recreational use of forests, reservoirs and related lands.

Because of the large areas of forest which exist, particularly in the South-East of the State, the Public Service Board considered it appropriate that responsibility for the studies be entrusted to the Woods and Forests Department. Under the Public Service Act, the board and the Government have the right and responsibility to deploy people to best meet the management needs of the Public Service. On this basis, Mr. Lyons was relocated from the Environment Department and placed in the Forestry Department to discharge the responsibilities of the public recreational use of native forests in forestry reserves and water catchment reserves. Section 57 of the Public Service Act is the appropriate section of the Act to use for this purpose.

STUDENT-TEACHER ALLOWANCES

In reply to **Mr. ALLISON** (10 August).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Education Department has spent the following amount on student allowances: 1976-77, \$3 471 641; 1977-78, \$1 298 735; 1978-79, \$400 000, \$600 000 (estimated).

WATER ALLOCATIONS

In reply to **Mr. ARNOLD** (18 July).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I agree that it is an anomalous situation that Government and private irrigators are not treated in a like manner in times of surplus flows in the river. The Engineering and Water Supply Department is now responsible for the administration of both Government and private irrigation. Consequently, I have asked the Director and Engineer-in-Chief to investigate this matter and develop a proposal for my consideration which would enable Government irrigators to be allocated additional water if there were sufficient flow in the river to enable the allocations of both private divertees and Government irrigators to be increased.

COMPUTER INSTALLATION

In reply to **Mrs. ADAMSON** (18 July).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: As this matter is currently under investigation, questions and answers should be

TOURISM

In reply to **Mr. EVANS** (2 August).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The figures quoted by the honourable member in this question are from a report submitted recently to the House of Representatives Select Committee on Tourism by Pigram and Cooper, researchers at the University of New England.

As recorded in subsequent evidence to the committee, this work of Pigram and Cooper, although commendably innovative, has been subjected to considerable critical comment, by such bodies as the Commonwealth Department of Industry and Commerce, the Bureau of Industry Economics, and the New South Wales Department of Tourism. I am advised that there is a consensus amongst professional tourism researchers generally that problems of definition and procedural and methodological weaknesses in the work are such that the derived data, as quoted, cannot be deemed to be authoritative. In particular, definitions adopted by Pigram and Cooper as to what ought to be included within tourism activity are extremely controversial.

In any case, if the work was accepted as being statistically valid, it would reveal no more than varying relationships, from State to State, between gross tourism product and gross domestic product. Because there are considerable variations in the structures of State economies, the percentages as calculated in the Pigram and Cooper research do not measure varying tourism performance or productivity levels between States. At this time, there is no meaningful data in this area.

However, increased data collection by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, other research, and exchanges of information between the States are improving our understanding of the economic significance of tourism in various contexts. In particular, the Australian States and Territories have combined to commission a two-year Australian domestic tourism monitor study, at a cost of about \$90 000 per annum. First useful data from this study is expected early in 1979.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House His Excellency the Governor will be prepared to receive honourable members for the purpose of presenting the Address in Reply at 2.10 p.m. today. I ask the mover and seconder of the address, and such other members as care to accompany me, to proceed to Government House for the purpose of presenting the address.

[Sitting suspended from 2.2 to 2.18 p.m.]

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that, accompanied by the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor's Opening Speech, and by other members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Address adopted by the House on 10 August, to which His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:

I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which I opened the second session of the Forty-third Parliament of South Australia. I am confident that you will give your best attention to all matters placed before you. I pray for God's blessing upon your deliberations.

PETITIONS: VOLUNTARY WORKERS

Mr. TONKIN presented a petition signed by 244 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to take action to protect and preserve the status of voluntary workers in the community.

Dr. EASTICK presented a similar petition signed by 24 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. HARRISON presented a petition signed by 38 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to amend the Succession Duties Act so that the position of blood relations sharing a family property enjoy at least the same benefits as those available to other recognised relationships.

Petition received.

PETITION: DOG REGISTRATION FEES

Mr. MAX BROWN presented a petition signed by 351 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government not to increase dog registration fees as proposed by the Working Party Report on Containing, Control, and Registration of Dogs.

Petition received.

MEMBER'S OVERSEAS VISIT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report on the overseas study tour, 1976, by Mr. S. G. Evans, member for Fisher.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME**SHEEP EXPORTS**

Mr. TONKIN: Will the Premier say whether the South Australian Government has accepted the findings of the Miller Report on live-sheep export, and what plans have been made or are being made to avoid a repetition of the most unfortunate and damaging confrontation which occurred previously, in light of the Australasian Meat Industry Employees Union rejection of the report and its subsequent threat to take further action from 31 August? The Miller Report shows that the export trade is a significant generator of jobs in its own right, that at most only a handful of meat industry jobs have been lost to the export trade, and that the imposition of ratios would be counter-productive, even for meat workers in the longer term. However, despite these findings, the A.M.I.E.U. has given notice of its intention to take further industrial action. The live-sheep export trade has provided a most valuable return to South Australia, and must be protected by the Government.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It will be a little time before it is possible for us to evaluate the report in full. When we have done that, I have no doubt we will be able to have discussions with the people concerned. We are concerned to see that there is not a repetition of the confrontation which occurred earlier this year and will use our best endeavours to see that that is the case.

NOVAR GARDENS LAND

Mr. GROOM: Can the Minister for Planning say how the price paid by the Housing Trust for the Lightburn Limited land at Novar Gardens was arrived at, and how did that compare with the Valuer-General's valuation of the land?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A report in the *News* last week referred to the fact that Lightburns had repurchased this land from Pilkingtons, I think, in September 1976 (although a deposit was originally paid in May of that year), for \$800 000, and that it was sold to the Housing Trust in February of this year for \$1 174 000. I should state, first, that negotiations relating to the purchase were handled by the late Mr. Alex Ramsay, dealing directly with Mr. Lightburn. It had been agreed that only the costs that had been actually incurred by Lightburns would be met by the Housing Trust in its purchase.

The costs actually outlaid by Lightburns between the time of its purchase of the land and its disposal are: rates and taxes, \$45 669; stamp duty, \$31 000; settlement interest, \$5 918; legal fees, \$4 124; agents' fees, \$29 355; levelling costs that had been paid by Lightburns, \$6 778; and interest, \$251 511.

That made a total of \$374 355, which, added to the \$800 000, would have given a figure of \$1 174 355. That was rounded out at \$1 174 000. Mr. Ramsay, on behalf of the Housing Trust, had refused to meet consulting fee expenses and advertising costs that Lightburn had incurred in relation to the land. Prior to any negotiations being entered into by the Housing Trust, the land was valued by the Valuer-General on the basis of R2 zoning and the land being used for medium density housing. There is, of course, an arrangement with the West Torrens council for that to take place. The valuation given by the Valuer-General at the beginning of this year was \$1 260 000, and the sum paid by the Housing Trust was \$86 000 below the valuation of the Valuer-General. I emphasise that the payment made by the trust to Lightburn met the costs incurred by that company.

SHEEP EXPORTS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Is the Minister of Labour and Industry satisfied that South Australian law in relation to picketing is satisfactory to control the situation if a confrontation occurs in the live sheep dispute? During the last dispute, when picketing occurred, the Government was not prepared to take action in relation to picketers, claiming that it was a Federal award and that it was a matter for the Commonwealth. This situation is obviously unsatisfactory when local confrontation occurs, and action is needed.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Throughout its term in office, the Government has always attempted to avoid confrontation and to encourage consultation on all matters, beginning at the shop floor level and carrying through to the Industrial Court, and including matters such as picketing. Any arrests made by the police, or efforts by the workers themselves to smash the picket line, will not solve the dispute. Obviously that will cause further confrontation and widen the dispute by bringing in other unions. On such occasions, the Government tries to get the parties together to avoid a confrontation.

I have said before that, in relation to the sheep industry dispute, it was at my instigation that the parties were

called together some two or three weeks before the Federal Minister intervened. Whilst the dispute was on South Australian territory, it was a Federal rather than a State matter; there is no question of that. If the member for Kavel takes his mind back, it is interesting to note that the propositions I put to the parties to that dispute in the first instance were similar to those involved in the final settlement. There was no difference in principle. The only differences I can recall in the terms of settlement related to the nomination of an arbitrator to determine the issue.

I did not go that far; I considered they could nominate their own arbitrator to examine the situation during a cooling-off period. The great success and strength of the Government has been to ally itself with that sort of peace in industry and, as a consequence, I again ask the honourable member and the Opposition to look at the statistics in this regard, wherein South Australia is so far ahead of other States that we were once described by my counterpart in Victoria as an industrially harmonious State.

RAIL SERVICES

Mr. KENEALLY: Has the Minister of Transport received any assurances from the Federal Minister for Transport (Mr. Nixon) that cuts in Australian National Railways services and personnel are not planned, and that a direction has not been given to the A.N.R. to prepare a report recommending where such cuts can be made? The electorate of Stuart encompasses most of the A.N.R. Commonwealth Railways Division, and the possibility that the Federal Government may be contemplating cuts in services horrifies the people in that area. I notice that the Federal Minister has denied that he has received such a report, but he has not denied that such a report has been prepared in his department.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Unfortunately, I have not received such an assurance, despite the fact that I have tried twice by telex to get Mr. Nixon to give that assurance to the people of South Australia. All that he will say is that he has not received a report and does not know anything of a report. I find it extremely strange that the Federal Minister for Transport does not know what is happening in his own department. Mr. Nixon has issued an instruction to the A.N.R. Commission to reduce the deficit by \$10 000 000.

Mr. Chapman: That instruction ensued from the Auditor-General's Report in 1973.

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

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No such instruction was given to me by the Auditor-General in 1973, and that has nothing to do with the question. The commission has been told to reduce its deficit by \$10 000 000, and the only way in which that can be done is to cut out services. Mr. Nixon has made a further revelation today, saying that, in addition, there is a 10-year plan, and the purpose of that is to cut out the deficit entirely. I suggest that members might do a few sums regarding what that means. The statement that the General Manager made in Adelaide last May when addressing the Rotary Club was that, if the A.N.R. carried out Mr. Nixon's instructions, that would be the case. I remind members that the Federal Minister has bitterly opposed the transfer ever since it was first mentioned. He opposed it in the Federal Parliament and was the only member of the House of Representatives who spoke against it.

The moment he became Minister again, he went racing off to a barrister in Melbourne to see whether he could

welch on the agreement that had been properly entered into by South Australia and the Commonwealth. That having failed, he is attempting now to pursue a course of trying to dismantle the railways, completely contrary to the spirit of the transfer, which requires the Commonwealth to operate, not dismantle, the services that were transferred to it.

I repeat what I said over the weekend and again yesterday that South Australia will not take the actions of Mr. Nixon without a fight. I would expect every member of this House and every Liberal in the Federal Parliament to support the demands of South Australia that the Commonwealth Government honour the agreement and not dismantle the railway system in this State.

Mr. Dean Brown interjecting:

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

SHEEP EXPORTS

Mr. RODDA: Can the Premier say whether an estimate has been made of the loss to South Australia as a result of the live-sheep dispute and of any possible damage to our reputation as a reliable trading partner with Middle East countries? If no such estimate has been made, why has it not been made?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not aware of an assessment having been made and I am blessed if I know how one could make one. The honourable member has managed to start working his little abacus, and I hope he will tell me precisely how one measures what the effect on our markets in the Middle East may be on what happens—

Mr. Tonkin interjecting:

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I certainly discussed the matter in the Middle East, and I could find no serious difficulties about the future of our market there. How one quantifies something of this kind, I do not know. If the honourable member can produce some methodology, I hope he will do so. I certainly cannot conceive of one, and I do not really believe that if the honourable member thought for a month of Sundays he could do so, either.

PRISON OFFICERS' AWARD

Mr. BANNON: Does the Minister of Labour and Industry consider that the criticism of the South Australian Public Service Board by the Full Commission of the South Australian Industrial Court in the prison officers' award case hearing is justified? In a judgment given on 9 August (and fairly widely reported in the press) the Full Commission had a number of fairly trenchant things to say but, in particular, dealing with a proposed consent prescription of double time and a half for work performed on public holidays, it said:

Indeed, we are constrained to say that such is the industrial irresponsibility attendant upon the approach of the Public Service Board in this matter that it places its industrial integrity in other areas in issue. Our charter under the Act is "to do what is fair and right . . . having regard to the interests of the persons immediately concerned and of society as a whole". Applying this test, we have no hesitation in condemning what is no more than an expedient "sweetheart" agreement between the parties which would prefer prison officers to the general body of employees throughout industry—we decline to give effect to it.

In view of those strong statements, I ask for the Minister's

comments.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It has always been my policy and that of the Government to pursue peace and not confrontation whenever industrial matters are being considered, and this has been from the common ground provided in the guidelines of wage indexation set down in State Legislation I introduced in 1975. My personal efforts at conciliation have been conducted with the knowledge that any decision reached would be subjected to the scrutiny of tribunals. In the present case, a concession was discussed in conference and, without going into detail, there appeared to be areas of solid ground for settlement. When the letter went out from the Public Service Board confirming the offer, specific reference was made to the need for scrutiny and ratification by the Industrial Commission. That letter states:

The General Secretary,
Australian Government Workers
Association,
240 Franklin Street,
Adelaide.

Dear Sir,

Prison Officers Award:

In relation to the log of claims seeking improvements in the Prison Officers Award, the board makes the following offer:

(1) Public Holidays

The board proposes that clause 12 be amended to read as follows:

Clause 12 Public Holidays

An officer required to work on any public holiday prescribed in the Holidays Act 1910-1971 (or days observed in lieu thereof) or on any day proclaimed as a public holiday throughout the State pursuant to the provisions of the said Act, shall be paid at the rate of double time and a half. This payment in substitution for and not cumulative upon the shift work allowance prescribed in clause 10 hereof.

This offer is subject to ratification by the Industrial Commission. Subject to written acceptance of this offer and the condition attached thereto, the board proposes that the date of operation be 29 May 1978.

I table that letter. I also table the following letter to the Chairman, Public Service Board, dated 29 June 1978 and signed by R. F. Morley:

Prison Officers Award

The Australian Government Workers Association accepts the offer as outlined in your letter of 20 June 1978 re public holidays.

Both those letters were tendered as evidence in the recent case. On this occasion the commission has refused ratification. It is my understanding that one person's view of the guidelines may conflict with that of another as to whether or not something is within the guidelines. The recent decision by the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission to ratify the Utah agreement is a case in point. I sincerely regret that some aspects of the criticism of the Public Service Board decision appear to go beyond what can be determined from those facts presented to the commission. I have every confidence in the Public Service Board to act in accordance with its responsibilities and its view of the guidelines.

The recent prison officers' decision was an industrially responsible one. However, it is of concern that the commission has seen fit to describe the Public Service Board's actions in respect of one of the claims before the commission as "industrially irresponsible" and call into question the board's industrial integrity. The decision did not state, as was submitted to the commission, that the offer to the unions in respect of penalty payments for public holidays was subject to the over-riding qualification

of the commission being satisfied that the offer did not offend the wage indexation guidelines.

In these circumstances, it is difficult to understand how this offer by the Public Service Board in those terms could have been described as a sweetheart agreement. The Public Service Board had continuously observed the wage indexation guidelines as laid down by the Australian and the South Australian commissions in its consideration of industrial matters, and will continue to do so.

PRAWN FISHING

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Works call on the Minister of Agriculture to refrain from implementing a reported schedule of licence fees for the prawn fishing industry in South Australia, or at least for those prawn fishermen who currently have authorities? I ask the Minister to cease proceeding with the reported formula until full consultation has been undertaken with the industry concerned. I draw attention to an agreement between the Australian Fishing Industry Council in South Australia and the Government regarding such major changes in the industry. In July 1977, it is claimed by the Australian Fishing Industry Council representatives, the Director of Agriculture and Fisheries gave an assurance to the prawn fishermen that the department would prepare discussion papers on a whole range of subjects covering the operation of the prawn fishing industry. It is claimed by that authority that to date the industry has received one such discussion paper, and the industry calls on the Government to explain why, on the one hand, the Minister asked the prawn fishermen to give him at least 10 to 12 months notice of an effective closure of the prawn fishery as applied in Spencer Gulf last year, and on the other hand why he proposes licence fee increases with two weeks notice and with absolutely no consultation in line with the agreement.

The increases to which I refer apply to two sections of the industry: one that operates a single-rig vessel in St. Vincent Gulf and the other that operates a double-rig vessel in Spencer Gulf. The proposed fees represent respectively an increase of 1 400 per cent and 2 800 per cent on the present fee structure. It seems justified at least to report to this House the violent reaction that has come from the prawn fishing industry in particular and the well-founded authority, the Australian Fishing Industry Council (S.A. Division), on behalf of the industry itself.

Accordingly, I seek the co-operation of the Minister and request that he ask his colleague in the other place to urgently adopt a fair and reasonable attitude towards the industry in this instance and, in line with a proposal made by the Minister of Transport today, uphold a Government agreement that appears to have been seriously eroded by the Minister of Fisheries in particular.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will do as the honourable member has requested. I will get an urgent report for him and let him know the outcome of that report as soon as possible.

NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. OLSON: Is the Attorney-General aware that the supplementary gap benefit available through the National Health Services Association of South Australia has been revised since 1 July 1978 without contributors being advised? I have received complaints from constituents who have been members of the association for more than 20 years and have been contributing for benefits equal to

table 8. Under the laws of that association a maximum gap benefit of \$100 is payable for each registered person for each calendar year. However, as the supplementary gap benefits have been revised with effect from 1 July 1978, an amount of only \$75 a calendar year is available. Does the Attorney believe that organisations of this kind are taking advantage of contributors because of the interference of the Federal Government in Medibank?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I do not know the details of the matter raised by the honourable member, but, from what he has told the House, it would appear that a breach of contract could well be involved in the arrangements that he has mentioned this afternoon. I will be happy to take the matter up on behalf of the honourable member's constituents if he gives me the details.

COLLEGE AMALGAMATIONS

Mrs. ADAMSON: Will the Minister of Education say whether draft legislation for the amalgamation of Torrens College of Advanced Education and Adelaide College of Advanced Education, and Kingston College of Advanced Education and Murray Park College of Advanced Education, has been drawn up? If so, does the Minister intend to make draft copies available to interested parties, including the Opposition, before the legislation is introduced, and when will that be? The future of many hundred staff members of the four colleges (including two principals who have already lost their positions) will be affected by the legislation. Those people are anxious to have the opportunity (and ample time) to study the legislation and make representations about it if need be.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The legislation has not been drawn up, but is in the process of being drawn. I am pleased to have the honourable member's assurance that the Opposition is an interested party. All I can say is that the normal consultative process will be carried out.

USED CAR PURCHASES

The Hon. G. W. BROOMHILL: Will the Attorney-General consider introducing legislation to allow a cooling-off period for persons buying used motor cars? My question is prompted by two approaches that have been made to me by constituents in recent weeks. On each occasion a child of the family has purchased a used motor car on impulse, or after attending a used car lot and being tackled by a salesman, and before they know it signing up to purchase a used car.

On arriving home and thinking the matter over, and after talking with their parents, they have regretted their decision. Unfortunately, however, there is no redress for them under existing legislation. As this may be a subject of common complaint to the department, will the Minister examine the matter to see whether such a provision is required?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I shall be happy to seek information from the department as to the number of queries received in relation to the need for some type of cooling-off period on contracts relating to the purchase of second-hand motor vehicles, and I shall let him have that information. The Government intends to amend the Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act during this session, and the amendment should be introduced soon. I will consider the honourable member's suggestion to see whether some type of provision similar to that suggested by him could be introduced into the legislation. Some difficulties are involved in a cooling-off arrangement relating to consumer

goods as against real estate, for which we have introduced cooling-off periods in the past.

Certain legislation provides for cooling-off periods in relation to items sold on a door-to-door basis. However, I think this principle generally needs to be restricted, and we need to look carefully at whether there is a demand and a need for such extension. Anyone who purchases a second-hand motor vehicle for a price of \$500 or more has the right, under the Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act, to have the vehicle repaired under warranty for three months, or for a longer period if the purchase price is more than the minimum of \$500. I think that gives fairly adequate protection generally. However, I shall look at the matter raised by the honourable member to see whether a cooling-off period is desirable.

BREAD BAKING

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether he is aware of great concern within the bread industry regarding illegal baking of bread at weekends, particularly in the metropolitan area; if so, what does the Government intend to do to overcome the problem?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am not aware that there is great concern—enormous concern, in other words; "great" was the word used by the honourable member. I do not think the people who are breaking the law are doing so at any great extent, although they do not get my support for breaking it, whether in a minimum or maximum way. I have had my inspectors out for some time trying to catch these people, and several prosecutions have followed, although I do not know that the penalty is sufficient to stop people breaking the law again. One of the problems is that the penalties are too light. The court does not inflict the penalties on these people. Obviously, those who are breaking the law are doing it to their own advantage and to the disadvantage of those who are complying. I do not know how I can physically get any more inspectors on the road. They are out in various areas, checking up on legislation, on second-hand car yards, on caravan parks, on people breaking the law in the bread-baking industry, and everywhere else.

Mr. Gunn: Throwing people out of jobs.

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

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Particularly with staff ceilings as they are at the moment, there seems to be no possibility of increasing the numbers of inspectorial staff. We can only do our physical best, and that is what we are doing.

Mr. Mathwin: And—

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

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I suppose we could consider legislation to increase the penalty, although the Liberal Party probably would be opposed to that. As is obvious from its previous policies on penalties, members opposite object quite strongly to increased penalties in most other areas. It seems that the only solution is to increase the penalties or to look at the holes in the legislation itself.

A couple of instances which have come to my notice are interesting. One metropolitan baker closes the doors, bars them, pulls down blinds, or paints his windows black so that no-one can see inside his premises and no-one can get in. My inspectors know that he is baking bread but cannot get in and catch him, because he is taking these precautions. That is a far from satisfactory position, and we are trying to stamp out that sort of practice as much as possible. I have no sympathy for people who break the law

to their own advantage and to other people's disadvantage, and that is what is happening in these circumstances.

STATE FINANCES

Mr. WILSON: When statutory bodies that have borrowed outside the Loan Council under Treasury guarantee are holding money surplus to immediate requirements, will the Premier say whether it is the Government's practice to transfer this money to the Treasury and, if so, is this money used to support the general Loan programme?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, it is normal to hold the money in a special trust fund and, in the case of statutory bodies which have not yet undertaken their major capital programme, to support the ongoing administrative costs of those bodies out of the interest. That has happened, for instance, with the South-East Areas Regional Cultural Centre Trust. We have given assistance to bodies of this kind in that way. The normal arrangement is that the moneys are invested with Treasury approval. The moneys are paid into a special account, and are then disbursed appropriately. I cannot say that in no case has this money been paid into general revenue, as in some cases it may well have been, but in most of these cases we have followed the course I have described to the honourable member.

CHILDREN'S INJURIES

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Community Welfare provide the House with any information on the work of the Northern Metropolitan Regional Panel on Non-Accidental Physical Injury to Children? I am aware that the work of the panel is becoming better known in my electorate and in other electorates in the northern suburbs, but I would appreciate it if the Minister could provide more details on the activities of the panel, together with any other relevant information.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member has had a continuing interest in this area, and I am pleased to be able to tell her that, only a couple of days ago, I received the annual report of the body to which she has referred. The Chairman of the panel, Dr. Brian Fotheringham of the Modbury Hospital, reports that the panel appears to be firmly established and functioning successfully. The panel met on 42 occasions during the last financial year, and these frequent meetings have served to minimise the delay in hearing new or urgent cases. Dr. Fotheringham reports that 39 cases were notified to the panel during the year, 50 per cent of the notifications coming from the Community Welfare Department and hospital sources. The report states that there has been an encouraging trend in the past six months in the number of notifications in the "at-risk" category.

If one subscribes to the view (and I am sure that all members do) that prevention is better than cure, then the more cases notified at the preventive level the better. Dr. Fotheringham believes that the higher notification of "at-risk" cases may also be an indication that the existence of the panels and the philosophy behind their creation are becoming more widely recognised and accepted. One of the most important aspects of the panel's work during the year has been the introduction of a course for the preparation of community volunteers to become parent aides. The role of these parent aides is to work with the parents of abused children and help them develop

parenting abilities.

There has been a very high level of acceptance, I am pleased to report, of parent aides by the families with which they have been placed in these circumstances. The first group of parent aides completed their training last November, and a second group is due to complete its training later this month. Dr. Fotheringham reports that further training courses are planned in the future. This brief summary of the panel's excellent report gives some indication of the progress being made in handling this often difficult and tragic matter by the officers concerned operating throughout the State.

MURRAY RIVER CONTROLS

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Works say whether, since the State Ministers responsible for water supply and conservation in South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales inspected the effects of salinity and other pollution in the Murray River, there has been any progress towards enacting the necessary legislation in Victoria and New South Wales to provide the River Murray Commission with adequate powers to control pollution in the Murray River and its tributaries?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: About two weeks after the tour to which the honourable member has referred, the River Murray Commission reported to all the Governments concerned, I think, the recommendations concerning amendments to be made to the River Murray Waters Agreement Act. As the honourable member would be aware, the South Australian Government had offered to make available the services of the South Australian Parliamentary Counsel to draft the necessary legislation. In other words, in consultation with the other two States and the Commonwealth, the Parliamentary Counsel would be responsible for the drafting of the legislation that would form the basis of the complementary legislation to be introduced in the Commonwealth and the State Parliaments concerned.

The recommendations in relation to the various amendments to the South Australian legislation are at present with the Crown Solicitor for checking. Only yesterday I inquired about the progress being made by the Crown Solicitor on this matter, because I am anxious to have Cabinet consider it and to obtain Government approval before I attend a meeting in Darwin that I have arranged through Mr. Newman with the various Ministers on, I think, 31 August, prior to the Water Resources Council meeting that will be held there on 1 September. I have written to both the Victorian and the New South Wales Ministers, and I tried to telephone the New South Wales Minister, Mr. Gordon, this morning, but there was trouble with Telecom and I was prevented from doing so. However, I intend to contact the Victorian and the New South Wales Ministers.

I was in touch early this morning with Mr. Newman about another matter and raised this matter with him, too. As far as the Federal Government is concerned, there is no problem. I do not know whether all the necessary steps have been taken by the Commonwealth, but there is no problem. I do not expect a problem with either Victoria or New South Wales; however, I want to be absolutely certain that the Governments concerned have approved in general terms what is already in operation, namely, the extension of functions, as agreed between them in October 1976. I want to be absolutely certain, before we launch into the expense of drawing up the necessary amendments and consulting with the other States and the Commonwealth, that those Governments have approved this final

step. If I have not had an indication of their approval by 31 August, I would certainly hope to have it on 31 August. When that occurs, and when all the Governments have agreed on the matter, I will be asking the South Australian Parliamentary Counsel to leave no stone unturned to draw up the legislation, because I would want, if at all possible, to introduce the legislation in the South Australian Parliament during this session.

PRAWN FISHING

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Fisheries what consultation took place between the Government and the prawn-fishing industry prior to the Minister's announcement that fees were to be increased by more than 2 800 per cent? Does the Government intend to use increased fees of this magnitude in other licensed industries? In today's *Advertiser* a press release indicates that the licence fees for prawning permits has been increased from \$300 to \$9 000 for vessels in the Spencer Gulf region. The prawn fishermen maintain that the extent of the increases was never discussed with the industry and, as a result, they have reacted violently to the announcement. A letter from the Director of the department clearly indicates that this increase is only the first of further massive imposts on the industry.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will refer the matter to my colleague and get a report for the honourable member.

MOORE v. DOYLE

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether officers of his department are still researching ways and means of overcoming the Moore and Doyle situation and whether this matter has been before meetings of Ministers of Labour and Industry? Further, has the South Australian Government proposal that was made three years ago in an effort to remedy the difficulties in this matter been accepted by the other States? This matter has occupied the attention of Mr. Bowes and other members of his department, and an approach that was suggested by the department received consideration in some States but was rejected by others. As this matter is still causing considerable concern in industrial affairs, I wish to know whether there has been any progress towards a solution.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I commend the honourable member for his interest in this matter. Not enough interest in it is shown throughout Australia, and as the honourable member quite rightly points out it can have serious industrial consequences. My department prepared a paper for me to present at a Ministers' conference about two and a half years ago. All Ministers were interested in the suggestion, which they were to refer to their departments to be examined in the light of both their own and Federal legislation. Nothing was done about it then at a Ministerial level for about 18 months. I then requested my own Premier to write to Mr. Neville Wran (Premier of New South Wales), asking whether he could encourage the New South Wales Labour Department and the people concerned in other States to reopen negotiations on the matter. The Premier did so and, to his credit, the New South Wales Premier made several speeches about it. It at least provided a platform for further discussions at the next Ministers' conference. We have done that and there has been a continuing examination of the matter by my department. Apart from South Australia, no other State appears to be interested at the moment. However, now

that the honourable member has raised the matter it will give me an opportunity to present an up-to-date paper at the next Ministers' conference in September, and I will be discussing it with my department.

OVERSEAS STUDY REPORT

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the rescission of an order of the House made this day.

Motion carried.

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

That the order of the House for the printing of the overseas study tour report by the member for Fisher be rescinded.

I do this without casting any criticism or aspersion upon the member for Fisher or his report. I believe that the reports made by members to this House on the completion of study tours are useful and informative to members and that members should have that information. However, I believe that the information is satisfactorily provided for members or any other interested persons by the tabling of the report and the provision of a sufficient number of typed copies (up to half a dozen or 10) so that anyone who is likely to take an interest in the matter can get information from the number of copies supplied to the House.

It seems to me an extraordinarily unnecessary expense to go to the length of setting up the machinery and printing the material when it can be provided in that ordinary way. I appreciate the approach made to me by the member for Fisher, who indicated that my remarks in the House, when I expressed some surprise at being called on to move the printing of the report, he actually supported, and he felt that it was an unnecessary exercise to go to the length of printing the report and that it was encumbent on members to save money where they could. I am told by the Clerk that it has previously been the practice to print these reports, although I think that is an unnecessary expense. I appreciate the support of the member for Fisher for the course I am now recommending to the House.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the motion. My report is lengthy and I did not really consider the cost of printing it when I was preparing the document. I also agree that it is unnecessary to print any such report in the future. It is a practice that I think should never have been started. I think I have given three copies to the Clerk, and I have at least another 10, which can be made available to the library. We should try to save money where possible, and I believe that a duplicated report that can be perused by members either in the House or in the Library is the best and cheapest way to do this. I support the motion and hope the practice of not printing members' overseas study tour reports will be continued.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): As the seconder of the original motion to be rescinded, I commend the member for Fisher not only for the excellence of his report which I have studied only briefly but also for his attitude to this matter. I wish to place on record how refreshing it is to find some concern being shown for unnecessary expenditure by the Government.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the motion. I regard these study leave reports as valuable. I hope that no-one will construe from this motion that there is no value in these reports. I was fortunate to be the first

member on the Opposition side selected to undertake a study tour. I took it seriously, as has I think everyone who has been chosen since then, and I have received much pleasure and information from reading study leave reports of members on both sides of the House. I read with interest the report of the member for Florey. Although I did not agree with everything he said, it was refreshing to get a view from the other side of the House about union affairs overseas.

I support the motion to save expense, but I stress that I believe roneoed copies of these study leave reports should be made available to any member of the public who is interested in the topic studied. I would be very concerned if I thought these study leave tours were in any way being down-graded by the fact that the House did not believe it was necessary to have them officially printed. I believe copies should be freely available and, if it can be done less expensively, I support the motion.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY INTO PROSTITUTION

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable him to move a motion without notice forthwith.

Motion carried.

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

That a Select Committee be immediately appointed to inquire into and report to the House upon the following:

1. The extent of prostitution in this State, including the ownership and operation of premises in relation thereto and the receipt of profit therefrom.
2. Whether the law relating to prostitution should be altered in any way.
3. Whether it is desirable to introduce a licensing or registration system for massage services for reward by other than registered physiotherapists, legally qualified medical practitioners or chiropractors, where the massage is not connected with prostitution.

In making the said inquiries, publication of the identity of witnesses or material which disclose the identity of witnesses shall be prohibited, unless authorized by the committee; and hearings of the committee shall not commence until arrangements have been made to ensure the immunity of witnesses from prosecution for offences against sections 25, 26, 28 and 29 of the Police Offences Act and kindred offences against the common law and the Criminal Law Consolidation Act which may be revealed in the course of evidence before the committee.

I draw honourable members' attention to the fact that that is a slightly amended form of the resolution from that I gave to the Leader this afternoon. First, it cuts out the words "in the opinion of this House", which are unnecessary, and describes the Select Committee as "a select committee of inquiry", because it is a Select Committee to inquire. It also adds the Provision that not merely the identity of witnesses but material which would disclose the identity of witnesses should be prohibited.

That has been added because it has been that case previously that newspapers (and this was found at the time of the Duncan coronial inquiry) did, in fact, publish material which, although it did not give the witnesses names, certainly gave enough information concerning the witnesses to disclose their identities. In fact, some witnesses who came before that coronial inquiry lost their

employment, as a result of having given evidence before that inquiry, because of that publication in newspapers. Therefore, it is undesirable that that should be allowed to occur. It is vital that the House, to protect the proceedings which it is proposing to establish by this committee, should have covered that in the resolution before hand so that there can be no doubt that, if we have to call somebody up for breach of the conditions, that is fully covered and they are warned beforehand.

The reason for the provision that the committee is not to commence inquiries in this way before there has been adequate arrangement made arises from a minute by the Director-General of the Law Department to the Government, which I propose to read to the House because I think it is important information for the House as to the proceedings of the Committee. I sent to the Crown Solicitor a requirement that the necessary provisions to give proper immunity to witnesses should be made before this inquiry was commenced so that similar immunities to those granted under the Royal Commission into the Non-medical Use of Drugs would be provided in this particular case.

I put to honourable members that that is absolutely vital if, in fact, we are to get the kind of evidence which this Select Committee must have. The minute from the Director-General is as follows:

I refer to the minute herein dated 8 August 1978 of the Crown Solicitor and draft amending resolution prepared by him.

The Crown Solicitor points out that it is not possible to provide immunity from prosecution by any act or direction of a Select Committee.

The immunities provided to witnesses before the Royal Commission into the Non-medical Use of Drugs are substantially based upon the 1977 amendment to the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act, 1939-1976, referred to by the Crown Solicitor.

In addition, arrangements endorsed by Cabinet were:

- (1) that the Government may undertake, on the recommendation of the Commission, not to proceed in relation to offences other than offences under the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act, provided that no proceedings with respect to the offence or offences had already begun and provided that the Commission did not certify that, in its opinion, the giving of such evidence or the making of the submission was for the purpose of avoiding prosecution.
- (2) that the Commissioner of Police would be requested to direct his officers not to proceed against witnesses to the Commission in respect of offences which would otherwise be covered by the Government's other undertakings and
- (3) that an approach would be made to the Commonwealth and other State Governments to seek their co-operation by undertaking not to prosecute witnesses disclosing offences within their jurisdiction.

Although the proposed Select Committee would, as a substantial proportion of its inquiry, be dealing with matters which could give rise to evidence of offences relating to prostitution and brothels under the Police Offences Act, there could be a number of other offences disclosed, such as obtaining moneys by menaces, rape and other offences involving violence to the person.

In order to provide similar immunities to those provided to witnesses before the Royal Commission into the Non-medical Use of Drugs, it would be necessary for legislation to be passed which provided that no person should be prosecuted, except upon the authorisation of the Attorney-

General, where that person, in evidence before, or in a submission to, the Select Committee, made a statement tending to incriminate her or him of an offence against sections 25, 26, 28 and 29 of the Police Offences Act and kindred offences against the common law and the Criminal Law Consolidation Act (e.g. sections 63, 64, 65, 66 and 68). Although prosecutions against sections 25 and 26 require the written consent of the Commissioner of Police or a Superintendent or Inspector, this would not provide similar immunity to that provided to the Royal Commission.

Any further immunities of the kind mentioned above in relation to witnesses before the Royal Commission into the Non-medical Use of Drugs would have to be by Government undertakings.

It could be provided in the resolution setting up the Select Committee that the committee should not commence any hearings until an undertaking as to immunity, satisfactory to the Committee, had been given by the Government.

We do propose to provide those immunities to enable the committee to proceed with its inquiries. It is necessary that the committee be satisfied that that situation is covered before it commences calling witnesses before it. That is why that section is included in the resolution before the House.

Dr. Tonkin: Do you think there will not be a need for legislation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not believe that we will have to legislate. I believe that undertakings by the Government will be sufficient, but it will be necessary to assure the committee that that is the situation and that the necessary undertakings have been given; then the committee is in a position to proceed. If the committee, as a result of calling law officers before it, should conclude that legislation were necessary, then the Government undertakes to introduce that legislation promptly.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): For obvious reasons I support this motion. At the outset, I commend the Hon. Mr. Burdett and the member for Hanson for having raised in another place and having placed on the Notice Paper in this place, a matter similar to this, and I believe that that has considerably helped the Government to take this positive step. I consider that this matter is, to a large extent, above politics and should be treated as such.

It is an important matter and with the growing rate of the incidence of violent crime and the growing evidence day by day of the involvement of organised crime in our society, I think it necessary, indeed, that we should go into these matters and find out every thing we can about them so that the Government will be in a position to take the necessary steps to protect the community.

When the matter was first raised, the Liberal Party intended that a Joint Select Committee should be appointed, for obvious reasons. We believed that the matter was of such significance and such importance that it would be covered properly only by a Joint Select Committee. However, with the assurances the Premier has given, and the fact that the Government is prepared to move on the matter, I am pleased to support the motion. I am certain that our two representatives on the Select Committee will give the whole matter their best attention.

The matter of adequate safeguards is most important, and I am pleased that the Premier has elucidated the position so thoroughly. It is important that we do not suffer in any way from the effect of stand-over tactics, threats of violence, or blackmail, all of which activities in other countries and in other societies have been associated with inquiries of this sort. The whole question of organised prostitution, associated as it is with stand-over tactics, threats and menaces, and in many instances involving the use and supply of drugs as associated functions, is one on

which we cannot afford to influence the deliberations of the Select Committee in any way.

The protection of witnesses is absolutely essential, and I am pleased that the Government will give undertakings involving, I presume, the Attorney-General's function in this matter. I am even more pleased to hear that the Government will introduce legislation if it becomes necessary, and I accept the Premier's undertaking. If it becomes necessary to introduce legislation in this House, despite the Government's remarks that it has a heavy legislative programme—

Mr. Goldsworthy: We haven't seen—

Mr. TONKIN: We have not seen much evidence of it, no. However, I assure the Government that if legislation is necessary the Opposition will be pleased to give the most urgent consideration to any measures to provide the necessary protection to witnesses and to further the deliberations and the outcome of the Select Committee.

Motion carried.

The House appointed a Select Committee consisting of Mrs. Byrne and Messrs. Keneally, McRae, Millhouse, Nankivell, Simmons, and Wilson; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers, and records and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on 9 November.

HARBORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Marine) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Harbors Act, 1936-1974; and to make consequential or related amendments to the Local Government Act, 1934-1978, the Crown Lands Act, 1929-1977, and the Coast Protection Act, 1972-1975. Read a first time.

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

The amendments contained in this Bill arise from a variety of circumstances. The development of modern shipping and the associated technology and new approaches to the management of ports and port-related activities, demand corresponding changes to the legislative framework upon which the administration of harbors and ports is based. This Bill therefore covers a number of miscellaneous, yet most important, matters. The most significant amendments increase the minimum size of vessels for which compulsory pilotage is required, facilitate the administration and enforcement of the Act, and make possible the transfer of non-commercial jetties from the control of the Minister of Marine.

Included in the Bill are consequential amendments to the Local Government Act, Crown Lands Act and Coast Protection Act. The Bill also extends the definition of "vessels" to include newly launched hulls, partly broken-up vessels, and other structures. Control over these is essential if safe navigation in harbors is to be assured. The provisions for the acquisition and disposal of land have been amended to comply with the modern requirements of the Land Acquisition Act, 1969-1972, and to eliminate the unnecessarily complicated existing procedures. Where appropriate, metric values have been substituted for imperial units.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 amends the

heading to Part II of the Act. The amendment is related to subsequent provisions of the Bill which provide for consolidation of the provisions for acquisition of property in Part II. Clause 5 amends section 5 of the principal Act to provide a metric value for an imperial unit. Clause 6 repeals section 6 of the principal Act, which is superseded by the amendments to section 8 of the principal Act.

Clause 7 amends section 8 of the principal Act to consolidate within one Division the provisions for the acquisition of properties. The definition of kinds of properties to which the section applies is expanded to include property which can now be required under Part III. The amendment also provides that the Land Acquisition Act shall apply to all acquisitions. Clause 8 repeals Division III and Division IV of Part II of the principal Act, which is superseded by the amendments to section 8 of the principal Act. Clause 9 amends section 32 of the principal Act by providing that compensation to owners, lessees, and other persons having interest in land abutting on any resumed, closed or obstructed streets, roads or ways shall be arrived at by agreement or determined by the Land and Valuation Court rather than under the obsolete provisions of Division IV which are to be repealed. Clause 10 repeals sections 34, 35, 36, 37 and 40 of the principal Act and includes in their place a general provision for the disposal of property by the Minister.

Clause 11 amends section 43 of the principal Act, which contains definitions for the purposes of Part III. A new definition of "navigational aid", including all relevant structures, marks and devices, is included. The existing definitions of "buoys and beacons" and "lighthouse" are repealed. The definition of "Harbourmaster" is varied to provide for appointments by the Minister and the definition of "vessel" is expanded to include all floating structures, including wrecks. "Mile" is defined as a nautical mile, and the definition of "within the limits of the jurisdiction of the Minister" is amended to substitute a metric value for an imperial unit. Clause 12 repeals sections 44 and 45 of the principal Act and substitutes a new provision consolidating those provisions with the provisions presently contained in subsection (1), (2) and (3) of section 476 of the Local Government Act. (These latter provisions are to be repealed by clause 38 of the Bill). This consolidation provides a comprehensive code for the care, control and management of the foreshore, reserves and wharves. The new section expands the existing provisions to enable the Governor by proclamation to place any part of the foreshore, any reserve or structure under the care, control and management of any Minister of the Crown, the Coast Protection Board, or a council.

Clause 13 repeals section 48 of the principal Act which is superseded by the amendment to section 8 of the principal Act. Clause 14 amends section 64 of the principal Act to provide consistency with other amendments proposed in the Bill. Clause 15 amends section 66 of the principal Act by substituting a metric value for an imperial unit. Clause 16 repeals section 68 of the principal Act and includes in its place a new section investing the Minister with exclusive control and management of navigational aids, and the limiting of civil liability on the Minister or employees for acts or omissions in good faith in the positioning or operation of navigational aids. Clause 17 amends section 69 of the principal Act by striking out references to buoys and beacons, etc., and is consequential to the amendments to section 43. Clause 18 amends section 70 of the principal Act to extend the power of the Minister to require dredging for a distance of 60 metres from private wharves within harbors. Clause 19 repeals sections 71 and 71a of the principal Act which are superseded by the

amendments to section 8 of the principal Act.

Clause 20 amends section 75 of the principal Act and is consequential to the amendment of section 43. Clause 21 enacts Division IVA of Part III of the principal Act and provides a new section to empower a member of the Police Force, harbormaster, or person authorised in writing by the Minister, to direct the master of a vessel to stop or manoeuvre the vessel in a specified manner, board and inspect a vessel and to require persons suspected of committing an offence against the Act to state their names and addresses. Clause 22 amends section 89 of the principal Act by increasing the minimum size of vessels for which compulsory pilotage is required. Clause 23 repeals section 92 and section 93 of the principal Act. These provisions are no longer necessary or appropriate in view of the fact that pilots are now Crown employees. Clause 24 repeals section 94 of the principal Act, a redundant section. Clause 25 amends section 109 of the principal Act by removing offences considered no longer applicable to pilots employed by the Minister.

Clause 26 amends section 116a of the principal Act and is consequential to the amendment of section 89. Clause 27 amends section 117 of the principal Act by substituting a metric value for an imperial unit. Clause 28 amends section 122 of the principal Act to remove the limitation on the power to require the removal of a wreck, stranded or abandoned vessel. At present the power can only be exercised where "injury to navigation" can be established. This is, in many cases, an unrealistic fetter upon the exercise of the power. Clause 29 amends section 127 of the principal Act and makes provision for the levying by regulation of harbor improvement rates on goods discharged or shipped from a specified harbor. Clause 30 repeals section 132a of the principal Act, which is redundant. Clause 31 amends section 144 of the principal Act, in consequence of the new definition of "navigational aid" in section 43, and provides that regulations may require compliance with standards made or recommended by any specified authority body or person.

Clause 32 amends section 161 of the principal Act in consequence of the new definition of "navigational aid" in section 43. Clause 33 repeals section 188 of the principal Act which is now redundant. Clause 34 amends section 193 of the principal Act and provides for the prescribing by regulation of the method of calculation of the tonnage of deck cargo carried by a vessel. Clause 35 repeals the third schedule and is consequential to the amendment to section 193 of the principal Act. Clause 36 repeals the fourth schedule and is consequential to the repealing of section 71a and to the amendment of section 8 of the principal Act. Clauses 37, 38 and 39 amend the Local Government Act, the Crown Lands Act, and the Coast Protection Act. The amendments are consequential upon the new section 44 inserted in the principal Act by the Bill.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

REMARK IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Remark Irrigation Trust Act, 1936-1978. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Remark Irrigation Trust is the authority which is responsible for the supply of water to agricultural land in

the Renmark irrigation district. Owners of such land who are ratepayers under the principal Act are entitled to be supplied with water under its terms. Although the trust has power to supply water to non-ratepayers in the district, it is not clear that it can do this for any purpose other than irrigation or domestic use. Water is needed for other purposes such as use by industry, drinking water for stock, and public purposes, generally. The trust has no specific power at present to supply water for these purposes. The effect of the Bill will be to give the trust a general power to supply water for any purpose on terms and conditions that it determines. The obligation to supply ratepayers is unaffected by the proposed amendments and the supply of water to non-ratepayers is subject to the trust's obligation to ratepayers. As the remainder is explanatory, I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 removes from section 60 of the principal Act the passage "for irrigation and domestic purposes". These words restricted the power of the trust when supplying water to townships and are no longer appropriate. Clause 3 replaces and simplifies section 64 of the principal Act, which deals with the supply of additional water. Besides simplifying the section, it removes two anachronistic provisions requiring that additional water be supplied only for domestic and irrigation purposes and only with the Minister's consent. Clause 4 amends section 73 of the principal Act, which empowers the trust to make regulations and by-laws. Paragraph (a) gives the trust power to make regulations and by-laws for or incidental to the purposes for which the trust is constituted and for the exercise by the trust of its powers under the principal Act. This provision will mean that, in the future, the trust will be less restricted in its regulation-making powers.

Paragraph (b) repeals the power given by paragraph IIIa to fix terms and conditions for the supply of additional water. This power is subsumed under the wider power to impose terms and conditions on the supply of water in paragraph XII. Paragraph (c) adds power to make regulations and by-laws on specific subjects. Paragraph XII gives the general power to impose terms and conditions on the supply of water. Paragraph XIII allows for the measurement of water supplied which will enable appropriate rates to be charged. Paragraph XIV deals with the granting of licences for the diversion or taking of water. Paragraph XV increases the penalty that can be imposed for breach of regulations or by-laws from \$100 to \$200. The penalty was originally 50 pounds, and a penalty of \$200 is now more realistic.

Mr. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2), 1978

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the Government of South Australia during the year ending 30 June 1979.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to apply, out of the General Revenue, a further sum of \$270 000 000 to the Public Service for the financial year

ending on the thirtieth day of June 1979. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides \$270 000 000 to enable the Public Service to carry out its normal functions until assent is received to the Appropriation Bill. Members will recall that it is usual for the Government to introduce two Supply Bills each year. The earlier Bill, for \$220 000 000, was designed to cover expenditure for about the first two months of the year. The Bill now before the House is expected to be sufficient to cover expenditure until mid-November, by which time debate on the Appropriation Bill is expected to be complete and assent received.

Normally, at this stage, the second Supply Bill would be introduced for the same amount as the first Bill. However, this year it is planned to change procedures and introduce the Appropriation and Public Purposes Loan Bills together on 12 September. This change may require additional time for the passage of the Appropriation Bill and, to cover this contingency, the amount of this Supply Bill is \$50 000 000 greater than normal requirements. The Bill provides the same kind of authority as has been granted in the Supply Acts in previous years.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill is in the usual form for matters of this kind. It provides about \$50 000 000 more than the usual Bill introduced at this stage. I am indeed pleased to hear that the Appropriation and Public Purposes Loan Bills will be introduced together, on 12 September. This move has been in operation in other State Parliaments for some time, and I believe that it is a sensible one. It has become apparent over the years that it is impossible to consider (indeed, I think that the Treasurer has said this) matters involved in the Loan Account and the current Revenue Account in isolation, because one bears on the other, and we have had instances of sums being transferred from one account to the other in times gone by at the end of the financial year.

I am a little puzzled by the need to provide the additional \$50 000 000, and the comment that the additional time is the reason. The fact that we may require additional time for the passage of the Appropriation Bill and the Public Purposes Loan Bill is, to me, a heartening suggestion, because it seems that we will be able to consider in more detail the matters presented to us than has been the case previously, and it seems that we can expect to get more detailed meaningful answers.

It has been a matter of considerable concern to the Opposition in the past that we have not been able to obtain from Ministers the answers that should properly be forthcoming to the Opposition as a matter of public interest. Be that as it may, we will be prepared to wait and see the outcome. If it means that in this heavy legislative programme that the Government tells us it has we will be devoting more time to the consideration of the Budget and Loan Estimates, I can only welcome that move. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

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

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

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I have already referred to the heavy legislative programme which is supposedly confronting the Parliament, but we have seen no evidence to support the existence of such a programme. There are at present 18 matters of Government business on the Notice Paper, together with two matters that have been placed on it today. In looking at those, I would say

they would involve a short time indeed, before they could be dealt with effectively by this Chamber and sent elsewhere.

The number of Bills on the Notice Paper gives no indication of the amount of work that needs to be done. I was surprised to see the programme for this week, showing as it does, for instance, that on Wednesday, Other Business will be dealt with until 6 p.m., with which I totally agree, but then only three Select Committees are to be set up, and the Barley Marketing Act Amendment Bill is to be dealt with. That Bill is important, but it will not occupy the time until the time for the moving of the adjournment of the House.

The Government, in this session, has been under sustained attack by the Opposition, and I think it interesting that the timing of the introduction of this Supply Bill should coincide with the introduction tonight in the Federal Parliament of the Federal Government's Budget. Undoubtedly, as we have seen already, there is a considerable interest in the community, which has been reflected in newspaper headlines, in speculation, and in all sorts of analyses, much of it promoted by the Labor Party, which has been guilty of raising unnecessary concern in the minds of many people and generally behaving in a disgraceful way.

Obviously, this State Government is trying to minimise any further adverse publicity that may be coming, because of its own management of the State's economy, by blaming the Federal Government, which it has been doing ever since the session started. It has been trying to divert attention from the State's economy by blaming the Federal Government for the cut-backs which, according to it, are responsible for every single ill concerning the State. It has blamed the Federal Government for the cut-backs and, in so doing, it has explained away its own shortcomings. I say yet again, although I probably should not have to do so, that this State is in considerable difficulty, and I can well understand why the Government wants to draw attention away from that dangerous situation.

The State deficit is \$25 000 000. The Premier has in the past been quick to say that South Australia is the envy of every other State. I think we have all heard him say that so many times that it does not matter. He has said it in respect of almost everything good, but not about everything else. What he means is that in respect of a particular subject South Australia has been standing out above every other State, but I have not heard him making the same sort of comment about this State's financial situation.

We are not the envy of every other State in this regard, and I think that every other State would be looking at South Australia with some degree of horror. I am amazed that South Australians are not looking at this State Government's performance with more horror than they are, but I believe that that horror is increasing. If we look at the comparative situation of State Budgets, once again we find that, apart from Tasmania, which budgeted for a small deficit, South Australia is the only State that has a deficit for the past financial year. Not only that, but the deficit in the past financial year of \$25 000 000 is a record for this State, and it is more than the sum total of all the deficits for the previous 10 years.

The railways agreement, we heard, was to bring this State about \$800 000 000 over 10 years. An analogy, is being made successfully, namely, many times in the past people who have come into a small fortune, such as people who have won the lottery, having spent their money and embarked on a course of spending foreign to them, have lost not only the money they have won but the remainder of their possessions as well, because they have got into the

habit of not considering how they spend money. The State Government, with the railways agreement money, has been guilty of doing exactly the same thing: it has been going on spending, regardless of the effects. It has continued that policy, which the Whitlam Government has proved to be wrong, which has been acknowledged to be wrong by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, and which has been tacitly accepted by Mr. Wran, Premier of New South Wales, as being wrong. The Government of South Australia has insisted on spending as though no financial stringencies were placed on us. The railways agreement was very attractive financially (one cannot deny that), but it has contributed severely to our critical financial situation at present. It was accepted and agreed to by the Australian Labor Party and this Government for political considerations. The Government wanted to bring about decentralisation of power in Canberra and wanted, by making a good and attractive deal, to persuade other States that they had everything to gain by handing over their railways, and ultimately other things, to Canberra control.

That is what it tried to do, and that is why we have the benefit of about \$800 000 000 over 10 years, but the whole point is that, with that extra money, we have behaved exactly as has the lottery winner: we have spent it all away to give some tangible and visible evidence that it was worth going along with what was then a Canberra Labor Government and with the concentration of all power in Canberra. If we were to look at the correct Budget deficit for South Australia at present, it would really be \$25 000 000, plus the sum that came to South Australia under the railways agreement in that same time.

It is something in excess of \$100 000 000. In other words, the \$25 000 000 plus the amount that came to us under the agreement and the saving in the country rail deficit would amount to \$100 000 000 plus the \$25 000 000. Our true deficit, that is, the deficit on last years' spending, should probably be in the region of \$125 000 000. Inevitably, the question that will be asked is, "Where has all this money gone?" After all, it is taxpayers' money. The level of spending and the colossal extravagance that this represents to the people of South Australia is absolutely disgraceful. It is a \$125 000 000 deficit, because South Australia had at least \$100 000 000 more than the other States had.

It is apparent why the South Australian Government is doing the best it can to harp on about the Federal scene, why it is taking every opportunity to speculate about the Federal Budget and why it is trying to hide how much worse than the other States' finances South Australia's finances have become, in spite of the railway deal. The latest attempt to blame the Commonwealth Government and to prejudice the Budget also involves the railways and show up the totally political and hypocritical attitude of the State Minister of Transport.

A report appeared in the *Sunday Mail* last weekend, which I am told was made available by the State Minister of Transport, intimating that the State's country rail services would be slashed. The *Sunday Mail* quoted a report that had been prepared, the Minister said, by the Australian National Railways Commission, showing the cut-backs that the Minister expected. The Minister said that it was a blueprint for tearing the State's rail services to pieces. The plan covered, so it was said, reductions in frequency of services and in facilities they provided, referring to the Overland and the Ghan and the cessation of such services as those to Peterborough, Mount Gambier, Gladstone, Wilmington and Victor Harbor.

The impression given throughout the report by the Minister was that the outcome depended on the Federal

Budget and that the cuts were expected to be announced tonight and operating as from next week. It was as urgent as that. That was the clear impression given by the Minister.

The other thing that he clearly said and repeated in the House this afternoon was that he was totally and absolutely against this plan and that he would stand up and fight any cut back in services in the country railways. He said he would depend on Liberal Party Senators and other Senators to stop the country rail services being closed. Why did he sell out?

The Minister's politicking over the weekend has been totally revealed by later disclosures. It turns out that the report relates to a draft plan (and we have heard about draft plans before) which has not yet been submitted to the Federal Minister and which, far from coming into operation next week, will cover the next 10 years. At this stage, they are only proposals.

The whole exercise by the State Minister drew forth a stern rebuke from the Federal Minister, a well justified rebuke. Among other things, he said that he wished the State Minister would refrain from further comment and speculation. Indeed, the letter sent by the Federal Minister to the State Minister, who carefully did not quote it in full this afternoon, states, in part:

In the meantime, I would be grateful if you could refrain from further comment and speculation. To alleviate the concern you have caused the people in your State, you might consider making a public statement indicating that your comments were based on rumour only, and that I have informed you the Commonwealth has not yet received any proposals from A.N.R. and therefore not made any decisions which will adversely affect any rail services in South Australia.

Yet the Minister of Transport persisted in the House with the half truth that he had not received any reassurance from the Federal Minister. A reassurance about what? The Federal Minister has not received the report. How on earth could he be expected to give reassurances about matters that are the subject of an alleged report that he had not yet seen? The whole exercise has been typical of the tactics indulged in by the Labor Party generally. It is something that has caused the people of this State and Australia generally a great deal of unnecessary concern.

The Federal Minister makes a strong point when he suggests that the State Minister should apologise to the people of South Australia for the concern he has caused. I believe that he has acted in a disgraceful way. There again, members of the Australian Labor Party have, in recent days and weeks, demonstrated that they do not have any concern for people's fears; indeed, they have played on people's fears simply to make political mileage and capital. The people of South Australia will not forget this sort of activity.

The first point I wanted to draw to the attention of the House was the extreme and disgraceful politicking of the Minister of Transport on this matter. That despicable action was at least equally as bad as the gross hypocrisy that has been demonstrated during the course of this entire exercise. Having listened to the Minister of Transport over the past few days, one would expect that he did not really expect to lose control of the railways when they were transferred to Canberra.

The second point is that one would be forgiven for believing (and certainly he said so in the House this afternoon) that he was totally opposed to any change or reduction in country services. Of course, once he had sold the railways he had no control over them. Surely he must know that. He is far too shrewd an operator not to be aware that he sold that control when he sold the railways.

The point concerning the veto which I believe was used by the Government in some justification of its decision to accept the Canberra Government's offer with such alacrity in the first instance is absolutely ridiculous. The South Australian Government does not have a veto on this matter: it simply has the power to ask for the matter to go to an adjudicator. That is not control. The Federal Minister would know that very well, too, and so would the State Minister, who had no right to intimate publicly that he believed he had control. When he sold the railways he sold the control of them. That is as fundamental a fact as one could find. I do not see what good there is in shedding crocodile tears now, but that is what he is trying to do.

As for being totally opposed to a reduction or closure of services, I should like to consider the Minister's past record, which I have done several times in the House. It is not a particularly good record, as honourable members will know. Let me bring out a few headings that will recall for honourable members the sort of fiasco that we have seen created by the Minister of Transport in this State. "The world's biggest dial-a-bus system would begin operating in Adelaide in June," the Minister announced on 24 March 1973. "There will be an electric railway next year. A \$15 000 000 electric railway is expected to be completed between Adelaide and Christie Downs, the centre of the proposed Noarlunga region, by the end of next year." That was in April 1974. The Minister cannot even say that it was a Federal Liberal Government that denied him the funds. It was his own brand of Government, the Whitlam Government. That \$15 000 000 electric railway was presumably expected to be operating to Christie Downs by December 1975, but have we seen it? No, nor have we seen anything like the futuristic illustration that appeared in the newspaper.

In July 1973 an article, headed "\$22 000 000 plans for trains", stated:

High-speed, electric double-decker trains could be servicing the new Adelaide-Christie Downs railway line by mid-1975.

Once again in no way could the Government have blamed a Federal Liberal Government at that stage, because a Federal Labor Government apparently refused the funds. In October 1975 the following headline appeared in a local paper: "Press-button transport planned for Monarto". There were two disasters there. The article said that the State Government was examining the possible application of a space-age, fully automatic public transport system for the new city of Monarto. We all know what happened to Monarto. In June 1973 we were promised "driverless shuttles"—

Mr. Dean Brown: What about magnetic levitation?

Mr. TONKIN: That is something that may well come in the future, as well as linear induction motors.

Mr. Wotton: So will the horse and cart.

Mr. TONKIN: We may well be back to the horse-and-buggy days before the Government does anything about it. We were promised "driverless shuttles", and in September 1975 it was reported that the railways forecast a rural super train. The article stated:

An improved railway from Adelaide to Murray Bridge with some sections allowing speeds up to 160 km/h is forecast in a South Australian Railways report.

In June 1970 an *Advertiser* report was headed "Some lines 'must go' ". Here is an interesting thought: in the midst of these clippings which I have pulled out of the file I find a clipping dated 10 June 1970, when the Minister was still basking in the honeymoon glow of his office, and stating:

Railway lines should not be kept open just for the sake of keeping them open, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Virgo) told the convention yesterday. "Whether we like it or not,

there are lines in South Australia that just cannot be retained and should not be retained," he said.

He then ventilated the whole problem a little more thoroughly. On 27 October 1971 the *Advertiser* stated:

Rail loss alarms Government—The Minister of Roads and Transport (Mr. Virgo) said yesterday that the South Australian Railways deficit had risen to alarming proportions. He said the South Australian Railways loss over a number of years had been \$6 000 000 to \$8 000 000. That loss was readily accepted because the railways were essential to the social well-being of the State . . . Over the past three years, due primarily to cost increases, that deficit had increased first to \$12 700 000, then to \$16 100 000 and this year was likely to be more than \$20 000 000.

Obviously, from his comments, he believed something ought to be done about it. He said that, every time a passenger got on a country train, the working cost to the Government amounted to between \$12.68 and \$14.72. I am quoting 1971 figures, and this was over and above the fares charged to passengers. At a press conference Mr. Virgo said:

The primary cause of the trouble was the non-use of the public transport system generally.

There was a supporting editorial in the *Advertiser* which stated:

Mounting rail deficits—Many people will share the concern voiced by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Virgo) over the prospective deficit of some \$20 000 000 on South Australian Railways operations this financial year. Describing the figure as of "alarming proportions," the Minister indicated yesterday that the drift could not be allowed to continue.

It was mentioned in the editorial that he had said another possible way to cut losses was to curtail rail services and close more of the most unprofitable lines. The editorial continued:

Mr. Virgo seemed to have such a possibility in mind when he referred yesterday to the need for a new approach to some of the operations.

On 18 October 1972 Mr. Fitch, the distinguished former South Australian Railways Commissioner, said in his annual report to Parliament that railway finances were in a crucial situation. He said that he believed there would have to be some rationalisation of some suburban passenger services and that there would be some necessity for looking at the possible closure of railway lines.

On 3 January 1974 we saw the most colossal performance by the Minister of Transport. At about 11 o'clock, the Minister of Transport announced that metropolitan rail fares would increase by 13 per cent and that M.T.T. fares would rise by 5c for eight or more sections and for transfer tickets, and the railway services from Mount Barker to Victor Harbor, Kingston to Naracoorte, Glanville to Semaphore and the passenger service from Adelaide to Tailem Bend would be discontinued. Then he was summoned to Trades Hall, and an hour later he issued a revised statement saying that these were only propositions; they were not firm proposals, after all. Mr. Virgo was reluctant to say who put the plan to rationalise services before Cabinet. When pressed, he said, "If you like you can put it down as mine." Mr. Virgo said that it was a common practice to go to Trades Hall to discuss issues before the Cabinet announcement. Apparently, he had discussed them; he had announced them, and there was no doubt at all that the Government was considering closing those rail services and that that consideration in fact was supported by Cabinet at that time.

Mr. Wotton: The people at the Strathalbyn railway station knew all about it.

Mr. TONKIN: Indeed they did, and so did many other people. Now the Minister has the gall to say he supports the continued existence of every service in this State, when indeed over the past few years he has had a total record of advocating that lines be closed and services be rationalised. This is the height of hypocrisy. It appears that with the disposal of the railways the Minister not only lost control of the railways, and he knows it, but he has done a monumental "about face" on the entire matter of closing and rationalising the country railways of South Australia. His present attitude is grossly hypocritical. He knows of and has advocated the necessity for measures to control the costs of country railways, and he has repeatedly said so until the point when South Australia sold the railways to the Commonwealth. From that time, although obviously his real attitude has not changed, he has been prepared to use the subject for politicking. Nothing has changed, except that the Minister has lost the control of and responsibility for the country services. If closures are recommended at any time over the next 10 years as a result of this or any other report they must be examined carefully, and that is the position we hold.

There must be at least a six-month opportunity for local people to make representations and to demonstrate their real need. It is the Government's responsibility to provide public transport to country areas, and we accept that; so, I believe, does the Minister of Transport. While it is the Government's responsibility to take up some of the costs from the public purse to do that, we must not forget that that money is indeed the taxpayers', and we have to balance the responsibility for providing services to country areas against the financial interests of the taxpayers as a whole. Each instance must be evaluated carefully in each case considering the circumstances and involving local residents.

The exhibition that the Minister of Transport has made of himself over a story which he manufactured has been absolutely disgraceful. He has done this in furtherance of a desperate desire to make political mileage at the expense of the Federal Government and to draw the attention away from the State Government's gross financial incompetence, and in doing so he has been guilty of crass hypocrisy. I can apply no other description to him. It is yet another example of the totally irresponsible attitude that has been adopted by this Government in relation to its own financial affairs, and it can only be condemned in the strongest possible terms.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I want to raise the matter of my suspension from this House last week. I read with much interest the *Hansard* report of that event last Wednesday. The concern I expressed rather forcibly as I left the Chamber has been reinforced by what I see in the *Hansard* extracts relevant to those proceedings last week. I was excluded from the House under Standing Order 169.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member that he cannot reflect on a decision of the House.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am accepting the decision of the House, but I believe it is my right to make one or two observations relating to that Standing Order and the way it operates. I was named for "persistently or wilfully obstructing the business of the House". There has been confusion in the minds of some as to the number of times I interjected. In all, I interjected three times on Wednesday afternoon, once during the speech of the Leader, and the person affected by that interjection, of course, would be the Leader, who has since told me that in no way did that interjection (the longest I made that afternoon) obstruct him in making his remarks. During the Leader's speech, when he was saying that the Government spent a great

deal of taxpayers' funds, I interjected (according to the *Hansard* record) as follows:

They like to think it's their money.

That was my first interjection. The Leader, as is common practice in this House, took up that interjection, agreeing with the sentiment, which simply reinforced the point he was making. In my personal explanation I said that I had interjected twice during the Premier's speech, and that was a statement of fact. If I interpret that Standing Order correctly, the only time I could have obstructed the business of the House was when I interjected during the Premier's speech. On the first such occasion I said, "He said—" and was chopped off, and on the second occasion I said, "Printed."

The second difficulty I had is in understanding in what circumstances a member's explanation will be accepted. I was granted the opportunity by the Speaker to explain my interjections—my three words which could be interpreted as interruptions. I apologised to the House, if that in fact was required, although, in all honesty, I could not see that I had interrupted the business of the House. However, even though I apologised at the behest of the Speaker, the apology was not accepted. What sort of explanation will be accepted in those circumstances?

Having been excluded from the debate, I read with great interest the further proceedings of the House that day, and I was alarmed to find that during the course of the Address in Reply speech of the member for Torrens the Minister of Transport interjected *no fewer than 11 times*. I was told (and this is confirmed in *Hansard*) that the Deputy Speaker was in the Chair and called for order early during this series of interjections, but thereafter the Minister of Transport went on his merry way.

Mr. Wilson: I had to ask for the protection of the Chair.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: You did not get it: the *Hansard* record is quite clear about that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable gentleman now reflecting on the Chair? I understood the member for Torrens to say, following a remark made by the honourable member for Kavel, that he did not receive the protection of the Chair. I ask the Deputy Leader to withdraw that implication.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I would not reflect on the Chair; I am just dealing with facts.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable gentleman withdrawing the remark?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If it has been taken as a reflection on the Chair, I withdraw it, but I am dealing only with facts. It is difficult, when one is playing a game of cricket, if the rules are not consistent. Having been suspended from the House in the circumstances I have outlined, I point out that, even though the Minister of Transport interjected 11 times during the course of the debate on that occasion, there being a call to order early in that debate, he was not excluded from the House. At one time, during the speech by the member for Torrens, the Minister of Transport said:

What a bloody disgrace that was.

Without reflecting on the Chair, I was puzzled after reading that *Hansard* report. I am puzzled about what is going on among Labor strategists and spokesmen at present. I will read to the House some recent quotes of notable members of the Labor Party, which show where the Labor Party is going in the immediate future. First, Mr. Ducker, President of the New South Wales Branch of the Australian Labor Party, was reported as saying:

One of Labor's bugbears is the word socialism . . . I think as a Party we have to make up our minds whether the word socialism really says what this Party is all about and what it stands for.

That report appeared in the *Canberra Times* on 4 June 1978 and it related to comments made during an address to the N.S.W. Labor conference. The next quote appeared in the *Age* of 5 June 1978, as follows:

Mr. Uren described Mr. Ducker's address as provocative, divisive, and a personal insult to the Left.

Mr. Hayden, the new Federal Leader of the Opposition, was reported in the *Courier Mail* on 16 January 1978, as follows:

I think that "social democracy" says the things the Labor Party stands for in a softer and more acceptable way than the term "socialism".

The next quote appeared in the *Canberra Times* on 11 June 1978, as follows:

The annual conference of the A.C.T. branch of the Labor Party voted overwhelmingly yesterday to retain the word "socialism" as a political idea, in direct opposition to the N.S.W. and Victorian branches, which have agreed to play down social ownership.

The next report appeared in the *Nation Review* of 7-13 July 1978, and reports Mr. Hurford as saying:

No matter what radical innovations we might want to achieve we have to be conservative in our approach.

Another report appeared in the *Age* on 6 May 1978, quoting N.S.W. Premier (Mr. Wran) as saying:

I think we can forget the possibility of a national Labor Government for these two elections, say, six or seven years.

What have Labor's economic spokesmen been saying recently? Mr. Willis was reported as saying in a speech to Labor economists on 30 June 1978:

. . . there is considerable uncertainty within the Party as to what course we should now adopt. That this is so is a reflection not only of the disillusion that accompanies loss of government and electoral defeat but also of the recent realisation that economic issues are far more complex than seemed previously to be the case.

Mr. Wran was reported as saying to a Sydney Rotary Club on 6 June 1978:

Let me give credit where credit's due. There are lots of things I'll disagree with the Prime Minister about and do but one thing he has achieved and that is in bringing inflation down and all of you will be aware what a massive task that's been and how some very tough decisions have had to be taken to achieve that drop in inflation.

Mr. Willis was reported as saying in an interview on *A.M.* on 27 January 1978:

Now I would say that the 8 per cent [inflation] estimate for Australia is likely to be optimistic . . .

Mr. Willis was then quoted as saying:

We must tackle the conservatives' ideology head-on.

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

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I wish to grieve in relation to a matter concerning a Mrs. S. C. Leach, of Upper Sturt. Mrs. Leach was working for a company, an associated company of which went into liquidation. When the associated company went into liquidation, she was owed holiday pay, the 17½ per cent loading on holiday pay, and one week's pay in lieu of notice, a total amount of \$1 357.75. Mrs. Leach wrote me the following letter:

	\$
Holiday Pay—6 weeks	958.20
—2.6 days	61.42
17½ % loading on holiday pay	178.43
One week's pay in lieu of notice	159.70
	<hr/>
Total claim	\$1 357.75

I have written below the sequence of events as they occurred!

31 March 1978, 2.30 p.m.—Liquidators moved into the office known as John Scott Educational Books Supply. At 5 o'clock they sacked us with a promise of one week's pay in lieu of notice (which now they dispute and are seeking legal advice), also with an assurance that we would receive all our back wages which were due to us when the company was wound up. We left the premises with no reference, wages, or group certificates.

In late May (after many entreaties and phone calls to Melbourne) we were told that since our wages had been debited to a company called Judith Court Properties (S.A.) Pty. Ltd., we had no claim on the liquidators in the finalisation of John Scott Educational Books Supply. I asked what could be done and they said the only recourse was to write to the directors of Judith Court Properties (S.A.) Pty. Ltd., and put our claim in writing. We did this and received a reply from Mr. John Scott. In his letter he admitted a moral obligation but did not actually put into words that we would receive our dues. He also said that until he received moneys owed to him from John Scott Educational Books Supply in late June/early July, he was unable to honour our claim.

On 31 May, we consulted Mr. McLean of a well known firm of solicitors. He took all our paper work and said he would look into it. After about a month he has given us no further details other than I had already given him, and since no assets were held by Judith Court Properties, and we could not sue the directors, in the circumstances there was no hope for us.

I would like to add that I was employed for six years and four months, and the first four group certificates were marked as John Scott Educational Books Supply (the liquidators will repudiate this, but I have copies of my group certificates available), thereafter as Judith Court Properties.

Our wages were received weekly by cheque and marked "John Scott Educational Books Supply", so to all intents and purposes, we firmly believed ourselves to be employed by John Scott Educational Books Supply.

There may be no hope for us but surely something can be done to help those who will come after us.

I would also like to thank you and your secretary, who have been kind enough to spend time and trouble listening to a very complicated case. It took enough effort to find someone who really cared.

Mr. Slater: Why didn't she go to her local member? She is one of Stan Evans's constituents.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Mrs. Leach is from Upper Sturt, which is in my area. Her letter continues:

It seems as though if you are employed by an interstate company, nobody wants to help you. I received nothing but a negative response from solicitors, Labour and Industry Department, Citizens Advice Bureau, the Industrial Court and the Taxation Department. My husband and I are not affluent people and have worked hard all our married life to build a home and all that goes with that. This money represented a lot of things to us. One might say that I am lucky to be re-employed so quickly and that there's no sense crying over spilt milk, but surely in a democratic Australia something can be done to prevent this ever happening again.

I raise this matter because it appears that Mrs. Leach was in fact working for Judith Court Properties (S.A.) Pty. Ltd. when she was dismissed by the liquidator, not of Judith Court Properties, which I understand has not been liquidated, but of John Scott Educational Books Supply. The pertinent thing is whether there was any right in the liquidator to dismiss Mrs. Leach. The evidence suggests that there may not have been. Secondly, why cannot Mrs. Leach receive her holiday pay, her loading on annual leave, and her one week's pay in lieu of notice? It appears that action should be taken, and I am amazed that the

Labour and Industry Department, the Minister's department, has not been prepared to help Mrs. Leach in her dilemma.

An examination of the records of Judith Court Properties (S.A.) Pty. Ltd. reveals that it is a \$5 company. Although it has a nominal capital of about \$20 000, only five shares have been purchased, and those are \$1 shares held by John James Scott, Esther Margaret Scott, and James Lawrence Scott, all from Victoria.

It is astounding that Mrs. Leach and the other people concerned are not able to get justice. They should be paid their salaries and their holiday pay. Mrs. Leach has received a letter from a Mr. John Scott, asking her to make a claim against the liquidators of John Scott Educational Books Supply, but I reiterate two or three pertinent points. First, it appears that Mrs. Leach should not have been dismissed, because the company which employed her was not being liquidated. Secondly, why did she receive cheques for her pay from John Scott Educational Books Supply if, in fact, she was employed by another company, Judith Court Properties (S.A.) Pty. Ltd? Thirdly, why cannot her claim against the assets of Judith Court Properties be met, and why is she not being paid?

The Attorney-General and the Minister of Labour and Industry should look at this case carefully. If people can be paid through nominal companies, with the only assets those companies hold being a \$5 paid-up capital, something must be wrong, because those companies are being operated for no purpose other than to make sure that no-one can make a claim against the company. It appears that, in such a case, Judith Court Properties (S.A.) Pty. Ltd. simply received moneys so that that company could pay its debts as they arose in terms of paying off any individuals or employees.

I see this as a serious case, and I hope the Government will consider it carefully. Mrs. Leach has less than 21 days in which to make a claim against John Scott Educational Books Supply. Action is required urgently, and I ask both Ministers to examine the matter as quickly as possible. I can supply them with more details than those I have read out in the House this afternoon, and I ask them to give me a report within seven days.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I take this opportunity to raise a problem that concerns many of my constituents, particularly in the prawn fishing industry. As most prawn fishermen are constituents of mine and, more to the point, as the hundreds of process workers who process prawns are also my constituents, I treat with concern and indignation the fact that the Government should treat this section of the community in the manner in which it has treated it.

I first became aware of this problem last Friday, when executive members of the Australian Fishing Industry Council (South Australian Branch) were trying to negotiate with the Agriculture and Fisheries Department and with the Minister to have this problem settled. I point out that the problem has been instituted by the Government. The Minister has made an across-the-board decision, whereby he has arbitrarily said that he will increase prawn licence fees from \$200 and \$300, respectively, to about \$5 000 for vessels operating in St. Vincent Gulf and to \$9 000 for vessels operating in the Spencer Gulf region. This, I think, must be the greatest slur on any industry and the greatest retarding factor for the expansion of any industry. Although we have heard members refer many times to unemployment, this avenue, which is open for expansion and which could employ people, is now being hampered and hamstrung by the

State Government. In a letter addressed to the Chairman of AFIC (Mr. Michael Thomas), the Director of Agriculture and Fisheries states:

I have recommended that the licence fees in the prawn fisheries in South Australia be increased. The fee for a prawn authority was originally \$200 in 1969 and part of that fee was to pay for prawn research. Since that time this fishery has become highly profitable because of the rigid controls on entry to the fishery. The estimated costs of research into this fishery in 1977-78 are \$87 000, excluding the costs of the *Joseph Verco*, and there are also substantial other costs for managing this fishery.

We could tear that argument apart, because in no way can the Government claim credit for this. We could immediately ask where that \$87 000 has been spent. Not one prawn fisherman in the State could indicate that \$87 000 has been spent. It has been absorbed by the Agriculture and Fisheries Department, but not in the field of prawn research. Mention is also made of the *Joseph Verco*—the greatest white elephant the State has ever known, as far as the fishing industry is concerned. Most of the time it is tied up at the wharf. It costs the taxpayers \$1 126 a day to have it tied up and to operate in South Australia, but for no result. I think it fair to say that no tangible results have come from that research vessel. What hurts these fishermen is that they have these facilities for the department, and they have offered their vessels to the department for research and have offered to carry departmental officers on their vessels for research, to see at first hand how the industry is going. That has been declined by the department, which, instead, has incurred this massive expenditure. The Director's letter continues:

and there are also substantial other costs for managing this fishery.

Again, what comes into question is whether the fishery has been managed. I doubt it. But for the responsible actions of those fishermen, the industry would be thrown to the wolves. It was the fishermen themselves who overrode the Minister's decision earlier this year to close the other regions of the Spencer Gulf. The fishermen acted responsibly, but the Minister was not prepared to buy into the argument. It was too hot for him to handle. He would not be part of it. The fishermen had to manage their industry. The letter refers also to the Minister's having had recent discussions with the industry, but I challenge him to give the dates of any such discussions. Frankly, from the information that has been given to me, such a meeting has not taken place. The prawn fishermen have not been consulted. They have not had meetings at the time the Minister has said that discussions have taken place, unless it happened between the Minister and one of the fishermen other than at an authorised meeting.

The whole problem is of grave concern to South Australia and should be exposed as such. The State Government has applied a resource tax to the prawn fishermen, meaning that 5 per cent of their gross takings will be grabbed by the State Government. Government members sit in the House and say nothing. Cabinet has decided that it will rip off from the prawn industry \$350 000, and that is hard for me to tolerate. Let us look at the practicalities of the matter. Where will the industry find \$350 000 between now and 1 September, when the licences come up for renewal? Each prawn fisherman must find the requisite sum, based on \$200 for each whole metre of surveyed length of the vessel, and \$9.60 for each continuous rated brake horsepower of the main engine. This means that vessels will attract fees to the extent of \$9 000 if they are operating in Spencer Gulf, and that is an intolerable expense.

This Government has gone hell bent against the industry

without consulting it. The Minister, in his explanation in the press, has said that the prawn fishing industry was prosperous enough to withstand the increases. He admits that this is a resource tax. Will it be imposed on lobster, abalone, and scale fishing or other licensed industries, such as building and road transport?

Will the Government arbitrarily apply massive increases, to the extent of 2 800 per cent, in licence fees, merely because the Government thinks the industries involved can afford it? No greater exercise has been made by the State Government regarding unemployment by applying a disincentive than this one fell blow. It has demoralised the industry and destroyed any goodwill. It has completely undermined what was a prosperous industry that brought to the State \$7 000 000 in catch value and from the processing factories. The value to our respective electoral districts would be considerable.

There has been no Government assistance to the industry. There are no wharves or fishing facilities. Any fisherman in his right mind would leave the State immediately because of the huge impost. In the House last week, I referred to the many people who are leaving South Australia. There is no shadow of doubt that people are leaving South Australia, although the Minister has come up with figures which show that, on balance, the State is equalling out or has made a slight gain. South Australian assets are leaving the State. Everyone leaving is taking his assets with him, and those returning are not bringing much back with them. The insult to end all insults is the part of the letter in which the Director indicates that these increases of up to 2 800 per cent are only a start. The department intends to double them again to 5 600 per cent. If one considers that sort of increase, one realises that it must have the most hampering effect that could be applied to any industry.

I view this matter with great concern, because it is the most negative move made by any Government. It is setting a resource tax. Will such a move be made against the holders of leasehold leases when their land becomes subject to review? Will the Government apply a resource tax to them? The Government has, by its action, set a precedent where it will tax the resource ability of any enterprise. A criterion has now been established. Cabinet has agreed to it and intends to pursue it. I shudder for the people of South Australia because this precedent, having been set, could now be applied across the board to every industry in South Australia. For this, the Government must be condemned.

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

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I wish to speak briefly on two topics. The first is to express some surprise at the sudden incursion by the Minister of Transport into the press over the question of the problems associated with the Australian National Railways. I was particularly surprised, because this was one of the contentious issues that arose in the debate in August 1975 when the railway transfer agreement was before the House. I point out that one of the issues that I raised was that there was no guarantee then that the levels of employment or the present standards of the rail services (the 1975 standards) would be maintained. I referred specifically to clause 9 of Part II of the agreement, which I said confirmed that belief.

Many railway employees are located in Mount Gambier or in Adelaide. I questioned at the time whether the State Government would be willing to contest the legality of the agreement that it was asking us to approve against any possible future contrary action by either the Australian Government or the dreaded Interstate Commission that

was looming on the horizon at that time.

I asked the Minister whether the South Australian Government would stand up for South Australia's rights when it came to the question, and I also asked whether metropolitan Adelaide realised that it, too, could be affected adversely by increased charges and by the transfer interstate of staff if South Australian terminals were reduced in staff. The member for Stuart at that time took the opportunity to rebut some of what I said by referring to the people of Port Augusta, Whyalla and Port Pirie. He said:

We find we are the only people in Australia who know what the Australian National Railways can do. They know what the Australian National Railways can do for them, and they know that they will not be inconvenienced in any way by the transfer.

That was the reassurance from a member who felt there was no danger at all of a closure. Now the Minister has suddenly come out in print last weekend. The question that must be asked is whether the Minister, in rushing that legislation through in 1975, accidentally or deliberately neglected to cover the very loophole, so as to protect the country rail services. We believe that there is a loophole. Alternatively, was he in collusion with Whitlam to ease the way for the Interstate Commission to take over the South Australian and, indeed, the Australian railway system in due course? I suspect very much that the Minister's plaint of the weekend was one where he was weeping crocodile tears.

Mr. Keneally: You missed the point.

Mr. ALLISON: I didn't miss the train, that is for sure. Given a normal year, had South Australia still owned the railways (which obviously it does not, much to South Australia's delight) the Premier gave us an assurance that we had—

Mr. Keneally: Don't you agree with that right?

Mr. ALLISON: If the honourable member reads what I said in *Hansard* during that debate, he will see that I said we agreed in principle with the sale of the railways but we objected to certain clauses that left South Australia wide open to abuse. Here is the very case in point. The Minister ignored that comment two years ago, and he is now complaining bitterly about what the Federal Government might do. He missed the bus completely.

So far, from the sale of the railways, we have received \$117 000 000 in the past four years. The Premier assured this House that we would gain between \$600 000 000 and \$800 000 000 in 10 years. This has a direct bearing on South Australia's current financial situation. About 18 months ago the Premier told a journalists' conference in Perth that South Australia was the envy of everyone with a \$50 000 000 credit at that time, but a few weeks later he said in the House that the credit was about \$2 000 000. That was a sudden drop! South Australia now has a deficit of \$25 000 000.

That means that had we not sold the railways we would have been in debit to the tune of \$105 000 000, given the Premier's figures. We are \$80 000 000 better off through the sale of the railways, yet what have we done with that sum? The Government seems to have squandered it. Instead of being well in advance of other States and running in high credit, we are in deficit, and the sale of the railways has not done much to slow that down. That simply highlights that the Premier is covering up the maladministration and the financial mismanagement for which his Government has been responsible over the past few years. So much for the railways issue.

The second point that I bring before the House is what I consider to be the gradual usurping of Ministerial authority by a number of authorities either established by

Ministers or already in existence. In this case, I refer to the Education Department. It seems to be increasingly difficult to find any definite Ministerial policy pervading all of the schools in South Australia.

We had a classic example a few days ago, when a 1976 policy, which had been held in limbo, was suddenly invoked to protect a school from attack by parents. The South Australian Institute of Teachers had no idea of the existence of that regulation, the Education Department circular. Apart from that, there are wider implications. There is increasingly the impression that headmasters, principals, members of staff, parents, the Director-General of Education, and anyone else who can be consulted in education will be consulted, not to the edification of the students and all those involved in education but to their confusion.

In the period of almost 20 years through which we have just gone, the old maths has been thrown out and the new maths introduced to replace it. Further, over 10 or 15 years the formal grammar and structure that used to be an integral part and parcel of learning our language has been thrown out, and we must obtain that education by learning a foreign language. Many older staff still persisted in teaching literacy and numeracy, which we still refer to as the basics but which are an absolute essential of education. However, so many people are becoming involved in policy-making that the schools are being given the so-called autonomy to themselves decide what they teach that parents just do not know, when they send their children to a particular school in the South Australian State school organisation, what the children will learn.

I suggest that it is high time that Ministerial responsibility was declared for precisely what went on in school as far as a certain basic core was concerned. This is not just to be a minimal part of education but a major part of it. Too much of a teacher's time in secondary school in South Australia is spent on remedial work. Were the attention, staffing and curriculum given to primary schools, were the primary schools given the support in curriculum development and discipline, were highly qualified teachers placed in control of the students when they first enter primary school instead of new teachers cutting their teeth on new students to the disadvantage of both, I suggest that, when students left primary school and entered secondary school, a far higher proportion of them would be ready for that transition period. Instead, at present 20 per cent (and I am quite sure that it runs as high as 30 and 40 per cent) of students who currently go to secondary schools need remedial work in literacy and numeracy.

It makes the secondary school teachers job all the harder when absolute pressure is being placed on them these days, including pressure from the Director-General of Education who has stressed that we must be providing youngsters with adequate skills (without delineating them) to equip them for work and life in the wicked wide world. The secondary school teacher should have all this time for fitting youngsters to leave school, instead of having to spend dead time in catching up on what should have happened in primary school.

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

Mr. EVANS: (Fisher): The first subject I wish to raise relates to a bequest made to the District Council of Stirling by the late Ern Coventry towards the provision of a library in the Stirling council area. I do this in all sincerity hoping the Minister who is in charge of the House at the moment will refer my complaint to the Government with a view to amending the Act if the problem cannot be remedied

otherwise. According to the Stirling council, people are not encouraged to make bequests to local authorities for community purposes. In the case in question, the bequest would attract a subsidy from the Government, so the real subsidy loss to the council is the succession duty charged. The property was left by an individual to be sold, the proceeds going to the council for the purpose of establishing a library for the local community. If all the money in question could have been left for that purpose there would have been a higher subsidy from the Government, but succession duties were charged. The council asked whether I would take up the matter, and I do so by this method. The council has provided a short history regarding the bequest, as follows: It states:

The will of the late E. F. J. Coventry contained the following clause:

I direct my Trustee to sell my house property situated at Cox Creek Road, including the cottage erected on the said property, at public auction and to pay the net proceeds of such sale to the District Council of Stirling to be applied by the said District Council of Stirling towards the building of a library for the use and benefit of the people of the Stirling district, and it is my wish that the said library shall be known as the Coventry Memorial Library in memory of the various members of the Coventry family who have lived and died in the district, and I declare that the receipt of the Town Clerk for the time of the said District Council of Stirling shall be a sufficient discharge for my trustee.

The property was sold for about \$37 600. Succession duties paid to the State Government amounted to \$9 714.25, and that left the value of the actual bequest at \$27 870. Of the money left, 25.6 per cent went in State succession duties. The Succession Duties Act provides that duty payable can be reduced to 10 per cent if considered to be "for the sole or predominant purpose of the advancement of . . . science or education in this State." What is the purpose of a library? Its main purpose must be educational. It may be used for recreational reading but I believe that predominantly a library serves an educational purpose in the community. The average person in the community would accept that argument. The council went on to say:

A statement contained in correspondence from the Premier dated 20 April 1977 gives the Commissioner's reason for assessing duty at the higher rate—"The Commissioner is of the opinion that, although the bequest may be a charitable gift, there is doubt whether it is a trust for the advancement of science or education.

I believe that is drawing a fine line. It is not greatly disadvantaging the State, because the money was going to a local government authority for the benefit of the community, that is, to provide an institution which the Government of this State promotes as being essential in the community—a public library. The council continued, referring to the Commissioner:

He has been unable to find any precedent in which a court has decided that a gift towards the building of a library is a gift for the advancement of science or education.

He may not have found any case where a court had decided that, nor had he found any case where a court had decided the alternative, that is, that it was not for the advancement of education or science. I believe that there would have been no challenge and that everyone would have accepted it as right and proper that succession duty should not be paid. The council continued:

The council considers that the following matters are relevant to the Commissioner's opinion:

- (a) If the bequest had been made to the Libraries Board of South Australia to be applied to the building of a

library in Stirling, it would be unlikely that any duty at all would have been assessed.

In other words if it had been given through a different channel (which may not have been thought of by the individual when making the will), namely, the Libraries Board, there might have been no succession duties. The council continues:

- (b) The Libraries Subsidies Act is committed to the Minister of Education and before any subsidies are payable by the Treasurer a substantial proportion of the books must be of an educational or literary nature, and the library will be available for public use.

The Minister of Education, who handles the money in that area, has said that the books must be of an educational or a literary nature, and surely the bequest I have outlined is for a predominantly educational purpose. The council continues:

- (c) The council (as beneficiary) has few rights in the matter. However, it has been pursued through the Premier's office and discussed with members of the Premier's personal staff.

- (d) The decision of the Commissioner and the Premier do not appear to encourage similar bequests for development of community facilities.

The council appreciates the investigations which have been performed by officers of the Premier's Department and the factors which may have been considered in refund of an amount collected by the Commissioner of Succession Duties.

The council considers that imposition of succession duties on bequests to local authorities for community purposes should be discontinued and that, in the case of the Coventry estate, the interpretation of the Succession Duties Act by the Commissioner is open to considerable doubt.

I support that. I have great respect for the Commissioner, but I believe in this case he has been too tentative and has not taken what I believe would have been an acceptable approach, that is, not charging succession duties on money left for a public library, the use of which must be predominantly educational. I do not think there is any doubt in anyone's mind that libraries are for an educational purpose. I ask the Minister to take the matter up with the Premier to see whether the \$9 000 taken out for succession duties could be returned. Let us set a precedent, where money is left for the purpose of establishing a library, that we will not levy succession duties, because the library will be used for educational purposes.

Earlier this year the Minister of Works was contacted about a water supply being extended to certain properties along the Upper Sturt Road in my own district and that of the member for Davenport. However, I have heard nothing about the situation since. We may have had a wet winter, but that does not take away the need for a water supply to those properties in the summer months. I believe these people are entitled to a water supply as much as is any other group in the metropolitan area of Adelaide. I believe the Minister can apply to the Federal Government for a grant to extend water mains where a need exists and where the money may not be available from the State Government.

I ask the Minister to examine his records and find out why I have not been told when water will be available to the Upper Sturt area along Upper Sturt Road towards the top of Footes Hill. Those people badly need water in the summer months, because they face the risk of bush fires from the Belair recreation park, which has much native scrub, and they should be protected from such a hazard. The Belair recreation park is a public property, and it is part of the public's responsibility to give those people a

water supply so that they can live in peace and be safe from fire in the summer months.

Mr. WOTTON (Murray): I wish to raise a number of issues that are of concern in my district. First, I support the statements made by the member for Fisher about the need for a library in the Stirling district, and I believe he has adequately covered that subject.

I believe it is time that this Government started doing something for people in the country. I am referring not just to people on the land but also to those living in large country towns. I am going to refer to the need for improved services in country areas and particularly to the need for this Government to do something positive about decentralisation rather than just paying lip service to this matter, as it is doing at present.

When I first became the member for Murray about 12 months ago I asked the Government to help in the filtration of river water supplied to the towns of Murray Bridge and Mannum. I have been continuing to press for that to be done, but without any success. A letter I received recently from the Minister of Works states:

I refer to your correspondence concerning the provision of water filtration for Murray Bridge. You are probably aware from recent press statements concerning water filtration that the present estimated cost of providing a filtered water supply to metropolitan Adelaide is \$135 000 000 . . . Unfortunately, until this programme is completed, the Government would not commit itself to providing a filtered supply to other areas.

I think it is time that this Government started to consider people other than those who live in the metropolitan area. It is all very well for members on the other side to say that they do, but I would like to see some positive action taken to show how they are supporting people who reside outside of the metropolitan area. A letter I have received from a person in Mannum refers to the need for something to be done to improve the condition of the water in that town, and states:

I wish to draw your attention to the anomalies which occur in the water rating system at present being used in this State. Recently it was announced via both the press and radio that an increase of 15 per cent in the water rate and 20 per cent in the sewer rate would be effective as from 1 July 1978; thus a property valued at \$45 000 would have its rate increased to \$188 per annum. My property here at Mannum is valued at \$41 000, and my present rates are \$227.88. With the proposed increases my rates would be \$267.76. This figure represents an amount of \$79.76 greater than a city property of higher value. I would also draw your attention to the variation between Mannum and Murray Bridge, Mannum 5.20 per cent on water and 5.90 per cent on sewer, whilst Murray Bridge is 4.40 per cent on water and 5.00 per cent on sewerage. I would be pleased if you would look into this unjust and unfair position which people along the river are forced to contend with and take some immediate action to correct this situation.

I believe that that letter sets out the anomalies in the rating methods in this State. A letter written to the Editor of the *Advertiser* last week about the quality of water along the river states, under the heading "Where is Equality?":

Adelaide dwellers who pay less for their water, who have it pumped 50 miles and who receive it filtered are now being pampered with special treatment of their water. It appears the Murray is too muddy in its present condition for the fastidious metropolitan dwellers and so will be pumped to Millbrook reservoir and left to settle for three months. We in Mannum, however, are expected to pay more for our filthy unfiltered water and now presumably must welcome the addition of extra mud in our water systems as a bonus for the

privilege of paying higher water rates.

The people living in Murray Bridge and Mannum are concerned about the negative attitude of the present Government, which will not do anything at all to assist them in improving their water supply.

It is all very well for the Government to say it has policies about decentralisation, but I again call upon the Government to do something positive about this matter. A letter I have received from a constituent who lives in Mannum states:

There is no need to elaborate on the disastrous effect on the people of Mannum when Horwood Bagshaw retrenched about 80 per cent of the work force in October 1977. At the time public feeling was high, public meetings were held and a Mannum Economic Development Committee was formed.

I commend the work that that committee is doing regarding unemployment, which is still very evident in Mannum. The letter continues:

The Premier asked Government departments to see what contracts could be let to the Mannum plant (that is, of Horwood Bagshaw). That happened nearly nine months ago and the only things that have happened here are uncertain casual jobs created by the SURS scheme and hard-won contracts and improvement in farm machinery sales for workers at the Mannum plant. My job at the Mannum plant is an estimator, and I am responsible for labour and material requirements for all outside contracts. One aspect which seems to happen frequently is that we obtain a higher percentage of contracts from the S.E.C. (State Electricity Commission) of Victoria than from ETSA, although Victorian tenderers have a 10 per cent advantage and manufacturers in decentralised areas an additional preference around 5 per cent. A paragraph in a State Electricity Commission of Victoria tender which I worked on last week reads as follows:

Preference scheme for Victorian decentralised industry . . . Preference will be given to a tender from an industry within the meaning of the State Development Act 1970, provided the approved industry completes the required application for preference form.

The writer of the letter goes on to say that he understands the State of New South Wales operates a similar scheme. The letter then continues:

I feel that if the Government adopted the scheme it would at least be a starting point to encourage manufacturers to break away from the metropolitan area. We have this year lost ETSA contracts using proven, very efficient and expensive tooling, probably by the small margin of having to build into the price the cost of getting the material up to Mannum and finished goods back to Adelaide. I feel that the preference scheme, if adopted would enable us to quote competitively with our city cousins. At present we have to be more efficient particularly where material value is high compared to labour involved.

He goes on to say that he is writing a letter to the Premier to point out the existence of the interstate scheme and that he would hope the Premier would already be aware of what the other States are doing in this regard.

I say quite openly that the people of Mannum appreciate the money that has gone into that town through the SURS scheme. I do not think there would be any person living in that town who would not appreciate it, but they have repeatedly called on the Government to take some positive steps towards assisting decentralised industry. As I am not yet convinced that the Government is doing something positive in that regard, I call on it to help people who live in towns, large and small, outside the metropolitan area of Adelaide.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): My concern relates to the effect of

the present policy of the State Government in not allowing the mining, milling, and export of uranium on the economic development of South Australia, and in particular the possibilities that it will deny to the iron triangle. For some reason best known to itself, the Government believes that South Australia can live in isolation from the rest of Australia and the rest of the world. Anyone who thinks about it will realise that that policy is doomed to failure, and that the only people who will miss out will be the people of South Australia, who will be denied the opportunity of reaping the great economic benefits flowing from the development of this natural resource.

I understand that large quantities of uranium exist in the Roxby Downs area, and that the Plumbago Station area, out from Mannahill, also contain large quantities of this resource. I understand, too, that inquiries have been made from the Plumbago area by a mining company in the past few days. I am perturbed that members who represent the iron triangle have been opposed to the development of a uranium enrichment plant in the area. Although the Mayor of Whyalla and the Mayor of Port Pirie have supported the building of an enrichment plant in the locality, the member for Whyalla has clearly indicated to the House that he is opposed to the creation of hundreds of jobs. The member for Stuart has placed on record his opposition to the creation of job opportunities in the Port Pirie area and I understand that he is at present in conflict with the Mayor. We have not heard from the Hon. Mr. Blevins, who also represents the area, or from Mr. Wallis. We hear much from Mr. Wallis, although normally he does not say very much. He goes on with a lot of garbage, attacking the Federal Government.

Mr. Rodda: He wasn't saying much 12 months ago.

Mr. GUNN: No. I should like to know where those representatives of the area stand on this matter. The people of South Australia, and especially the people of those towns, are entitled to know where their members stand. I support the mining, milling and export of uranium. If it is possible to build a plant in the iron triangle or in the Whyalla area, if the people of the town want it, and if the council supports it, then I support it. I make no apologies for saying that. I believe it would be in the best interests of the people of this State. If the Minister who is smiling and nodding his head thinks South Australia can cut itself off from the rest of the world, he is more irresponsible than I thought.

Mr. Rodda: Do you think he is an isolationist?

Mr. GUNN: He could be. The Commonwealth Government has set down guidelines to protect people from any possible ill effects of the mining and development of uranium. In my opinion, the safeguards are adequate to meet the requirements. I would not support the establishment of an industry which would be likely to harm the health of the people in my district or anywhere else in South Australia. The Australian Government has been most responsible, taking its time, laying down guidelines to protect the welfare of the people and to create jobs.

I am amazed by the change of attitude of the South Australian Government. Clearly, its opposition is a political decision. It wants to do everything in its power to stop the economy improving. It does not want to see unemployment reduced, or perhaps the people of Australia benefiting from the wise policies of the Commonwealth Government. The South Australian Government has set out to do everything possible to make life more difficult for the Commonwealth Government. Only a couple of years ago members of the Government were supporting the mining and export of uranium. That is

on record in this House, and it has been quoted by Mr. Hurford—

Mr. Slater: He's not in this House.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member is very touchy on this subject.

Mrs. Adamson: And Mr. Hudson.

Mr. GUNN: The Minister produced a report that he took around the world.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GUNN: The present Minister of Education made statements on the possibility of establishing a plant at Port Pirie. The Premier made statements. Mr. Connor, the architect of the Whitlam Government's mineral policy, made statements, as did Mr. Keating and the member for Adelaide, Mr. Hurford, who advised people what the Labor Party would do in relation to uranium. Suddenly, he has gone very quiet. He has had nothing to say over the past couple of years.

Mr. Becker: He's changed his mind so many times he isn't game to.

Mr. Rodda: He's muzzled.

Mr. GUNN: As the honourable member said, he is muzzled. We are accustomed to the member for Whyalla and the member for Stuart being very vocal, and likewise the Federal member for Grey. They said very little when Charlie Jones, on behalf of the Whitlam Government, scuttled the shipbuilding industry, or when the Minister of Mines and Energy let a contract to build a new power station. They said very little about protecting job opportunities in Whyalla. They were not allowed to say anything. Because the Federal Government takes a positive approach in its uranium mining policy, they are screaming like stuck pigs. The Minister of Mines and Energy, who has just entered the Chamber—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson interjecting:

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

Mr. GUNN: Thank you, Sir, he is more than out of order.

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

Mr. GUNN: The Minister was a well-known supporter of the mining, milling, and export of uranium until he got rolled in Caucus. Perhaps he would like to explain why he took the report overseas and tried to get companies to invest in South Australia.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why do you keep on lying?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: I object to the Minister's remark, Mr. Speaker, and I ask for its withdrawal.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable Minister to withdraw.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will withdraw the term "lying" and substitute "keep on telling untruths", which is what the honourable member does time and time again.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is out of order. I call him to order.

Mr. GUNN: The Minister can make all the accusations he likes, but it is well known in this House and in the community, particularly in the mining community, that he was and probably at heart still is a supporter of the mining, milling, and export of uranium from South Australia.

Mr. Chapman: Do you think he is embarrassed?

Mr. GUNN: I think he is embarrassed.

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

Mr. GUNN: I should like to know from the Minister whether any applications have been made recently for mining companies to mine in the Mannahill area, on

Plumbago Station.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: No.

Mr. GUNN: That is interesting. I have been informed that, if there have been no applications, there are likely to be some soon. The South Australian Government must make a decision within the next few months. Unfortunately, if it continues with its export policy, we will miss out. The development will take place elsewhere and we will be exporting jobs from South Australia. The Government will have indicated clearly to the people that it is not really—

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

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): On 2 August I canvassed in this place several reasons why I believed the Government in South Australia has failed to recognise the importance of the fishing industry in this State. I continued in that address to bring to the attention of members matters that concerned me about the Government's management of its fisheries policies, particularly the handling by the Minister of Fisheries of a recent issue related to the scale fish industry.

I do not intend to canvass all that material again, except to remind members that at that time I said that the criteria on which applicants for B class fishing licences were determined to be eligible or otherwise were in conflict with the free enterprise system and, indeed, that the interpreted criteria on which the Government was determining who shall or shall not participate as a B class fisherman were out of touch with the true intent of the Act.

I do not in any way reflect on the person who provided that interpretation for the Government back in 1975. However, clearly, the Fisheries Act in this State provides that a person in casual or part-time employment may apply and, according to all the other requirements of the Act, qualify for the issue of a licence to catch and sell fish.

The show cause exercise that was dealt with at length has, I believe, caused a considerable amount of hurt and distress among people connected with the industry. Those who have participated, as I said earlier, for periods up to a life time are now, as a result of this interpretation, denied entry or the opportunity to participate. Since raising that matter in Parliament, a number of fishing association meetings have been held in South Australia. I will bring to the attention of Parliament a brief report that has emerged from a meeting held by South Australia's licensed fishermen in one of South Australia's first fishing ports, being Kingscote, Kangaroo Island.

On 9 August 1978 a special general meeting was called to discuss Government fishing policy and the Assistant Director of Fisheries (Mr. Kirkegaard) was invited to attend. That meeting was the largest fishing meeting that has ever been held in that community. Indeed, from the report with which I have been furnished, it was certainly the most hostile. The local newspaper report is headed, "Fishermen hostile towards management policies" and "Fisheries chief given rough time at K.I. meeting". The report is as follows:

Kangaroo Island fishermen are almost universally united against present State Government Fisheries management policies.

The editor indicated that this became clear when Mr. Kirkegaard entered the meeting on that Tuesday night. The report continues:

The meeting held amid the blaze of TV lights and cameras, was attended by the Assistant Director of Fisheries, Mr. Ian Kirkegaard. It became clear from the moment that Mr. Kirkegaard entered the room that the fishermen were in a

hostile mood. Despite the hostility directed towards Mr. Kirkegaard and occasional shouts of "good old Commos" and "we'll shoot you first", the meeting was orderly for most of the four hours. Mr. Kirkegaard, who admitted to being the chief architect of recommendations on fisheries policy adopted by the Government, refused to be upset by the obvious feeling against him.

I admire the officers of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department in this State who have been called on to carry out policies that are not only unfair and discriminatory but are also quite inconsistent, if not day by day, certainly year by year, as they apply to this industry. The report continues:

He [Mr. Kirkegaard] was constantly accused of being evasive and indirect in his answers to questions and of being an apologist for socialist Government policies.

The balance of the report refers to the attitude of those fishermen, bearing in mind that they consisted of lobster fishermen, prawn fishermen, A and B class scale fishermen, and all those connected directly with the fishing industry and indirectly with the processing factory on the island. The report stated that the meeting finally voted unanimously to support the following motion:

That the contents of a letter circulated to all South Australian fishermen by Mr. Ted Chapman, shadow Minister of Fisheries, be adopted and that his address [referred to earlier] be supported.

I also bring to the attention of the House a further demonstration of support for my attitude, support which was expressed on that occasion not specifically by B-class fishermen in the industry but from a well established and well regarded association on the mainland sector of my district. I refer to the Southern Fishermen's Association, which purports to and does represent inshore scale fishermen of the south coast and fishermen participating in the Lakes and Coorong area.

The meeting of 11 August was attended by 35 A class fishermen, 25 B class fishermen, other officers of the department, inspectors, and, again including Mr. Kirkegaard, AFIC representatives, including the scale fishery representative (Mr. Adrian Fletcher), and the executive officer himself, Mr. Richard Stevens. I quote, from notes taken and checked with the Secretary of that association, the following resolution of the meeting:

that the association's long-standing policy of supporting their south coast in-shore, Lakes and Coorong fishermen (whether A or B class) be upheld and that those in the abovementioned areas affected by the recent "show cause" exercise and desiring to continue fishing and selling their catch legally be re-issued with their respective licences forthwith irrespective of their assets, income or shore job occupation. The Southern Fishermen's Association does not support the use of a means test in any form being used as a criteria for determining the issue or re-issue of either an A- or B-class fishing licence.

An important long-standing policy has been adopted by that association that in no circumstances does it agree with a means test being the basis or criterion for determining whether fishermen should be allowed into the industry. Accordingly, that association went ahead and gave its overwhelming support for the manner in which the subject was raised, the content of the circular letter to which I referred that went to all fishermen in the State, and the content and ingredients of my address on that subject on 2 August.

We now find, getting away from the scale fishing industry for a moment, that today the Minister (the Minister who has come under so much criticism not only from members in this House generally or from me in particular but from the whole spectrum of the fishing

industry in South Australia) has acted outside an agreement with the Fishing Industry Council of this State, wherein the Minister undertook to discuss and consult with the prawn industry on all matters of policy before seeking to implement policy regarding that industry in this Parliament or publicly.

As reported at page 299 of *Hansard* of 3 August, the Minister stated that reporters did not seem to understand that Ministers, Cabinets and Parliaments did not suddenly make decisions based on personal whim but only after careful investigation and sounding out of those who would be affected: the reports of these investigations and this seeking of opinions were the very foundation of policy making. The Minister has again demonstrated gross inconsistency by announcing today the rates and fees that will apply from here on in the prawn fishing area, rates that have risen, as I said earlier this afternoon, in St. Vincent Gulf by 1 400 per cent and in Spencer Gulf by 2 800 per cent, giving fees applying to the prawn industry of \$5 000 and \$9 000 respectively.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Coles.

Mrs. ADAMSON (Coles): In debate on a Supply Bill when the State Government is asking for money it is appropriate to scrutinise how it raises its income through taxes and how efficiently it spends that money and manages that expenditure. On both counts the State Government has much to answer for. I support the member for Murray in his condemnation of the Government for its savage increases in water rates.

The South Australian Taxpayers Association is monitoring the State Government's taxation policies and its methods of taxation. Its current July newsletter, under the heading "Your water rates are going up again", states:

The State Government has recently announced savage increases in the price of water, and the higher charges will apply to the current 1978-79 year. While Governments are talking about single-figure inflation, the cost of your water is going up twice as fast—at the staggering rate of 16 per cent. But that's not all: the amount of water allowed for in your basic water rate is to be cut so the new 22c per 1 000 litres will be levied on more of the water you need. Even if your property's net annual value remains the same, there's also a 15 per cent increase in the basic water rate. Apart from that extra \$45, on that \$5 000 N.A.V., if you used the same 1 812 kilolitres as allowed in 1977, the excess water charge would be \$46.

In the face of that, we have the extraordinary statements of the Deputy Premier and Minister of Works made in the past week and reported in a local newspaper. The Minister had the bare-faced effrontery to make the following statement:

Campbelltown ratepayers will not have to pay "anywhere near" the same percentage increase in water and sewerage rates as the increase in property revaluations this year.

It must be quite a comfort to those ratepayers, because some of their property valuations have increased by about 400 per cent!

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Were they realistic figures?

Mrs. ADAMSON: The honourable member might well ask. If they were not, why were they not? What kind of value system allows for increases of 400 per cent?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I rise on a point of order. In the interest of consistency, at what point are interjectors pulled up by the Chair? I refer to the Standing Order that I quoted earlier today.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order, but I ask honourable members to desist from interjecting. I point out that during Question Time and during serious debates, there have been many interjections, when much leniency has been shown to both sides of the House. The honourable member for Coles.

Mrs. ADAMSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am willing to debate the matter at any time with my opponents opposite. The Minister goes on to say:

The average increase in property values has been 175 per cent—

that may be true, but there has been extraordinary variation, some as high as 400 per cent—

but the increase on water has been held at 20 per cent and sewerage 28 per cent.

It is extraordinary to hear members opposite criticising the Federal Government and other Governments for increasing charges, and then coming down with bare-faced arrogance by saying that they have kept their charges down to an increase of 20 per cent. The report continues:

Mr. Corcoran's comment followed approaches to him by people in the area who were concerned that substantial property revaluations would mean equally substantial increases in water and sewerage rates.

The Minister is also quoted as follows:

The increase is 20 per cent on water rates and 28 per cent on sewerage, compared with the 175 per cent increase in valuation.

I should like to convey the news to the Deputy Premier that his constituents and mine are not the least comforted by his bland assurances. In fact, I have received a letter in the past week from a constituent who states, in response to that news item, as follows:

Since our Engineering and Water Supply rates have been going up by 15 per cent per annum without revaluation, and since inflation is about 8 per cent per annum, this is unacceptable. Salary indexation has been less than 8 per cent per annum, which makes a 20 per cent increase an attack on taxpayers by Dunstan and company.

All Opposition members would endorse those sentiments. I refer now to how that money is managed once the Government has raised it. I give but one example of what I consider to be gross inefficiency. I travel to the city from my electorate office along Payneham Road. For the past three months the area between St. Peters Street and Ann Street, including the Nelson Street intersection, has been in the process of being ripped up in order to lay a new sewer main.

That is fine, the only difficulty being that once the 15ft. deep new main had been completed and filled, and the road sealed, it was apparent that the surface was sinking. What happened? The work that had been done was ripped out in order to refill the trench with appropriate filling, that is, rocks, and to use pile drivers to compress it and then reseal the area. If that is an efficient way to spend taxpayers' funds, then I'm a Dutchman.

The construction time has been doubled. That is not efficiency, and it is no way to spend the taxpayers' dollar. Further, businesses and traffic on that road have been grossly inconvenienced. Business people have suffered serious financial losses. One business in the area was down by one-third in its takings in the two weeks when this work was being done outside its premises.

Turning now from how the Government manages the taxpayers' money to how it manages the human problems with which it is confronted, I refer to the adopted persons contact register. The register is a record of people who approach the department voluntarily requesting that the department register their wish to contact their original parents, their children, or their brothers and sisters who

have been separated as a result of adoption. The Minister introduced this register much to the alarm of many adoptive parents in South Australia. I believe that, as a result of his announcement, there has been much heartburning and tragedy in homes where there are adopted children.

Many adoptive parents are suffering terrible pangs at the thought that one day their children may, by virtue of this contact register, be lost to them. The Deputy Director-General of the department maintains that the linking of names is achieved by confidential departmental records, not from the records of any court proceedings. However, confidential records should remain confidential.

If the register is not breaking the letter of the law it is certainly breaking the spirit of the law by using confidential departmental records. The Minister has given an assurance that his department will not solicit registration from anyone, that it will not contact anyone, yet he has told adoptive parents that the contact register may advertise so that people can contact the department to be reunited with their natural parents. If that advertising does not constitute soliciting registration, then I believe that the Minister is grossly at fault and has misled both the public and the parents who placed their trust in both him and his department, as well as those who have gone before him in the department.

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

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I want to address myself to the situation applying to teacher housing and the lamentable lack of action by Government members. I say "Government members", because this embraces promises given to the teachers by the former Minister of Education (now Minister of Mines and Energy) as well as by the present Minister.

Mr. Venning: Or the lack of them.

Dr. EASTICK: That is so. On 16 December 1977, I received from the Secretary of the Mid-North Primary Principals Association a letter which directed my attention and that of other members to whom it was sent to the grave difficulties that members of the teaching profession were experiencing in having adequate teacher housing prepared or maintained for them. That letter stated:

On behalf of the Mid-North Primary Principals Association, I would like to express the concern of the members at the present situation regarding maintenance of teacher housing. The members express concern at the following points:

- (1) The standard of maintenance being carried out in teacher housing accommodation.
- (2) The delay in maintenance work being carried out.
- (3) The lack of supervision of maintenance.
- (4) The broken promises by the previous Minister of Education, Mr. H. Hudson, who stated that there would be improved maintenance under Teacher Housing Authority and give a better deal on maintenance of teacher housing.

Our association feels that these points should be raised as a matter of urgency as Principals (and other teachers in T.H.A. houses) are being severely disadvantaged by this inferior service.

Subsequently, I sought information from the same group, and in July this year I received details from the group's present Secretary.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you taking all this up with the Teacher Housing Authority?

Dr. EASTICK: It is not possible for me to refer now to all the information that has been made available to me.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. EASTICK: I will not enter into a debate with the Minister. However, I should like to pass on to members some information—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You know—

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I rise on a point of order. Although I do not want to waste my colleague's time, the Minister of Mines and Energy has interjected three times in this debate. I draw your attention, Sir, to Standing Order 169, which refers to any member who persistently or wilfully obstructs the business of the House. No mention is made in that Standing Order about there being any priorities in relation to the business of the House or of one debate being more important than another. In the interests of consistency, I ask that the Minister be warned.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order.

Dr. EASTICK: I now refer to a letter that relates to house No. 5863, at 2 Mais Terrace, Crystal Brook, as follows:

To whom it may concern:

1975—November—House vacated by principal who moved to new replacement house at 2 Mais Terrace declared beyond economic repair by P.B.D.

1975—November—New appointment of Deputy Principal for January 1976. Only accommodation available was vacated house No. 5863. Residence taken up by Deputy Principal on undertaking that upgrading, etc., would be done in near future.

1976—July—T.H.A. assumed control of teacher housing State-wide (with some exceptions).

Kitchen—Hot water service replaced; Bathroom—Hot water service replaced—Both applied for by previous tenant—

that is, the original Principal—

Difficulties experienced:

May 1977—advised by S.A. T.H.A. of approval of major upgrading works—approval granted January 1977. South Australian Housing Trust were advised and we were informed—were currently seeking contractors.

No upgrading whatsoever had taken place up to 21 March 1978.

March 1978—Recladding of porch area partially completed.

Kitchen cupboards deposited early 1978 on front verandah; still there.

This letter is dated July 1978. It continues:

Some laminated tops lifting due to moisture.

Bathroom—bath, screen and hot water service arrived early 1978 and stored on front verandah—still there.

Constant inquiries as to commencement of major upgrading fobbed off.

Dates given for commencement of various sections not adhered to.

Stage 1—viz., connection to effluent system left partially completed and untidy state.

Result of connection to town effluent system left without hot water in bathroom—brought to notice of South Australian Housing Trust. Over one week has elapsed, so far, without hot water.

No hot water in laundry—carted in buckets from bathroom to laundry.

Back door impossible to lock from outside.

Back door impossible for children or wife to latch in winter.

No paved area whatsoever resulting in great difficulty in keeping porch, kitchen and lounge room reasonably free from dirt and mud (three young children).

Both bathroom windows unable to be closed completely, or opened—nailed in position.

The strong impression that one group or department was blaming the other for—

- (a) lack of movement in commencing work,
- (b) for not giving, and also for not adhering to, dates for beginning upgrade.

That is only one example. I now refer to another one, this time relating to 31 Forgan Street, Crystal Brook.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you referring this to the Teacher Housing Authority?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. EASTICK: The letter states:

Occupied December 1977.

Difficulties and delays:

1. Griller in electric stove has never worked. Reported twice—once verbally to T.H.A. agent and once written. Still no action.
2. House undergoing renovation—started January 1978.
 - (a) Kitchen cupboards due to arrive January—arrived April.
 - (b) House to be connected to sewerage within first three months of 1978. In process of being connected now. However it has now been decided to renew piping in toilet; consequently a temporary connection has been set up. It has been that way for over a week with no sign of any contractors.
 - (c) Back yard has not been levelled out or packed down since new tank installed. Ground sinks each time it rains leaving large holes in the back yard.
 - (d) New concrete (put down as part of renovations) has now been torn up in three places to make way for new pipes.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. EASTICK: That is the precise situation to which the member for Coles referred. The letter continues:

This apparently was only decided after the concrete was laid and was not shown on plans of sewerage connection, according to contractor doing concreting.

I have another example, this time relating to 61 High Street, Gladstone, 14 Cross Street, Gladstone, and 6 High Street, Gladstone, as follows:

Re 61 High Street, Gladstone: A screen door recently "disappeared". The tenants assumed repair but could not find out who had taken the door for two days. When contacted, the local T.H.A. officer had no knowledge of the work. Finally, the tradesman was found. He was acting on authority from an Adelaide-based supervisor, but after removing door, found that he did not have sufficient material to complete the task until further material was received. He did not advise the tenants of his activities.

Re 14 Cross Street, Gladstone: The tenants are aware that only urgent minimal maintenance will be provided, because of the condition of the house. The front fence was damaged late last year as a result of an accident, was found to be beyond repair because of its derelict condition, and remained so for several months before it was completely removed. The appearance of the residence is now even more drab, attracting neither the enthusiasm of the tenants to keep it in order nor the respect of the community for the profession as a whole.

Re 6 High Street, Gladstone: Since December last, the residence has been the object of minor repairs, improvements and painting. The general standard of workmanship and finish has been poor and the subject of considerable conflict between tenant, tradesman and supervisor: e.g.

Paint has already peeled in bathroom and laundry; various 'difficult' but visible areas have not been painted;

kitchen floor covering was laid without first nailing loose boards which continue to creak; the floor covering was not laid parallel to the walls, leaving oblique joints; repairs to wall cracks are more 'eye-catching' than the original cracks; a front door handle was fitted too close to the edge of the door and fingers have been caught when pulling the door closed; and the tenant has effected much of the clearing up of nails, timber and materials.

The teaching profession has been promised a better deal by the Government. However, it has not received it, and there can be no excuse for this state of affairs. The headline "Housing outlook bleak—Hudson" in today's *News* certainly applies in relation to the Teacher Housing Authority situation, and, on behalf of these people and the many others whose testimonials I will answer and refer to so that in due course they are recorded in *Hansard*, I protest.

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

Mr. WILSON (Torrens): I should like to start by correcting an impression that I unwittingly gave the House during the Address in Reply debate last week, when I was debating the matter of the North-East Area Public Transport Review. I commented on a press report by the member for Ross Smith, who cited the NEAPTR scheme as an example in a case that he was trying to put to the House. The honourable member said that it was a pity that the people of the inner suburbs had not objected earlier rather than leaving it until later to do so.

I thought I said that the people did not object earlier because they were waiting to be told of the options that were available. From discussions that I have had since, it seems that members thought I said that the NEAPTR team had not kept the people informed. On reading *Hansard*, I should have thought that that impression would not have been gained. However, at that stage the debate was rowdy, and I can understand that some members may have misunderstood what I said. However, I believe the NEAPTR team did everything in its power to keep the people of the north and north-eastern suburbs, represented by the member for Newland and others, completely informed. I think it probably went further than it had to and, as a team of public servants, it was very dedicated.

I wish to refer now to a motion passed at the last State A.L.P. Conference, moved by Mr. D. Eglington and seconded by Mr. Blevins, M.L.C. It is enormously long, consisting of about 1 200 words and it contains some very interesting sentences, some of which I will quote, as follows:

The attempt to weaken the links between the Australian Labor Party and the trade union movement is part of a deliberate strategy to subvert the strength and unity of the Labor movement. We strongly believe that those within the Australian Labor Party who accept the idea of divorcing and splitting off the political movement from the trade unions are falling into the traps set by the right-wing forces. The Australian Labor Party must reassert its primary and fundamental commitment to the trade union movement . . . In order to meet the challenges of the present historical period it must make a concerted attempt to build up its organisation and develop policies which are democratic and socialist.

Later (I apologise for not reading all the motion, but obviously my time will not allow that) it continues:

The Australian Labor Party must reassert the long traditions of political action outside of the limited Parliamentary and electoral processes.

That is an extraordinary statement—to say that the

Parliamentary and electoral process is limited. In other words, the Australian Labor Party must continue militant action outside that process. I would also like to quote from a report in the next day's *Advertiser* of 5 June, as follows:

The A.L.P. State secretary, Mr. H. H. O'Neill, and the Attorney-General, Mr. Duncan, clashed over the role of trade unions in the Labor Party at the A.L.P.'s State convention at the weekend.

Later, Mr. O'Neill said:

If you are talking about the situation in South Australia—referring to the motion I have just quoted— with regard to the trade union movement, the strength of the trade union movement and the need to promote democracy, I would say, "Endorse that and you are cutting your own throats," . . .

Mr. O'Neill is soon to be a member of this House, I believe, and it will be interesting to see whether he still stands by that statement, but he criticises that motion passed by the majority of delegates at the State A.L.P. convention. Further in the article it states:

Supporting endorsement of the motion, Mr. Duncan accused Mr. O'Neill of "backbiting" and sought the Chair's protection to prevent his interjecting . . . Supporting Mr. Duncan, Mr. Blevins, M.L.C., said there was a danger the trade union movement would desert the A.L.P. if the Party concentrated on wooing the "swinging" voter.

That is an extraordinary statement, that the trade union movement would desert the A.L.P. if the A.L.P. tried to win the swinging voter. How else does a Party try to win an election? Now we come to the crunch:

The Deputy Premier, Mr. Corcoran, said he did not want to see a deep-seated split develop in the Party, although some factionalism was healthy . . .

He did not want to see the situation in the South Australian A.L.P. where people from the "middle ground", the rural section, or any other section who wanted to subscribe to the Party, were told it was the property of the unions.

We are now getting to the stage where the Deputy Premier and Mr. O'Neill are opposing the Attorney-General. I mentioned this last week, but I did not cover it fully. How does this action tie up with the views of the Federal Leader of the Labor Party, Mr. Hayden? I quoted this statement by Mr. Hayden last week, but I am sure members opposite should hear it time and time again. Mr. Hayden said:

I am totally opposed to nationalism. I think it is a clumsy, unnecessarily provocative tool. It brings more political ill will than benefit. We are very limited in what we could nationalise—if indeed anything.

Mr. Drury: You want to learn to read.

Mr. WILSON: That is a statement by the Federal Leader of the Labor Party, and the member for Mawson would do himself a service if he studied it. The *Advertiser* article I quoted previously goes on to say:

The resolution says those within the A.L.P. who accept the idea of divorcing and splitting the Party from the trade union movement are falling into traps set by right-wing forces. It says the A.L.P. must reassert its commitment to the trade union movement and the long tradition of political action outside the Parliamentary process.

This is entirely opposite to the actions occurring in other States, where the A.L.P. is having a close look at itself because of its disastrous result at the last Federal election. The A.L.P. in this State is obviously resisting what is happening elsewhere. The left wing of the South Australian Party is obviously in control, as was proven by the adoption of the resolution that I quoted earlier. People like Mr. O'Neill and the Deputy Premier are obviously unhappy with the situation. If the left wing in this State continues its present course, we may see the day when the

Federal A.L.P. executive is intervening not only in the affairs of the Queensland branch but in the affairs of this State as well. It is obvious that there is a division in the Government ranks.

We have a group centred around the Attorney-General, and no doubt this group will have much to say in the coming nominations to fill vacancies in the Ministry of the State A.L.P. Government. It will be very interesting on this side of the House to see the manoeuvrings on the other side. The people of this State are becoming aware that the Government is completely divided on this question. We will just have to wait and see, but the people of this State will realise by the next election that it is time the Government was defeated and the Liberal Party was returned to government in this State.

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

Mr. RUSSACK (Goyder): Last Thursday afternoon there were one or two things I wished to say about my district but time was not available. There is a vast difference now in the outlook this year from what there has been in the three previous years in the District of Goyder. There are some lush fields this year, and the promise of a good harvest. As we know, until grain is in the bin and sheep are in the saleyards anything can happen, but it would seem that there will be a successful season, and we are grateful to have had so much rain.

The Hon. D. W. Simmons: I hope the unemployed will share in it.

Mr. RUSSACK: I am sure the unemployed people will share in this successful season because the 6 per cent of the population of Australia involved in the rural industry produce about 50 per cent of Australian exports. From the removal of those goods and their despatch overseas those who are unemployed will receive great benefit.

It would do us good to examine what the rural industry does for Australia in these times. There has been a decline in secondary industry because of seasonal conditions that have prevailed in this State during the past three years: everybody has suffered. There will be benefits to our unemployed because of the good season, and any person with common sense would know that. There are still problems, despite the rain that has fallen upon the land in the District of Goyder, with reticulated water and the distribution of water. I have raised that matter in this place many times and I have communicated with the Minister by letter.

I realise the financial difficulties involved in this question, but I must not be silent about the need for reticulated water systems in three particular places in the District of Goyder. First, the southern part of Yorke Peninsula, where we are thankful that there has been rain to refresh the bores in that area so that there is some possibility of watering stock in an easier way than carting water, the method used over the past few years. I bring this matter to the notice of the Government.

The second area I refer to is Watervale, which needs water for vineyards. A survey undertaken in recent years in that area (as there was some years ago) indicated that most people in the area want water available, not only for private homes but also for industry, which is crying out for water. There could be further development in that area if the water situation was improved.

The third area is Virginia, which has a lucrative market gardening industry. I am sure that the member for Napier knows this only too well.

Mr. Millhouse: Why should he know about it?

Mr. RUSSACK: Because the boundary of Napier borders the boundary of Goyder in that area, and I have

heard him speak of this matter in the House.

Mr. Hemmings: He wouldn't know.

Mr. Millhouse: I did not know that the member for Napier had ever spoken in this House about that.

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

Mr. RUSSACK: I am pleased that the Government has given permission for this water to be used for certain purposes. There is a main highway through Virginia and, to get water from its source to the area where it can be used for producing vegetables and for other market gardening activities, that road presents an obstacle that must be overcome. Again, I appeal to the Government for assistance in this matter.

A situation has been aggravated in my district by this welcome season; that is, the deterioration of roads. It is disappointing to councils, because there has been a reduction in many grants for roads in council areas. I know that the Government says, "Well, the Federal Government has not given us the money, we cannot pass it on unless there is money forthcoming from the Federal Government." I hope it is not true, but, since the 1.52 per cent of personal taxation has been flowing through the channel of the Grants Commission to local government, there seems to have been a definite decline in road funding. In some council areas the reduction has been for the same amount that has come through the Grants Commission.

I am grateful for the answers that have been given to me recently to questions about road allocations. I asked the following Question on Notice:

Does the Minister regard the 1978-79 Commonwealth Government grants of \$43 207 000 for roadworks as being in the category of tied grants, and, if so, what are the individual amounts?

I am particularly interested in the first part of the question, "Is it a tied grant . . . ?" The answer I received to that question was, "Yes".

If these are tied grants, I suggest that their allocation has been made after priorities have gone in from the Minister or the Government in South Australia, and then they have been approved. Therefore, the money that then flows from the Commonwealth for those categories must be used in those categories. I also asked what was the amount of Government grants for roads last year, and what amounts were spent in particular categories. The answer given was that the allocations were exactly the same as the allocations made available from the Federal Government last year. I still cannot understand why local government receives so little. Out of an amount of \$43 000 000, of which I think there is about \$19 000 000 to \$20 000 000 used for national highways, \$23 000 000 is left, out of which the South Australian Government proposes to distribute only \$6 100 000 to local government.

Last year's Auditor-General's Report states that \$1 697 610 of rural local road money was spent on the Strzelecki Creek track, leaving in that category only \$2 500 390 for council areas within the corporated areas. I should like the Minister to say in what areas of the State these categories are used, and whether local government has been deprived of that allocation of money to areas outside the corporated areas.

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

Mr. MATHWIN (Glennelg): I wish to bring again to the notice of the House a matter on which I have spoken many times. I refer to the juvenile institutions of this State, particularly the McNally Training Centre.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo interjecting:

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister of Transport might think this is very funny, as might the member for Price, but they would not have that view if they worked in the institution as floor workers. The basic problem with the institution at the moment is a complete lack of discipline.

Mr. Millhouse: What do you think should be done about it?

Mr. MATHWIN: I believe that the staff, especially female staff, are at risk in McNally at the moment. I call on the Minister to bring down a report forthwith, after a proper investigation, and with particular reference to the underlying causes of the trouble, one of which is a complete lack of discipline.

Mr. Millhouse: Have you any idea what you would do about it?

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes, I have indeed.

Mr. Millhouse: What?

Mr. MATHWIN: One day, when we have a little more time, I shall explain in the shell-like ear of the member for Mitcham what I would do about it. I am asking that the Minister bring down not a padded report by those who are sympathetic to the present system, but a report by people who know about the trouble, particularly involving the floor workers. The report should reflect what is going on and the feelings of the floor staff, particularly the residential care workers, the front line forces.

Over the months, we have had many reports of trouble at McNally. A headline stating that a man was stabbed at McNally referred to a residential care worker. On 5 July 1978, a report, headed "McNally security at risk—staff worker", stated:

Lack of discipline at the McNally Training Centre was threatening internal security and eroding staff morale, a worker there said this week.

Inmates knew they would not be punished severely for breaches of discipline. About 10 days ago an inmate sprayed a woman residential care worker with a fire extinguisher. Police are understood to be preparing charges against two youths who allegedly tried to force another inmate to perform oral sex on them on Monday last week. A senior staff member confirmed that the incidents had occurred but denied they posed a threat to staff or security.

It is all very well for senior staff members to suggest that this sort of thing does not pose a threat to the security of the workers in the institution. Another report was headed, "Youth claims he was raped at McNally"—and so it goes on. It is quite common knowledge that assaults on staff occur at least once a month, and in the past two days we have had two reports of assaults on staff and of workers in McNally being attacked. On 14 August 1978, a report in the *Advertiser*, under the heading "Worker attacked at McNally", states:

Police have charged a McNally Centre inmate with assault following an incident on Saturday night. The inmate is alleged to have assaulted a residential care worker. It was the latest in a series of outbursts at the centre in the past two months which have included two reported rapes by inmates, fights between youths and attacks on staff. Confirming the incident last night, the Minister of Community Welfare, Mr. Payne, also confirmed a report that a Crown Law Department investigator will interview centre staff this week in an attempt to locate "leaks" of confidential information from the centre.

What on earth does the Minister of Community Welfare regard as a leak of information? Even though people who work there are getting bashed up every day, does the Minister wish to cover up what is going on at McNally? Does he intend to put a grand inquisitor on the staff in order to browbeat officers and try to stop them from talking to anyone within the community, informing them

of the serious situation prevailing? Today we had another report in the *Advertiser*, under the headline, "Another McNally 'assault'", stating:

Police are investigating an alleged assault by an inmate on a residential care worker at the McNally centre yesterday. It is the second alleged assault on a worker at the centre in the past three days.

Again, the Minister confirmed that he would be getting a full report as soon as possible. It is about time the Minister, whose desk is full of reports on staff-bashing at McNally, did something about it. It is time he stood by his staff, not only the great intellectuals who talk about the rights of the young people in the institution, but the people who are there to look after the inmates. Many fights have been reported by inmates, and it is known that morale at the centre is low. It is useless for the Minister to deny that. He has the audacity to go to the press, as does the chief of his department, saying that morale at McNally is not low. It might not be low in certain sections of the higher echelon, but the Minister can take it from me that it is low among the floor workers, who are working at considerable risk in that institution.

Rehabilitation is reported to be practically a non-event, and these young people can do just as they wish, threatening the staff and other inmates with bashing and rape, and indeed they are allowed to get away with it time and time again, yet the Minister does not bother to do anything about it. The Minister should get a report, not a report puffed up by the departmental officers in the city who think it is what the Minister would like to read, but a true and honest report on what is going on at McNally, together with some recommendations for remedying the situation.

Recently, when I asked a question of the Minister of Transport about the installation of traffic lights at the corner of Jetty and Brighton Roads, Brighton, he said there was no priority at all for that project. How on earth does the Minister expect vehicles and people to get from minor roads on to Brighton Road without the assistance of traffic lights? The only traffic lights on Brighton Road in the area are those at the intersection of Sturt Road and Beach Road, which is a minor road and which is now absolutely choked with traffic, particularly traffic coming from the parking area outside the railway station at Brighton trying to get on to Brighton Road. I ask the Minister to reinvestigate—

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I cannot remember when the atmosphere in this place has been pleasanter than it is now. No-one is taking the slightest notice of anything anyone else says. It is 10 to 8 in the evening and, yes, there are some people in the gallery—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows that he cannot refer to the gallery. I hope that he will not do it again.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will not. Anyone who is anyone, except us, is listening to the Federal Budget in Canberra.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: And are we being slaughtered!

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Medibank has gone.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am sorry to hear that. I much regret that the Labor Party is apparently rejoicing in the Budget from the way members opposite are interjecting. They are obviously pleased, because they believe the Budget will give them a Party-political advantage, and that is poor indeed.

Mr. Whitten: Maternity grants have gone.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Pensions are to be reviewed annually.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will get my own information in due course, no doubt. This evening we can say what we like and no-one will care two hoots about it, however interesting, significant, or important it may be.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should return to the debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I have made the point. I was pleased when I arrived here today, and a bit surprised, to find that I had been put on the Select Committee into massage parlours. No-one had asked me beforehand whether or not I wanted to be on it.

Mr. Drury: We knew you wanted to be on it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am a little alarmed, because I doubt whether most of my colleagues on the Committee have ever been inside a brothel. How we will get on, I don't know; however, there it is.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: They'll have to take your advice on it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am an expert; I made an inspection on one occasion.

Mr. Mathwin: In full Army kit?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, but I had plenty of protection. I am on the committee, and it will be the better for that. The next point I want to make, I do with regret. Last week I spoke in the Address in Reply debate and dealt at some length with the question of superannuation funds of the Public Service and Police Force. Unfortunately, nothing has occurred since then, and I can only hope that the Liberal Party, if it has any spunk at all left (which I doubt) will support me in what I said, because this is something that I believe is most serious.

The third thing that I want to say concerns the answers that I received to Questions on Notice a couple of weeks ago.

Mr. Mathwin: You are lucky to get answers!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, I got answers, because I asked sensible questions.

Mr. Mathwin: Did you get sensible answers?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I don't know about that, but I am alarmed by this answer, which is reported on page 201 of *Hansard* under the heading "Bulk Carriers". I asked the question, because I got a tip-off that no proper inspections of LPG bulk carriers are conducted in this State. I thought that I would make a bit of an inquiry about it. No doubt the tip-off was prompted by the ghastly accident that occurred in Spain a few weeks ago when one of these tankers careered down a hill and into a holiday camp and killed many holiday makers. I am told that it is quite possible the same thing could happen here. For that reason I put on notice the following question:

1. What inspections and checks for safety are carried out on LPG bulk carriers, how frequently and by whom . . . ?
The answer, which I got from the Minister of Labour and Industry, whose department it was (and I have no doubt that this is simply a report that was prepared for the Minister by his department), simply states that design and construction have to be approved but that, since 1960, follow-up inspections are carried out only on a random basis by industrial safety inspectors of the Labour and Industry Department. In other words, the answer was to the effect that these bulk gas carriers are not being inspected on other than a random basis and, on the information that I have, they are a menace in this State, as they have been shown to be in other countries.

The person who gave me the tip-off has now commented on the answers I got to my Question on Notice. Although this man is in business and does not want his identity to be revealed, I have his permission to read to the House his

comments, as they are contained in the following letter I received today:

I have no doubt that these vehicles and their tanks are built to rigorous standards originally, but from my observations, and after consultation with the Labour Department inspectors that the weakness lies in the fact that the "follow-up check" as mentioned—

he means "mentioned in the answers to my questions"—cannot be done, or is not done, because, as the inspector himself said, "S.A. has no inspection programme, random or otherwise." They say that they would inspect some now only if a particular complaint is received.

Mr. Whitten: They still must inspect pressure vessels, and you know that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the member for Price likes to laugh it off, he can.

Mr. Whitten: I am not laughing it off: I am concerned about it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps the honourable member would care to listen to the end of the letter. I do not know anything about this at first hand, whereas the chap who has written this letter to me does, and he continues:

I have first-hand knowledge of a particular unit that is shortly to be replaced by its owner due to its extremely worn and old condition. This vehicle has not been "random checked" and couldn't pass a check if it was. I feel that this old unsafe unit that suffers many gas leaks and other problems that has been involved in near tragedy several times with mechanical problems, such as loss of brakes, electrical fires, etc., etc., is simply a vehicle looking for an appropriate set of circumstances for a major accident to happen. Then everybody would sit up and wonder how or why.

It appears that competency and physical condition must be proven before obtaining a licence to fly, drive a tow truck, or a bus, or even a mini-bus yet there is no licence to drive these lethal gas carriers or even petrol tankers—

I believe that that is the position—

Surely it seems odd if the driver has no particular qualification, and the lethal vehicles are not subject to any check, when a private motorist whom wishes to own a microbus is subject to a bus drivers licence, which involves a health check and I think, a six-monthly vehicles inspection, even for completely private use. At the moment S.A. has not had a major accident involving these vehicles our Government is happy as the situation is. I for one am not, and I feel it should be remedied before it does, which I feel is inevitable. Perhaps a question for Mr. Wright—

That is the Minister, I think—

asking of the 21 units they know of operating in this State solely—

and that was the answer I got, that there were only 21 of these vehicles operating—

to supply a list of dates that they have been checked on. Although some of the syntax in the letter is not quite perfect, I think it gives the general drift. In conversation with this chap tonight he told me that, in his opinion, there are far more than 21 of these vehicles operating in South Australia. No-one may take any notice of what I am saying about this, but I hope that some notice will be taken by someone.

We do not want to have in South Australia the sort of tragedy, or any tragedy or even accident, such as occurred in Spain and other parts of the world where these vehicles have got out of control because of some failure, have exploded or caught on fire and caused tremendous loss of life and injury.

It was for this reason that I spoke tonight, even though it is one of the worst times one can ever choose to speak in this House because of the competition that we have from the crowd in Canberra.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): When my colleague started to speak he attracted attention from members opposite, who suggested that something was a shocker or that there were no topics left, but I wish to speak tonight about corellas, which have been making inroads into seed crops in my district. I can see that the Minister is having some difficulty in listening to two conversations at once.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I'll tell you what, the other one I'm listening to is bloody rotten.

Mr. RODDA: My story will not be much better. If Australia is to proceed, we have to do something about productivity. I am sure that the speech to which the Minister is listening is seeking to improve productivity. It may be referring to some belt tightening.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You'll lose your rail services, that's just what came over.

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

Mr. RODDA: A couple of weeks ago one of my councillors spoke to me about the inroads being made into the highly productive crops by feathered infestations that were attacking them, and in today's *Advertiser*, in a report by conservation writer Kym Tilbrook, this scourge is properly reported under the heading "Corellas raiding South-East crops". The South Australian farmer has always been a diversificationist: he has always had the initiative to meet the exigencies that arose—

Mr. Venning: He's always been a good farmer.

Mr. RODDA:—and he has always been a good farmer. We have seen changes on the rural scene. Highly productive crops have been grown, especially coarse seed crops with the large acreages to safflower and rape seed, and the smaller seed crops, in addition to the cereal grains that make up a large part of the rural scene. Mr. Tilbrook, in aptly describing the problem confronting farmers in the South-East, states:

Long-billed corellas are causing damage worth tens of thousands of dollars to crops in the State's South-East. The birds are ripping hundreds of hectares of newly germinated plants from the ground and many farmers have had to re-sow.

The situation has become so bad in the Naracoorte district council area the council has asked the Minister for the Environment, Mr Corcoran, to remove the long-billed corella from the National Parks and Wildlife Service protected list.

I can vouch for the devastation caused by these birds. They are there in literally hundreds of thousands and, because they are on the protected list covering these feathered monsters (and they are nothing more than that when they attack these crops), they seem to breed in their thousands and cause much devastation.

In recent weeks they have attacked crops of peas, oats, and sunflowers. Early in autumn when the safflower crops are growing, it is possible to see what looks like a highly cultivated crop that will return many hundreds of thousands of dollars to the farmers and, in turn, to the community. However, as soon as the crop is ripe, the birds descend on it, and what has been a prospective high yield crop is destroyed.

I am sure that the member for Rocky River will agree that, until a farmer has his harvest in the bag, he has no money in the bank. We have seen this devastation, which is like a plague, across areas that have been sown to such a valued asset of productivity that it is not funny for producers and, in turn, the Government. The report continues:

Some farmers have had to stop growing these crops because the corellas have either ruined them straight after sowing or before harvesting.

That highlights how this pest is such an ongoing threat, existing all the year round. Perhaps their motto is, "When one is on a good thing, one should stick to it". Such feeding grounds lead to only one thing: the increase in breeding of these birds, which seem to breed in the red gum areas and the dry swamp lands that extend into the State of Victoria as well as in South Australia. We are confronted with continuing devastation, which can get only worse.

Therefore, it behoves the Government and the Minister to consider closely Mr. Tilbrook's comment in this article: that these birds should be removed from the protected list. At present the only legal protection that farmers have is to resort to the scarecrow and the scare gun but, with much banging going off and with nothing in the guns, these pests soon wake up to the fact that there is no danger to them. Therefore, this devastation of what is one of the district's most valuable assets continues.

Councillor J. D. Possingham, who is referred to in the report and who is a most experienced farmer, having spent his lifetime in the Joanna district, is quoted as saying that these birds are a major problem. There are some areas in which they are so bad that farmers have had to stop growing specific crops.

Mr. Whitten interjecting:

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

Mr. RODDA: It will not do the honourable member any harm to take in his belt a couple of notches; it will do him the world or good. Indeed, I have been concerned about him, as he is putting on far too much weight. This time next year he will say what a wonderful night this was for him and for South Australia. In the report the Minister for the Environment is reported as saying that he has asked his officers to investigate this matter. As the member representing that highly productive area, I hope that the report and the decision arrived at will afford some protection to what will be a good thing for the coffers, which the Minister sits around when he and his colleagues draw up their Budget. I hope that my comments will be noted by the Minister concerned when he summarises this debate.

Mr. VENNING: (Rocky River): I welcome the opportunity to say a few words in this debate, but I regret that it should be taking place in this House at a time when the Federal Budget is being delivered.

It is interesting to note that the Minister of Transport, the only Minister sitting on the front bench at present, has a direct line to Canberra, so he can listen to the radio broadcast of the Budget debate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. VENNING: I am interested to watch the Minister's reaction all the time, because every now and again he gives a bit of a flinch. I can tell from his actions that he is not pleased with what the Federal Treasurer, a chap named Howard (might I say that most Howards know what they are doing), is doing, realising that the Federal Treasurer is doing the right thing not only for South Australia but for the whole of Australia. One needs merely to refer to the *Hansard* report of His Excellency's Speech (which was prepared by the Government) when opening Parliament to see that, compared to the Speeches delivered by Governors in the past, the Federal Government was knocked, in just about every other paragraph, in one way or another. The Government damned the situation and talked about unemployment. It almost makes one cry or laugh.

Mr. Harrison: You couldn't cry.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Albert Park is out of order. I hope that honourable members will cease interjecting.

Mr. VENNING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Unemployment is a serious matter. I ask Government members why they do not do something about it. They have all been associated with a union at some time, but what do they do? The demands made by unions became greater and greater all the time. I took a note of some of the Treasurer's words when I was listening to the debate in Canberra this evening, some of those words being, "Real wages are still too high" and "Wages are out of line with productivity." That is the story today: unless productivity is increased—

Mr. Whitten interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Price to order. The member for Rocky River has the floor.

Mr. VENNING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Until we realise what is causing the problem, we will always be stuck with it. Canberra cannot do everything; we in this State must do our part. I heard the member for Whyalla almost weep in this House about unemployment at Whyalla, but what has brought about the problem there and resulted in our losing the shipyards? Nothing more than union demands have caused this, to an extent that ships could not economically be built here.

This is the whole problem. We are at present trying to get a uranium enrichment plant established in this area, in which there is much employment, but we cannot get one member representing the area to support that. The Leader of the Opposition has told the House exactly what the position will be. In the long term, such a works could provide employment for 25 000 people in the area. What could be better for the area than to have these works established, so close to the steelworks at Whyalla? We have housing, public utilities, and everything else going for us there and, if we in this State do not wake up to ourselves, we will lose these works to Western Australia, which is breaking its neck to get them. Also, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen's State, Queensland, is looking for the works. If Government members are as concerned about unemployment as I am, they should do something about it: they should get behind someone somewhere.

Mr. Whitten: Is that the answer: uranium?

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

Mr. VENNING: I refer now to the live sheep export situation, regarding which a few questions have been asked in this House. Only recently (I think last week) the member for Eyre, Mr Gunn, asked the Premier the following question:

In view of the importance to South Australia of the export of live sheep to the Middle East from this State, can the Premier give an undertaking that the South Australian Government will give its full support to the continuation of this valuable project and, in particular, that it will use its good offices to assist those people involved in this export trade?

The honourable member then went on to talk about the Miller Report. In reply, the Premier said that the South Australian Government had always supported export trade in live sheep. However, that is a questionable statement, and the Premier has not done much to back up that support by urging unions to lay off. My mind returns to the situation obtaining a few years ago, when about 5 000 tonnes of steel was on the wharfs at Port Adelaide. It was not until the Premier decided to do something about the matter that that steel was moved from the area. In April, the Premier and his good officers—

Members interjecting:

Mr. VENNING: Perhaps the Minister of Transport

could turn up the wireless so that all members could hear it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will make the rulings in this House. Interjections from both sides are out of order.

Mr. VENNING: The Premier, when dealing with the live sheep matter, gave a reply that did not mean a thing. The Opposition is concerned that soon this situation relating to live sheep exports from this country could develop again. You, Sir, would realise that we in Australia cannot dictate to overseas buyers what they will purchase from this country. We must supply to those markets what they require from us, and they are looking for a certain number of live sheep. Despite what the unions here may have to say about the matter, this country has no control over what those buyers will order from us. It is merely up to us to supply their needs.

This market has been excellent for the type of sheep for which, on the local market, there was very little demand. One could get from \$4 to \$7 for a fully-grown wether, although on the live sheep export market as much as \$18 or \$20 a head was being obtained at that time. The sheep therefore have a premium value for the overseas trade. It seems that the unions could once again be showing some form of confrontation in relation to this excellent export trade for Australia.

Since returning from overseas, I have said that we in this country have a wonderful opportunity. In the past, we have been concerned about our isolation, but I am no longer concerned in this respect. The only problems that we in this country have are those that we create ourselves. We have developed at our terminals a bad reputation for delaying shipping and, if only we could get our people to see the light, sufficient markets would still be available to us.

Despite what has happened in the European Economic Community, there are still plenty of markets for Australian traders and, if the unions could show a sensible approach to the situation, there would be a wonderful future in Australia not only for primary producers but also for workers and everyone associated with this trade. Opposition members have heard the member for Gilles laugh; that shows how little he knows about anything. I support the motion.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): In my Address in Reply speech in this House on 20 July 1971 I said:

When one looks at the Government's proposed legislation, as set out in His Excellency's Speech, and the law reforms that could come, one wonders just what is going to happen to South Australia. To sum up, we must go back about 200 years to 1775, when Charles Dickens made some comments on life that appear to be as remarkably appropriate today as they were then. He said:

It was the best of times, it was the worst of times.
It was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness . . .

It was the season of light, it was the season of darkness.
It was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair.
We had everything before us, we had nothing before us.
We were all going direct to heaven, the other way.

When we consider what has happened in the first 12 months of office of the present Government, I see where we are going. Doubtless, it is appropriate that there should be an eleventh commandment, stating:

Thou shalt not criticise a Socialist Government, a Socialist Premier and his Ministers, for if thou dost, thou art banished from the State for the rest of thy life.

I picked up a copy of the *Herald* of July 1978 containing a

report under the heading "Digging around", written by Wombat. We could assume it might be Mr. Bruce Muirden, attached to the Premier's Department, but we are not too sure. This is one of the most disgraceful articles I have ever read in a political newspaper. No wonder people of this State are getting fed up with the attitudes of the major political Parties. I will read this article to describe what concerns me. It states:

"There is no way that rumors which attack the Premier or the Government are in fact going to destroy it because 99 per cent of them have no basis in fact. We have been pre-occupied with rumors . . ."

That admission by Opposition leader Tonkin (*The Advertiser* 17/5/78) says a lot about the level of Liberal politicking in South Australia.

It is all very well for the writer of this article to talk about politicking when we read what follows:

Favorite forums for those who seek to undermine the credibility of the Premier and the State Government are the letters to the editor columns. The *News* often runs knocking letters signed by the likes of "Unionist's Wife" (never "Company Director's Daughter!")

The *Advertiser* letters columns carried a number of new names in June, after having given full play to the old faithfuls in the first five months of 1978.

Three of the most trenchant and vitriolic critics of the Government have been R. R. St. C. Chamberlain (cast in the role of Grand Inquisitor), J. N. McEwin (Lord High Executioner) and P. C. Greenland (First Gravedigger). All three, interestingly, have exceeded their allotted three score years and ten.

Sir Reginald Roderic St. Clair Chamberlain, 77, Kt., LL.B., Supreme Court judge 1959-71, was perhaps best known as the Crown Solicitor who prosecuted during the Stuart case.

John Neil McEwin, 71, LL.B., a director of *Advertiser* Newspapers Ltd. since 1961, also is a director of Argo Investments, Bounty Investments, Wakefield Investments Ltd., Elder Smith Goldsbrough Mort Ltd. and Elder's Trustee and Executor Co. Ltd. He married a daughter of Sir Richard Butler, a conservative Premier of South Australia.

Like Don Dunstan, both Chamberlain and McEwin were educated at St. Peter's College and graduated in law at the University of Adelaide; unlike him, both are members of the Adelaide Club and the Royal Adelaide Golf Club.

Patrick Cecil Greenland, 72, M.B.E., M.A., B.Ec., is a comparative newcomer to the letters page, but already he has made his mark. As he sees it, the South Australian economy is lagging because the responsible classes are totally excluded from the government. Poor S.A. will never prosper while it is run by "our pop-art Premier as compere, with his troupes of trade union officials masquerading as Ministers of State . . ." (*The Advertiser* 29/5/78).

Not exactly the language one would expect from the winner of the Bunday Prize for English verse, University of Adelaide, 1928, or from a contributor to *The Australian Quarterly*.

Nevertheless, his hawkish line on uranium mining (22/4/78) would come naturally to a former secretary of the Australian Atomic Energy Commission (1953-65).

Quantitatively, the most successful critic of the Government is David Davidson, listed in the electoral roll as a bank official. In six months the *Advertiser* published 14 of his letters.

Then came Forbes Sage (seven letters), John A. Longhurst and Bob Brown-Parker (six each)—not always on overtly political topics—followed by the terrible twins, W. B. Wreford and the Rev. R. W. Noack (five each). Wreford, of course, operates under a dozen aliases in the *News*.

Other names to shudder at include James Essex, Robt. S.

Alcock, A. M. McMurtrie, K. W. Grundy, John Maguire, D. Hearn, Barbara J. Best, A. Bertram Cox, W. England, Roger Meadmore and Mark J. Posa.

The article then praises the efforts of a couple of people well known within union and Labor circles. The most disappointing part of that article is that somebody within the union movement, and within the Government (probably Mr. Bruce Muirden who is paid by the South Australian taxpayers) has spent much time and research in preparing dossiers on people who write letters to the editor.

This cuts right across the theory of this Government. I cannot understand it, nor can I understand the Premier who went on a witch hunt to get Harold Salisbury, the former Commissioner of Police, and who set up the inquiry into Special Branch of the Police Department. The Premier set out to destroy the activities of Special Branch, which operated to protect the innocent, and to warn and advise the Government of those who may be carrying on subversive activities in this country. For the Premier to deny that he knew anything about Special Branch is totally false.

When I was President of the Bank Officials Association in 1964-65, we knew that a special dossier was kept on all trade union officials. I was advised that inquiries had been made about my own position.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo interjecting:

Mr. BECKER: If the Minister of Transport would show some respect for this House and some respect for Parliament—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BECKER: We knew within trade union circles that Special Branch existed. It is ironic that the Premier's legal firm in those days, Roder, Dunstan, Lee and Taylor, was solicitor for the Bank Officials Association. When I found out that investigations had been made about me I mentioned this to a senior union official in another State. He said, "No worries, when the Labor Party comes into office in South Australia, we will fix Special Branch." I have no doubt that Salisbury was set up over the whole deal, and that it has been a long ambition of the trade union movement in this State to destroy Special Branch and all that it stands for.

This happens under a Government that, within its own organisation, compiles secret dossiers of citizens of this State. It is well known that for many years certain people within the A.L.P. have researched and prepared dossiers on people in various positions, particularly those in public life. I have a document that was taken from my dossier within Trades Hall. That is a scandalous situation.

Here we have a Government, sponsored by the trade union movement in this State, out to destroy Special Branch, because it dared to keep files on trade union officials, yet we have its own political organisation keeping files on citizens in the community. There is clear demonstration and proof that I have been seeking for many years that the Labor Party is prepared to go to any lengths to destroy the credibility of any person who dares criticise it. Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. BECKER: What sort of dictatorial Government are we getting in this State when we find Gestapo tactics being employed by the Labor Party to create dossiers and to destroy people who dare attack it, and offer criticism?

Motion carried.

Bill taken through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): Earlier today I referred to problems associated with teacher housing, and I stated that the occupant of the house at No. 6 High Street, Gladstone, had experienced considerable difficulty. The following information has been provided in respect of that house:

The tenant was given to understand, orally, that he had a choice of internal paint colours while the exterior was to be painted in existing colours. Again, confusion arose when external colours were changed. Challenges made by the tenant resulted in some attempt to match colours better, but the effect remains distasteful.

The quality of replacement screen doors has proved unsatisfactory in spite of the tenants' objections, raised before the doors were installed. The front door has no central supports to hold it open and already the wire is stretched and torn from lack of protection. Meanwhile the back door, opening into a dark entry porch, has its lower half filled so that light is reduced even further.

Sliding window screens, placed in the laundry, to be trimmed to fit before installation so that they have lost their strength—they still don't slide!

In some cases, the tenant was unaware of the work to be done, or the manner in which it was to be done, and felt that prior consultation with the supervisor would have eased the situation for all concerned.

The fortnightly interval between supervisory visits brought considerable problems as decisions affecting the execution of a job were occasionally delayed for the whole of the interval, to the annoyance of both tenant and tradesman. Where the tradesman felt the job must be completed promptly so that he could most effectively use his time, several unfortunate "blunders" were committed, some of which are beyond the extent of present finances to correct; for example, correct alignment of tiles on laundry floor, visible exterior paint work.

The fact that the work was begun in December last and is still not complete is particularly disturbing. The tradesman is supposed to have been asked to finish some tasks; however he is currently employed on other similar activities in the area and says that he has not been requested to return to this residence.

In consultation with the regional supervisor at Port Pirie, I am assured that requests for further work will be treated promptly. I have not seen the Adelaide-based supervisor for about two months.

Much of the foregoing was discussed with Mr Burrows when he visited the house recently. Unfortunately, my immediate fear is that much of the unfinished work will be left as a memorial to the confusion that can arise when tenant, authority and tradesman are not clearly informed of the work specifications—and the tenant will be left to live with it.

That statement, dated 17 July 1978, is signed by Mr D. Gallas, Principal of Gladstone Primary School. A letter, dated 21 June 1978, from the Principal of Gulnare Primary School to the Manager of the Teacher Housing Authority states:

On 26 November 1976 you wrote to me as Assistant Manager of the T.H.A. referring to your recent inspection with Mr. Lloyd Bennett and informing that a detailed report and cost estimates were being prepared and it was your aim to effect works as soon as possible.

On 3 November 1977 I wrote to you advising of long delays in major repairs and cyclic maintenance and repainting to our

residence. This was investigated in December 1977 by the South Australian Housing Trust with a clear indication that the work should be finished by March. On 5 April 1978 I wrote to you asking for a progress report. On 4 May your Housing Officer, Miss E. M. Anderson, wrote and advised that Mr. Bob Rathbone of the Housing Trust would call in the week beginning 8 May. He did not call, or if he did, he did not see either my wife or myself. In the same week you called. As this is now six weeks ago and I have heard nothing since, could you please let me have another progress report.

Is it little wonder that members of the teaching profession are greatly concerned at the failure of the authority to face the reality of their problem and either say "No" and let them know exactly where they stand or at least try to honour the promises that have been made. Another problem referred to me involves a new house at 8 Flinders Street, Crystal Brook, in which people have been living for four months without sanding of the floors being completed, making it impossible to put down permanent floor coverings. Most of the doors in that house will not close, either. That is an intolerable situation. Another problem involves a house at Laura, and the details are as follows:

Initial complaint about the house was made in June, 1977, by letter to the Teacher Housing Authority. Issues outlined were:

1. Both back and front doors spring open even when locked, giving no security whatsoever.
2. Windows in bathroom, toilet and laundry have fly-wire portions with no glass covering which allows weather conditions (including rain) to enter these rooms at all times. Request for glazing these sections.
3. Back and front access paths to residence non-existent and, being glass-like in wet weather, extremely dangerous. Request for these to be cemented.
4. Shower screen in bathroom cracked. Request that this be replaced. As a result of this letter, I received a visit by a maintenance officer from Adelaide who agreed and noted the above complaints and also added that:
5. The tiles on the laundry floor were inadequate and should be replaced.
6. Power should be connected to the shed.

Shortly afterwards, I received a reply from the T.H.A. [Teacher Housing Authority] that the following work would be carried out "as expeditiously as possible". (There is no date on the correspondence, but I dated it as August 1977.)—Tile laundry floor; concrete paving.

No action by December, at which time I was requested to leave the house key with a neighbour as the work was to be done in the Christmas vacation. I returned to school at the end of January to find nothing done. I inquired why and was told that the contractor was nearby and work would start almost immediately. More phone calls during term 1, 1978—same reply.

In May 1978, I am visited by the manager of T.H.A. who states "most time allowed for delay in jobs is seven months, but he couldn't explain why such a lengthy delay in the work at my residence". I also questioned him about the work to be done and he assured me that all the unmentioned work in his letter of August 1977 would also be done . . . Since then, three more phone calls have been made. Still no real action. All that has happened in the entire year is two bags of cement have been dropped in the shed and a load of sand and metal has been dropped on the front footpath about 10 weeks ago. That is dated 27 July 1978. I have another letter from the Solomontown Primary School, a copy of which went to the member for Stuart. The letter is dated 19 July 1978 and states, in part:

To give you some idea about the extent of the problem, I will now list those things which require attention:

Kitchen—Exposed gas piping (new) to be covered with tiling around the stove. Exposed gas piping (old) to be removed. Quarter-round to be painted.

Hallway—Replastered walls to be painted following removal of dampness.

Bathroom—Cracking to be repaired and painted.

Bedroom 2—Extensive cracking to be repaired and painted.

Bedroom 1—Extensive cracking to be repaired and painted.

Exterior—Downpipes to be replaced as they are falling down due to rust. The exterior of the house urgently requires re-puttying around windows and repainting. As the house is some 70 years old the need for maintenance of this type should be obvious.

Although the Housing Authority reference to the following is upgrade rather than maintenance, I would also draw attention to the fact that the house has no front door, that one outside door actually opens into the third bedroom, and that there are so many doors within the house that it is extremely difficult to arrange furniture. I have liaised considerably with both the Housing Authority and the Housing Trust about the house, but feel that after living there for 18 months with very little response this matter has gone beyond a joke.

I believe that many members of the profession have been most tolerant about the conditions under which they are expected to live. I do not expect that every error can be corrected overnight, but it is essential that the people who have been made promises, through the Teacher Housing Authority, be told either that the work will be done or that it will not be done and, if authority is given for it to be done, it must be undertaken without the fooling around that is obvious from the cases I have related. There are many others: every member of Parliament has them brought to his attention. In some cases, work is not carried out by local contractors.

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

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): Whilst I appreciate that members of the House will be suffering delayed shock resulting from the Federal Budget we have heard tonight—

Mr. Goldsworthy: A responsible Budget.

Mr. KENEALLY: Responsible in that it continues to take away from those who have the least, to give it to those who have the most. That tends, to my way of thinking, to indicate irresponsibility.

The subject of a uranium enrichment plant has received much publicity in the Port Pirie press. There seems to be a basic difference of opinion between me, as the local member, and the Mayor and many of the council at Port Pirie, as to whether or not the establishment of a uranium enrichment plant in the northern Spencer Gulf area should be encouraged. I do not challenge the integrity of the Mayor and the councillors. They, in their wisdom, believe that such an industry in Port Pirie would overcome many of the problems they see occurring there, and I accept that the responsibility of the council is to attract industry to the area.

My opposition to the uranium enrichment plant comes from a more basic problem that overrides any consideration of job opportunities. I point out that I have not been convinced by the pro-uranium lobbyists, that the total technology, the total nuclear cycle, is safe. That is why I have reported to the press that I am a very strong supporter of the A.L.P. policy in South Australia, and,

indeed in Australia, a policy determined on a consideration for human welfare.

It seems that politicians, as lay people, should not be making decisions that, potentially at least, could have a disastrous effect on generations to come, whilst the experts, the scientists themselves, cannot agree on the safety of this technology. I would be surprised if there is one person in this Chamber, in South Australia, in Australia, or outside Australia, who could honestly say that there are no problems in the nuclear cycle with the disposal of high-level waste, with nuclear proliferation, terrorism, and nuclear weapons. Those are the considerations we must have.

It would be an entirely cynical attitude for people in South Australia to say that they would support the construction of an enrichment plant because the enrichment of uranium is one of the least dangerous components of the nuclear cycle, but, having done that, bear no responsibility for what happens to the product after it leaves our shores. We must have a responsibility towards the total nuclear cycle. We cannot extract components and say they are safe and so we will support that and ignore the rest of the cycle.

That is the predicament I am in. I know that the mining and enriching of uranium are the least dangerous components. If someone could convince the A.L.P. that the whole cycle was safe, I am sure there would be a move to forgo the existing moratorium. That is all we ask.

Obviously, this cannot be done. As I said earlier, while the experts disagree it would be rather dangerous for lay people, like the member for Flinders, the member for Light and me, to make decisions that could potentially have such disastrous effects. I know that people at Port Pirie should keep their options open, as I know the Government in South Australia is continuing to keep abreast of nuclear technology.

Dr. Eastick: That is the first public indication we have had of any softening.

Mr. KENEALLY: There is absolutely no softening. As a matter of fact, I take a quite definite line that I am totally and absolutely opposed to the mining or enriching of uranium in Australia until it has been clearly shown that the total cycle is safe. As I said earlier, I hope that members do not adopt a cynical attitude "If we mine and enrich it, it will not affect us, so we couldn't care less what happens to it if it becomes the property of other people."

I believe that what is happening at Port Pirie smacks somewhat of political opportunism by people whose politics are different from mine. They know that Port Pirie desperately needs an industry, and they know that the South Australian Government's policy is that it opposes any uranium industry until certain questions are answered. They know that they are in a no-lose situation, and that they can talk to people at Port Pirie and get newspaper headlines saying "We support the establishment at Port Pirie of a uranium enrichment plant". The Leader of the Opposition has been quoted on this topic, and Senator Jessop took to Port Pirie an officer of the Atomic Energy Commission to convince Port Pirie people that the processes are safe. That is like asking someone who grows oranges whether drinking orange juice is safe. This man has a vested interest in the industry to which he belongs, although I do not reflect on his integrity.

If one is to bring experts to Port Pirie to discuss an important and potentially dangerous subject, one ought to bring people who can put a balanced view. The member for Alexandra takes out his handkerchief and the member for Eyre shakes his head; they are convinced—those scientific geniuses opposite—that this whole process is safe, despite people much more eminent in the technology

than they are who say that it is not. I can continue—

Mr. Chapman: Dig it up, pack it up and process it.

Mr. KENEALLY: That is right, so long as they don't dig it up and process it on Kangaroo Island, I suggest. It is interesting to note that people who want to promote a plant want to put the plant in districts that are represented by someone else.

I challenge a member opposite to give a categorical assurance to people of Port Pirie that the Fraser Government is contemplating constructing such a plant in South Australia at least and at Port Pirie in particular. If such an indication cannot be given, people should not go to Port Pirie and give the impression that the only things stopping the establishment of a uranium enrichment plant at Port Pirie are the Premier of South Australia and the member for Stuart because of their attitude. The problem is much more complex than that.

I do not know of any contracts we have overseas to sell our uranium. I understand that there will still be legal challenges to the mining of uranium in Australia. It is a long way yet from construction of an enrichment plant in Australia, even if Australia will get an enrichment plant. If we do, it will require millions and millions of dollars. South Australia cannot even get the Federal Government now to support the infra-structure for a petro-chemical works at Redcliff, when the feed stock is on our doorstep. How less likely are we to get the infra-structure costs from the Federal Government when those costs are at least triple the costs of the petro-chemical plant when the stock to be treated at Port Pirie comes from about 2 000 miles away.

As I said earlier, this is nothing more than a cynical attempt by people of the opposite political persuasion to me to go to Port Pirie in a no-lose situation to suggest to people there that the only reason that they are not going to get an enrichment plant is because of the attitude of the State Government.

I suggest that no enrichment plant is likely to go to Port Pirie unless all the answers to the questions asked by the A.L.P. are satisfactory, that it is a totally safe process, and so on. I would then be likely to support the establishment at Port Pirie of an enrichment plant. I say to the people of my district, and to Port Pirie in particular, that if they wish for my support, I will be supporting its going to Port Pirie, not Port Augusta, because I happen to live in Port Augusta.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): About half an hour ago the member for Goyder asked what I was going to raise in the debate this evening. I told him that I was going to talk about our pussies, and he laughed. True, it may sound a laughable subject to raise at this hour, but in my district we are having great difficulty with our pussies. This subject is not as light as the mirth from my colleagues may reflect, because on Kangaroo Island feral cats are becoming a serious problem, as I understand they are in many other parts of the State. Kangaroo Island has feral cats in plague proportions. Their numbers have been increasing dramatically in recent times. I suggest seriously that not only local residents on Kangaroo Island set out to slaughter and be rid of these diseased-ridden animals but also wild-life officers stationed on Kangaroo Island should be encouraged, as part of their function and duty, to help the local residents stamp out these cats.

Mr. Gunn: What about poisoning?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am not sure what the most appropriate solution is, but I draw the attention of honourable members to this matter. This problem has come to public notice in my district, and I understand that it is a problem elsewhere. Birdlife on Kangaroo Island has

deteriorated noticeably in recent years. This area once boasted a wide range of natural mammals and bird life, a claim that we promoted to attract tourists to the area, whether they be bird watchers or tourists at large. This problem is serious and requires urgent attention.

Further to the dramatic increase in the number of feral cats, some new and disturbing evidence has come to hand recently, and I refer to the following article produced by concerned local people only last week:

[. . . a well known farmer] of MacGillivray has been very interested in the connection between cats and sheep disease for a long time. "About five years ago very little was known about the disease," he said, "But when more rigorous meat inspection came in people began to take notice." The disease is caused by a microscopic single celled protozoan animal. Sheep pick the 'egg' up in grass and this travels through the bloodstream until it finally lodges in the muscle.

Cysts are formed in the muscular surface of the sheep's gullet and in any muscle. It also takes different forms. The cysts on the sheep's gullet are highly microscopic, being white and about the size of a grain of wheat. If the muscle meat is available to cats then the cat becomes an intermediate host of the disease.

The organism multiplies asexually in the sheep's bloodstream but sexually in the intestine of cats. Passed out of the cat as cysts sheep can be easily infected. At present the hypothesis is that the organism is carried in dust.

This hypothesis is the result of a study being carried out by Marshall Lightowlers, a Doctor of Immunology at the Institute of Veterinary and Medical Science. Mr. Lightowlers has a research grant from the Meat Industry Research Council for three years. He is principally investigating the possibility of using immunity as control.

"It's costing us an enormous amount of money," he said. "Sheep badly infected are discounted by as much as \$3-60 a head by some meatbuyers."

Although this matter may have sounded like a simple and light subject in the first instance, it is causing my community, including the meat producers, serious concern. I draw to members' attention the importance of ridding the scrub land and the natural areas of the community of this influx of feral cats. Indeed, any other member on the mainland who has this matter brought to his or her attention should deal with it equally as seriously. It is my view that the wildlife officers employed by the department and permanently stationed on Kangaroo Island ought to be encouraged to assist and guide islanders in the best methods of which they are aware of getting rid of these cats.

I have a few minutes left of the time allotted to me, in which I should like again to draw to members' attention my concern, which has been furthered by the attitude expressed by the Minister of Fisheries through the media this evening. He has disregarded the concern of the prawn fishing industry, to the extent that he now suggests that a wealth tax or an industry tax should be imposed on that section of this State's fishery. This suggestion has been

made despite the fact that an investigation has not been undertaken to determine the industry's capacity to pay the prescribed fees. The extent of the fees has been banded around in various press releases throughout the day and, indeed, over the weekend, ranging from \$2 500 to \$9 000.

I am now not clear about what the fees are, and can only rely on the Minister's own report, which was produced today and in which he says that the fees proposed for the prawn fishery are to be broken up into two parts: first, where the fishermen operating single-rig vessels, mainly in St. Vincent Gulf, will be subjected to an increase from the \$200 fee currently applicable to them to one of \$5 000 and, secondly, where fishermen operating double-rig vessels, in Spencer Gulf, will have their fee increased from \$300 to \$9 000.

Mr. Richard Stevens, Executive Officer of AFIC, demonstrated in his address to the public, how disgusted his organisation was because of the lack of promised consultation with the industry, as promised time and time again by the Minister since he was appointed to this portfolio. I raise this matter again, because it has been drawn to my attention today that the Minister, of whom we are so critical, in his handling of this industry and the management policies applicable to it, is reported in *Hansard* as actually having boasted that Ministers, Cabinets and Parliaments make decisions not suddenly and based on personal whims but only after careful investigation and sounding out of those who will be affected. The Minister is reported also as saying (page 299 of 3 August *Hansard*):

The reports of these investigations and the seeking of opinions are the very foundation of policy decision making. So, we have a Minister who boasts that, before making any policy decision or any decision affecting industry, full and proper consultation is undertaken. With the licensed fishermen of this State, I am disgusted not only at the manner in which these fees have been restructured and dramatically increased but also by the way in which the industry has been totally ignored, despite promise after promise that it will be consulted on such changes.

On the one hand the Minister has required the industry to notify him if it intends to close or cut down on effort in any managed fishery area. He has required up to a year's notice for that sort of movement in the industry, but, within a couple of weeks and without any consultation whatever, the industry has had thrust upon it increases to the tune of up to 2 800 per cent on its licence fee structure, quite out of line and out of step with any other prawn permit structure in any other State of the nation. I would hope that the Minister, after receiving such incredible reaction from the industry, would again consult his Cabinet Ministers and resile from the blatant attack that he has made on the fishing industry, in particular as it relates to the licensing fee structure.

Motion carried.

At 9 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 16 August at 2 p.m.