

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 22 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 be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: all questions except Nos. 9, 65, 77, 223, 258, 270, 295, 333, 341, 345, 372, 373, 377, 380, 384, 389, 391, 392, 396, 397, 399 to 401, 405, 407, 409, 412 to 417, 419, 420, 422, 425, 426, 428, and 429.

ELECTION STAFF

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

1. Who authorised payment of the following sums:

	\$
(a) Assistant Returning Officers	86.00
(b) Presiding Officers engaged at scrutiny ...	76.00
(c) Presiding Officers not engaged at scrutiny	62.00
(d) Assistant Presiding Officers engaged at scrutiny	66.00
(e) Assistant Presiding Officers not engaged at scrutiny	56.00
(f) Poll Clerks engaged at scrutiny	56.00
(g) Poll Clerks not engaged at scrutiny	46.00
(h) Doorkeepers	42.00

on the occasion of 17 September 1977 State election when the authorising regulation under the Electoral Act, 1929-1976, published in the *Government Gazette* on 26 June 1975 at page 2468, only provided for the following sums—

	\$
(a) Assistant Returning Officers	43.00
(b) Presiding Officers engaged at scrutiny ...	38.00
(c) Presiding Officers not engaged at scrutiny	31.00
(d) Assistant Presiding Officers engaged at scrutiny	33.00
(e) Assistant Presiding Officers not engaged at scrutiny	28.00
(f) Poll Clerks engaged at scrutiny	28.00
(g) Poll Clerks not engaged at scrutiny	23.00
(h) Doorkeepers	21.00

to be paid?

2. Has the unauthorised expenditure of public funds been drawn to the attention of the Auditor-General and, if not, why not and if the Auditor-General has reported on the matter what is his full report on the subject?

3. What action has been taken to prevent a repetition of such unauthorised expenditure in this department or any other Government department in the future and what, if any, disciplinary action was taken by the Government in respect of the unauthorised and/or illegal payments?

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

1. Rates of pay for polling staff for the election on 17 September 1977 were authorised by the Attorney-General, but, due to an oversight, the regulations were not amended to validate the new rates. Cabinet subsequently authorised this expenditure as *ex gratia* payments.

2. The correspondence relating to the "authorised expenditure" and Cabinet approval of *ex gratia* payments was brought to the attention of the Auditor-General.

3. The Electoral Act is to be amended to empower the Minister to fix the fees to be paid to polling staff, and thus avoid the necessity of amending the regulations every time

an adjustment to the fees became necessary. This is the practice that is in operation in the Commonwealth Electoral Office.

PROBATION OFFICERS

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

1. What is the ratio of probation officers to persons on probation at present, and for each of the past five years?

2. Will the Minister ascertain and inform the House of the comparable information for the other States and Territories?

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

1. The ratios of persons on probation to probation officers, for the past five years, in South Australia, are as follow:

July 1974	76.8
July 1975	66.4
July 1976	55.7
July 1977	51.2
July 1978	56.5

2. Because of differing systems in each State, comparative figures are not readily available. However, the following information was provided by other States.

Year ending	Qld	N.S.W.	Vic.	Tas.	W.A.	A.C.T.	N.T.
30/6/74	61	—	—	—	65	—	—
30/6/75	59	54	—	—	56	—	—
30/6/76	53	57	—	—	57	—	—
30/6/77	57	56	—	—	55	—	—
30/6/78	55	—	—	51	—	—	19

SEXUAL MOLESTATION

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

1. What are the figures on sexual molestation of children in South Australia for the years 1967-77, inclusive?

2. What are the figures for each month to date for 1978?

3. In relation to the figures provided by the Attorney-General on 6 December 1977 regarding rape occurring between the years 1968-1969 and 1976-1977, what are the classifications of rape (for example, oral, anal, vaginal and rape with an instrument) during this period?

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

1. Statistics are not maintained relating to the age of victims against whom acts of indecency are committed. It is therefore not possible to provide the information requested without processing individual files and extracting the information sought. To do this would involve a great amount of work, which it is not proposed to undertake.

2. See above.

3. Prior to the amendment to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1976, in law there were no classifications of rape. Such offences that are now classified as oral rape were dealt with by other sections of the Act which created the offences of indecent assault, gross indecency and so on. In order to provide the information required it would again be necessary to process all files which dealt with offences involving indecency.

A random sample has been taken over the period 1 July 1977 to 31 December 1977 of offences handled by the Rape Enquiry Unit. From the sample of 80 reported offences of rape, it was found that 65 were vaginal acts, 12 anal acts and 19 oral acts. On 14 occasions there was a combination of the various classifications.

ABORTION

243. Mr. VENNING (on notice):

1. How many abortions were carried out in South Australia, during the years ended 30 June 1977 and 1978, respectively?

2. Does the Government intend introducing legislation to minimise abortions in South Australia?

3. Will the Government give consideration to introducing legislation to protect the unborn child?

4. Will the Government make additional funds available to groups and societies actively engaged in assisting unwed mothers-to-be and to the Right to Life Association?

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

1. Year ended 30 June 1977, 3 077
Year ended 30 June 1978, 3 433

2. No.

3. See 2 above.

4. The Community Welfare Grants Advisory Committee will give consideration to granting additional funds upon receipt of applications from the organisations.

1. (a) Vaughan House (including Elizabeth Grace community unit)

	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June
Senior Staff	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
R.C.W.	32	31	33	32	32	32	30	29	30	28	28	27
Ancillary	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9

(b) Brookway Park (including Gilles Plains community unit)

	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June
Senior Staff	10	9	9	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
R.C.W.	41	42	43	42	41	43	41	41	40	39	38	40
Ancillary	16	16	15	15	15	14	14	14	14	14	14	14

(c) McNally Centre (including Glandore community unit)

	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June
Senior Staff	15	15	15	15	15	15	14	15	15	16	17	16
R.C.W. (inc. P.N.O.)	71	71	76	77	75	77	79	82	77	79	80	77
Ancillary	30	32	32	31	31	32	33	32	33	32	32	31

Other Various Hostels and Cottage Homes

	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June
Senior Staff	19	19	19	18	18	19	19	19	19	19	20	20
R.C.W.	35	55	55	51	52	52	52	53	53	52½	52½	52½
Ancillary	27	27	27	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26

2. On a daily average basis.

	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June
Vaughan House (including Elizabeth Grace C.U.)	9	10	12	11	15	16	12	10	14	16	12	14
Brookway Park (including Gilles Plains C.U.)	23	30	23	26	30	33	28	23	28	34	29	28
McNally Centre (including Glandore C.U.)	47	45	52	55	52	51	50	50	56	56	55	51
Other various hostels and cottage homes:	127	128	119	132	132	110	91	125	131	133	107	127

INSTITUTIONS

244. Mr. MATHWIN (on notice):

1. How many administration staff, senior staff and residential care workers were employed at:

(a) Vaughan House;

(b) Brookway Park; and

(c) McNally Training Centre,

and other various hostels and cottage homes, respectively, for each month of the financial year 1977-78?

2. What were the monthly totals of inmates in those institutions for that year, respectively?

3. What were the monthly totals of resignations from those institutions in the staff categories as in part 1 respectively?

4. What were the monthly total of injuries caused by inmates to staff in each of those categories at Vaughan House and McNally Training Centre for the year 1977-78?

5. What was the nature of injuries sustained and time lost in relation to each type of injury?

6. What charges, if any, were laid in relation to those injuries and what was the outcome of each charge?

7. Were there any resignations from those institutions because of injuries and, if so, how many, from which institutions and when?

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

3. (a) Vaughan House (including Elizabeth Grace community unit)

	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June
Senior staff.....	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
R.C.W.....	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	2	2	1	—	1
Ancillary.....	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1

(b) Brookway Park (including Gilles Plains community unit)

	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June
Senior staff.....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—
R.C.W.....	—	1	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ancillary.....	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1

(c) McNally Centre (including Glandore community unit)

	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June
Senior staff.....	1	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
R.C.W.....	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	—	2	1
Ancillary.....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

(d) Other various hostels and cottage homes

	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June
Senior staff.....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
R.C.W.....	—	—	—	—	2	—	1	—	1	4	2	1
Ancillary.....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—

4. (a) Vaughan House—Nil
(b) McNally Centre

	Sept.	May	June
Senior staff.....	—	—	1
R.C.W.....	2	1	—
Ancillary.....	—	—	—

5. Month	Injuries	Amount of time lost
Sept.	1 Bruising	Nil
	1 Strain	Nil
May	Bruising	8 working days
June	Lacerations and concussion	10 working days

6. Month	Nature of charge	Outcome
Sept.	1 Assault	Progress report ordered by court for 14/8/78
	1 Assault	Fine \$100
May	Assault	Ancillary Order to McNally
June	Assault	Not yet finalised by court

7. One; claimed as reason by staff member; McNally Centre, September 1977.

MONARTO SHOOTING COMPLEX

252. **Mr. EVANS** (on notice): What assistance will be given for the Monarto shooting complex and when is it anticipated that the complex will be completed?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The Monarto Development Commission is negotiating to lease the Monarto Shooting Complex Inc. an area of about 130 ha of land at Monarto. It is expected that the necessary legal procedures to enable a lease to be executed will be finalised in the next few months. An application has been received by the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department, from the Monarto Shooting Complex Inc. seeking financial assistance for the first stage development of the small-bore and full-bore shooting ranges within the complex. The cost of this stage is estimated to be \$44 438.

The first stage consists of earthworks (mounding and excavation) and clubhouse for the full-bore range activities. It is also intended to build a toilet block for use by both groups. It is estimated that the first stage would be completed within six months of the requested grants being made available. The development of the total shooting complex is a long range project and could take at least 10 years to complete. This application is being assessed by departmental officers who will visit the site. Announcements about successful applications will be made at the end of August or early in September.

RIVER MURRAY COMMISSION

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

1. When did the River Murray Commission come into existence and what is its charter?

2. On how many occasions since its formulation has the charter been altered and, if any, in what ways?

3. What recent arrangement has been entered into for the purpose of extending the powers of the River Murray Commission and what is the detail?

4. What practical examples exist, if any, to identify the genuineness of concern by the Commonwealth, New South Wales, Victoria and South Australian Commissioners towards achieving change?

5. Is it expected that any legislative change will be required and when will legislation be placed before this Parliament for that purpose?

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

1. 1915. The basic charter of the commission was to give effect to the River Murray Waters Agreement which set out the powers and duties of the commission and provided *inter alia* for the distribution of waters and for the construction of the following works:—

1. A storage on the Upper Murray.
2. A storage at Lake Victoria.
3. The construction of 26 weirs and locks on the Murray from Blanche Town in South Australia to Echuca in Victoria.

4. The construction of nine weirs and locks on the Murrumbidgee from its junction with the Murray to Hay, or alternatively on the Darling. New South Wales decided to place the weirs and locks on the Murrumbidgee.
2. The agreement has been amended 7 times.

10 August 1923: Preference in order of construction to be given to works which would provide for the needs of irrigation before those primarily for navigation. An increase in the Commonwealth contribution towards the cost of works from £1 000 000 as provided in the original agreement to one-fourth of the cost.

23 July 1934: The number of weirs and locks on the Murray to be reduced from 26 to 14, including a weir without a lock at Yarrawonga. On the Murrumbidgee, the nine weirs and locks originally provided for were eliminated and in their place two flood diversion weirs were included. The Hume Dam was to be completed to a capacity of 1 250 000 acre feet but to such dimensions as would permit the increase in capacity to 2 000 000 acre feet in the future. Provision for the construction of barrages near the mouth of the Murray in the Goolwa, Boundary Creek, Mundoo, Ewe Island and Tauwitchere Island Channels.

26 November 1948: Provision to increase the capacity of the inlet to Lake Victoria to 6 000 acre feet per day when the water level in the storage was seven feet below full supply level. Requirement for New South Wales and Victoria to take effective measures to protect from erosion the portions of the catchment of Hume Storage within their respective States.

Provision for the commission to initiate proposals for the better conservation and regulation of the Murray River waters and flows and for the commission to make recommendations for the construction of such works to the contracting governments. Provision for the commission to declare a period of restriction in a year of drought and the sharing of available waters between the States in the proportions:

New South Wales	1 000 000	(38.42 per cent)
Victoria	1 000 000	(38.42 per cent)
South Australia	603 000	(23.16 per cent)

2 November 1954: Provision for the increase in storage of Hume Reservoir to 2 500 000 acre feet and the construction of works between Tocumwal and Echuca on effluents to prevent the loss of regulated flow in the river.

11 September 1958: Provision for the accounting of water from the Snowy Mountains hydro-electric scheme flowing to the Murray system and an amplification of the procedure to be used for calculating available water to be shared between States in times of restriction.

8 October 1963: Provision for the construction of Chowilla storage with a capacity of 4 750 000 acre feet and the equal sharing of available water during periods of restriction after Chowilla becomes effective.

26 February 1970: Provision for the construction of Dartmouth reservoir with a capacity of 3 000 000 acre feet and the deferring of the construction of Chowilla reservoir until the contracting Governments agree that the work should proceed. Provision for the increase to 1 500 000 acre feet of the minimum annual quantity of water to South Australia after Dartmouth becomes effective. The incorporation of the Menindee Lakes Storage Agreement into the River Murray Waters Agreement.

3. Contracting Governments have received proposals from the River Murray Commission for further amending the agreement to give effect to the recommendations of the River Murray Working Party, which were tabled in this House in October 1976 and other matters which have been recommended by the Commission itself.

4. Prior to acceptance of the recommendations of the River Murray Working Party by the contracting Governments, the commissioners had no brief to recommend any change to the River Murray Waters Agreement. The other matters included in the proposals now with Governments are the commission's own suggestions for amending the agreement.

5. When Governments have signified their concurrence to the proposals, an agreement will be prepared which would be subject to ratification by the four Parliaments.

AMATEUR FISHING

256. **Mr. EVANS** (on notice): Has the South Australian Recreational Fishing Advisory Council made recommendations to the Government in relation to amateur fishing regulations and if so:

- is one of those regulations that a bag limit for any species be 40 per boat, per day, in total on all scale fish taken;
- is one of those regulations that bag limits for whiting be reduced from 30 to 20 per person in any one day;
- is one of those regulations that nets must not exceed 75 metres in length and must have mesh of not less than 5 cm, that only one net is to be used at a time (from date of proclamation) and only one net is to be registered from a subsequent date to be determined; and
- what action is the Government going to take in relation to these regulations?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

- No.
- No.
- Yes until 30 June 1980 when it recommends that the use of nets by amateurs be not permitted.
- An announcement will be made in due course.

FAMILY LIFE

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

1. Has any research been conducted by the Community Welfare Department into the effect on family life of legislation, regulations, and departmental policy introduced in the last 10 years and, if so, what was the result of that research?

2. Is the department required to prepare family impact statements and is the Minister made aware of any analysis of such statements before actions which could affect family life are taken?

3. Is it a fact that if a young person leaves the family home, even before the age of 16 years, departmental officers, in some cases, with the Minister's approval, refuse to disclose the whereabouts of the child?

4. Is it also a fact that contraceptives are made available by Government or semi-government agencies to children under the age of 16 years without the parents' consent or knowledge and, if so, which Government or semi-government agencies carry out this practice?

5. Is it the Government's policy to take over parental control and guidance of children in cases where departmental officers recommend, regardless of the parents' opinions?

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

1. The Department for Community Welfare has participated in a research study of programmes and policies in support of the family. The results of this research have been published in the report of the Family Services Committee. In addition, the department has contributed to a comparative analysis of legislation affecting children and families in Australia. This work has been published under the title "Children or Families?"

2. The notion of family impact statements, as invoked by the Royal Commission on Human Relationships, has at all times underlain the policy making and programme implementation of the Department for Community Welfare.

3. Yes, in a few cases where the young person is adamant that parents should not be informed. In these circumstances young people are counselled to advise their parents of their whereabouts and the departmental officer concerned informs the Police Department (missing persons) immediately he becomes involved with the young person. The police (missing persons) are then able to advise the parents and encourage them to make direct contact with the community welfare worker concerned, who works towards the restoration of the family.

4. Doctors have a confidential relationship with patients and prescribe treatment or assistance to patients according to their ethics. Some doctors in Government hospitals might prescribe contraceptives for children under the age of 16 years, without the parents' consent or knowledge, if they consider it is necessary for the child's well-being and there are valid reasons why the situation should be dealt with in that way.

The Women's Community Health Centre Incorporated, which might be regarded as a semi-government agency, has a policy that if a minor attends seeking information and help, every encouragement is given to the minor to discuss the matter with his/her parents and/or family doctor. Circumstances occasionally arise in which a minor refuses to follow this advice and in which, in the judgment of professional staff concerned, it is held to be reasonable to provide contraceptive advice directly to the minor. Parents will only be informed of the transaction with the consent of the patient concerned.

5. No, but a few children over the age of 15 years are admitted to temporary care and control at their own request. Any opinions expressed by parents are given full consideration.

FROZEN FOOD FACTORY

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

1. Has the establishment of the Government food factory resulted in most cooks and chefs in hospitals becoming redundant and if so:

(a) what job opportunities have been created for them; and

(b) has it resulted in their being forced to accept positions as orderlies and porters?

2. What is the cost of total preparation of meals in a hospital and the comparative cost of supplying food from the frozen food factory, with only final preparation being carried out at the point of delivery?

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

1. No, some have been redeployed.

(a) All cooking personnel from conventional kitchens in institutions have had the first opportunity to apply for jobs at the Frozen Food Factory.

(b) No. A number of officers have voluntarily sought and been successful in gaining orderly or porter positions.

2. It is not possible to provide the requested comparison because food preparation costs vary from hospital to hospital and from meal to meal. However, it has been indicated to hospitals that the cost to them of meals from the Frozen Food Factory for 1978-79 will be \$1.25 a meal. This includes preparation, cooking, processing and packing, overhead costs such as interest, workmen's compensation and depreciation on equipment, etc., and an allowance for inflation.

MISTLETOE

267. **Mr. EVANS** (on notice): As many trees on public property such as road reserves, recreation and conservation reserves have already died due to the parasite mistletoe, what action is contemplated to save those living trees which are seriously affected?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Mistletoe is an integral part of the Australian flora and, in general, the trees parasitised by it are not seriously affected. However, in situations where the prevalence of trees has been reduced the remaining trees become more heavily parasitised. Control of mistletoe is very difficult because of reinfestation. Chemical treatment could be used but this method is expensive and has harmful effect on the trees.

BELAIR RECREATION PARK

271. **Mr. EVANS** (on notice): What is the total amount of money spent on upgrading and improving the ovals and tennis courts within the Belair recreation park since June 1974?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The sum of \$63 000.

DOMICILIARY CARE

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

1. Why are pamphlets not available detailing the services from domiciliary care and rehabilitation services?

2. Will pamphlets be prepared in future and, if not, why not?

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

1. Information concerning domiciliary care services is available in the *Directory of Social Welfare Resources*, a book which is widely circulated to agencies having any involvement in the areas of health and welfare.

2. Domiciliary Care Services are currently fully utilised. The production of pamphlets might produce expectations which could not be realised, especially in the light of recent cuts in Federal Government funding.

REPLY TO LETTER

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

1. When does the Premier propose to reply in more detail to the letter of 28 March 1978 to him from Mr. J. Roxburgh, as undertaken in Mr. S. R. Wright's letter to Mr. Roxburgh of 10 April 1978?

2. Why has he not already so replied?

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

1. The Premier has now replied.

2. He did not reply earlier because he was waiting on a further report from the Commissioner of Police that is only just to hand.

MARIHUANA

326. **Mr. NANKIVELL** (on notice):

1. What was the cost to the Government incurred by the Police Department in eradicating and destroying the plantation of marihuana discovered on a property known as "Athlone Downs" near Tintinara?

2. Have the person or persons apprehended on the site been charged and prosecuted and, if so, in what court, before whom, and what fine or penalty was imposed?

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

1. About \$9 000. It is only possible to provide a close approximation of the cost, as it is not normal practice to isolate costs incurred in respect of particular crimes. Computation of the figure has been made from information readily available, and includes the normal salaries of personnel engaged in the exercise which, in fact, are fixed costs to the department.

2. Three persons were apprehended and charged in connection with the incident. Two of the offenders were convicted in the Adelaide Central District Criminal Court on 6 June 1978. They were each fined \$500 and sentenced to nine months imprisonment on charges of cultivating Indian Hemp. The terms of imprisonment were suspended by the court on the condition that they each enter into a bond of \$350 for 12 months. The third offender was committed for trial in the Supreme Court. The date of trial is not yet known.

COORONG

342. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Is there any change in policy relating to the licensing of nets for amateur fishermen within the perimeter of the Coorong National Park and, if so, what are those changes?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No.

MOTOR VEHICLES DEPARTMENT

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

1. Of the branches of the Motor Vehicles Department:

(a) what is the number of staff at each branch;

(b) what was the cost of operating each branch for the financial year ending 30 June 1979; and

(c) what is the estimated cost of operating each branch for the financial year ending 30 June 1979?

2. Has the introduction of branches meant an overall increase in staff and, if so, to what extent?

3. Has the establishment of branches proved worthwhile to the department, to the general public, and in improved general efficiencies and, if so, to what extent?

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

1. (a), (b) and (c)

Branch Office	Clerical staff	Driver testing officers	Total 1977-78 \$	Total Estimated 1978-79 \$
Elizabeth	9	3	141 262	147 000
Lockleys	5	3	13 473	113 100
Marion	9	5	130 324	165 400
Mitcham	5	3	37 806	100 700
Morphett Vale	5	1	62 315	81 135
Port Adelaide	6	2	8 124	86 100
Prospect	7	2	111 628	112 900
St. Agnes	5	2	64 750	93 900
Tranmere	7	4	139 775	140 660
Berri	4	—	55 313	51 070
Kadina	4	1	56 456	67 025
Mount Gambier	5	1	66 900	67 780
Murray Bridge	4	1	61 405	66 740
Nuriootpa	4	1	25 252	55 280
Port Lincoln	3	1	60 589	53 405
Port Pirie	4	1	67 445	71 395
Whyalla	4	1	63 803	66 245
Total	90	32	\$1 166 620	\$1 539 835

2. No. As additional branches have opened and become established, compensating savings have been made in head office, particularly in the mail and counter branches. Since 1975 the staff of the division has increased by 19 from 439 to 458 because of additional activities, which include the written and practical testing of drivers, the introduction of three-year licences, points demerit schemes, and the load rating of vehicles.

3. Yes, for the following reasons:

(a) From the division's points of view it has been able to offer a more personal service;

(b) The staff have attained more job satisfaction in the knowledge that they are providing a better service to the public;

(c) The public has gained by receiving a more personal service;

(d) People are able to transact business at a branch near their home, thereby saving cost of postage;

(e) The public in the country feel much less remote by being able to personally transact their business.

It has been found that 68 per cent of the division's cash transactions are handled in branches offices. An average of 6 000 customers transact business at branch offices each day.

SOUTH-EAST DRAINAGE

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

1. Is it correct that some inconsistencies have been found in plans used by the South-Eastern Drainage Board to determine rates payable by landholders alleged to benefit from the drainage system?

2. Will all ratepayers within the drainage area be given right of appeal and, if not, how many may appeal?

3. If some ratepayers are being denied the right of appeal, who made the decision and upon what criteria was this decision based?

4. Do the grounds of appeal include a landholder's claim that he may be adversely affected by drainage from other areas entering his property and, if not, why not?

5. Is the Minister currently considering abolition of rates in the South-East drainage area?

6. Will the drains continue to be maintained in the event of abolition of rates?

7. Has there been any feasibility study to consider the merit of installing weirs upon major drains to prevent total loss of surface water to the sea?

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

1. Yes.

2. No. The landholders of 141 holdings on which inconsistencies were found.

3. The Government, following consultation with the South-Eastern Drainage Board, requested the board to alter the boundary of the ratable area pursuant to section 49 (3) of the South-Eastern Drainage Act, 1931-1977, to remove any inconsistencies in the ratable area where inconsistencies, on a whole of property basis, have created an injustice to the landholder.

4. The grounds of appeal are covered by section 53 of the Act, and the relevant clause in this instance is:

2 (b) that the landholding, or any of the land comprised therein, has received no direct or indirect benefit from the construction of the drains or drainage works.

The appeal board considered all the evidence presented at an appeal and if the appellant gave evidence that he was being adversely affected by drainage from other areas this would have been taken into consideration when the appeal board made its decision.

5. No.

6. See 5.

7. Yes.

NOISE CONTROL

365. **Mr. WILSON** (on notice):

1. What steps have been taken to publicise the Noise Control Unit?

2. What hours of service are provided by the unit?

3. What provision is made by the unit to satisfy public inquiries on weekends?

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

1. Numerous articles have been published in both the *News* and the *Advertiser* advising the public of the functions of the Environment Department's Noise Control Section. Similarly, articles have appeared in these papers summarising the provisions of the Noise Control Act, 1976-1977, and associated regulations, and advising the public that complaints of excessive noise may be lodged by telephoning or writing to the section.

2. The Noise Control Section offices at 32 West Beach Road, Keswick, telephone 297 7055 are manned between the hours of 9.30 a.m. to 5.30 p.m., Monday to Friday. Inspectors under the Noise Control Act do, however, assess complaints of alleged excessive noise outside of these hours when such action is considered to be necessary.

3. Complaints of alleged excessive noise occurring during the weekend should be made to the Operations Room at Police Headquarters. A member of the Police Force will attend to the complaint and in extreme cases an "on-call" officer from the Noise Control Section may be called out by the police. Such action by the police will only

be warranted when the noise which is the subject of a complaint is being emitted from other than domestic premises. Complaints of alleged excessive noise from domestic premises may be subject to investigation by a member of the Police Force at any time of the day, seven days a week.

ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

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

1. What will be the particular role of the Co-ordination and Policy Division of the Environment Department?

2. To which field of environmental management will their policy development work be principally directed:

(a) initially; and

(b) in the long term?

3. Will the co-ordination aspect of the division be concerned with internal matters, or will it be more wide-ranging and involve other departments such as Agriculture, Lands, Public Works, Health, Transport, Planning, and Mines?

4. Will the division examine and prepare plans for the National Parks and Wildlife Division at an early stage in its operation and, if not why not?

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

1. The Co-ordination and Policy Division of the Environment Department will be responsible for co-ordinating environmental policies and programmes within the Government, formulating environmental policies, evaluating and reviewing existing and proposed environmental policies and programmes and developing an environmental information service within the Government and the community at large.

2. (a) Policy development work will be directed initially towards environmental impact statement procedures and preservation of the State's cultural heritage.

(b) In the longer term, policy development work will be determined by the priority the Government places upon any particular area.

3. The co-ordination effort will be concerned with both the various parts of the Environment Department, other Government departments, and other Governments.

4. The division is concerned with developing policies in the national parks and wildlife area and not with preparing detailed management plans.

NATIONAL PARKS

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

1. Have any complaints been received by the National Parks and Wildlife Division from land/leaseholders with properties adjacent to national and conservation parks concerning the intrusion of indigenous and feral animals that inhabit the parks on to their land for the purpose of feeding on pasture and crops and drinking at stock watering points and, if so, how many and how did the division deal with these complaints?

2. What type of fences are constructed around national and conservation parks?

3. Are all with parks completely fenced?

4. Are the fences adequate to contain wildlife in times of drought and other times?

5. Are fences maintained on an equal-share basis with adjoining land/leaseholders?

6. If damaged by wildlife are fences promptly repaired by park rangers or do the landholders mend the fences themselves and then bill the division for their share of the cost?

7. What length of time elapses, on average, between when a fence is damaged and when it is repaired?

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

1. Yes. The number of inquiries is not known. They are frequent. Each case is dealt with on its merits. The local ranger carries out an inspection if he considers that a problem has arisen with surplus fauna. He can issue destruction permits for kangaroos, emus, and possums. Other fauna problems are dealt with by staff from Head Office in liaison with the local ranger.

2. Three types of fences are constructed according to need:

- Type 1 Salt-treated pine posts
Steel droppers
Ringlock wire and barb.
- Type 2 Salt-treated pine posts
Steel droppers
5 strands high-tensile plain wire.
- Type 3 Salt-treated pine posts
Steel droppers
Vermin proof galvanised wire netting
2 strands of barbed wire.

The use of pine posts and droppers may vary according to terrain.

3. No. However, it is policy to fence reserves as resources permit.

4. No.

5. A fencing subsidy is paid to the neighbouring landholder on satisfactory completion of the construction of a fence of a specified design on a common boundary, provided that the total cost of construction including supply of the materials and labour is met by the landowners. The neighbouring landowner is responsible for the continuing maintenance cost of boundary fences.

6. Once the subsidy has been paid, responsibility for repair and maintenance rests with the landholder.

7. It is at the landholder's discretion.

NATIONAL PARKS OFFICERS

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

1. Are the measures listed in the Minister's reply to my question on 1 August successful in promoting and establishing a good relationship between the National Parks and Wildlife Fire Service Officers and adjacent land/lease-holders and, if not, why not?

2. What explanation can the Minister give for the frequently reported dissatisfaction and disagreement that appears to exist between the service and many local land/lease-holders?

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

1. The measures listed are going a long way to promoting good relationships. It will, of course, take some time before all neighbouring landowners are fully aware of the current attitude of the service. The working relationships are established by ranger staff.

2. The only reported dissatisfaction that I am aware of, and certainly the only instance in writing, is on Kangaroo Island, where the demands made are quite unreasonable, or the facts have been distorted. In recent months a number of meetings have been attended, and in all cases the very fact that this service now has an established policy is proof that the service is attempting to do all that is possible to co-operate with them.

CONSERVATION LITERATURE

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

1. What steps are being taken by the newly formed Co-ordination and Policy Division of the Environment

Department with regard to the provision of a more comprehensive selection of interpretative literature to interested members of the public, concerning national and conservation parks in view of the fact that an informed public is less likely to vandalise the parks and is more likely to respect features that they understand and, if no steps are being taken, why not?

2. Will such interpretative literature be more informative and detailed than that listed in the Minister's reply to my question on 1 August, since many of those items listed consist only of single sheet maps and, if not, why not?

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

1. At this stage of its development the newly formed Co-ordination and Policy Division of the Environment Department is not preparing interpretative literature on national and conservation parks for the public. As indicated in reply to a Question on Notice on 1 August 1978, a considerable amount of informative material concerning national and conservation parks is already available. In addition to the 38 items listed in that reply (which in itself is not a complete list of all available information) a further 15 pamphlets have been prepared by the National Parks and Wildlife Service and are awaiting publication.

2. The National Parks and Wildlife Service has concentrated on the single page/one map, format since this is the type of information most sought after by the public. It is recognised that more specialised information could be desirable, and the department will embark on the preparation of such information material when the demand for the single page/map format is satisfied.

BOTTLEBRUSH

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

1. Are the protective measures being taken by the Department for the Environment to prevent illegal harvesting of native bottlebrush or broombush (used for brush fencing) from national and conservation parks successful and, if not, why not?

2. Does the department consider that such illegal harvesting could endanger the continued existence of the species?

3. Have any persons been prosecuted for such illegal harvesting during that the past five years and, if so, how many and what, if any, penalties were imposed upon them?

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

1. Yes.

2. No.

3. Yes, two.

(a) \$50 fine, \$4 court costs.

(b) \$40 fine, \$4 court costs.

VEGETATION CLEARANCE

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

1. When will the final report on vegetation clearance be presented to the Minister?

2. Will the report be available to the public and, if so, how soon after the report is received by the Minister will it be made public?

3. Will the public be given a chance to comment on this report and, if not, why not?

4. Will legislation to provide for heritage agreements, along the lines of the draft Bill included in the Vegetation Clearance Report, be considered as a matter of urgency by the Minister and, if not, why not?

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

1. The final report on vegetation clearance is being prepared.
2. The final report takes into account the comments received from the public on the first report. A detailed examination of the findings of the final report will need to be made before any decision is made to issue the report to the public.
3. Vide 2.
4. This matter is discussed in the final report and will be considered when the report is reviewed.

ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

382. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Why would the Environment Department require extra staff to service environmental protection legislation when such "standard procedures of environmental assessment", as referred to in the Minister's reply to my question on 1 August, are already being carried out by the department?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member is confused between present operations, where assessments are given to a limited range of projects, and future operations, where statements for a wider range of assessments would be required under legislation.

WASTE DISPOSAL

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

1. Has the Government accepted the recommendations of the Waste Disposal Committee to set up a South Australian Waste Management Commission and, if so, when will legislation be introduced to set it up, and if not, why not?
2. What will then be the role of the regional organisations which presently provide for and manage the disposal of waste in their districts?
3. Will these regional organisations be required to financially contribute to the setting up of such a body and, if so, what will be the level of such financial contribution?
4. Will the commission, if set up, take over waste disposal land fill sites which have been already prepared by the regional organisations?
5. If the commission is to be set up, how many new Public Service jobs will be created, and how will the Minister reconcile such positions with the Government's policy of a "freeze" on expansion of the Public Service?

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

1. The Government has appointed an Interim Waste Management Committee, and has approved the distribution of the report to interested parties for comment. After the comments are considered and reported to Cabinet, it is hoped that legislation will be introduced during this session of Parliament.
2. This depends on reply No. 1.
3. This depends on reply No. 1.
4. No.
5. The report proposes that the commission should be financially self-supporting and, therefore, should not be affected by any restriction on the expansion of the Public Service.

REGENCY PARK TAVERN

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

1. Is the tavern at Regency Park, for which a licence is being sought, being built entirely by the State Planning Authority and, if so:

- (a) what is the total cost of the premises to be licensed as a tavern;
- (b) what is the cost of equipping the tavern with furnishings and all other necessary equipment for its operation; and
- (c) who will bear the cost of fully furnishing and equipping the premises?

2. In what form were tenders called for the operation of the licensed tavern and how many were received?

3. What experience has the successful tenderer had in operating licensed premises?

4. What fee is to be paid by the successful tenderer for the right to use Government property and equipment for the tavern establishment?

5. Is the amount of rent to be paid \$300 per week and, if not, what is the amount of rent?

6. Is there a provision for variation of the rent?

7. For what period will the contract run?

8. Is it proposed to establish any other similar facilities through the State Planning Authority and, if so, in what area?

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

1. The tavern at Regency Park was built by the State Planning Authority as an integral part of the recreation park.

- (a) The total cost of the premises to be licensed as a tavern, plus kiosk and change rooms, caretaker's residence and golf professional building, which are part of the same complex, was about \$279 000. Separated out, the licensed premises would have cost about \$190 000.

- (b) and (c) Furnishings and equipment of a permanent nature have been supplied by the authority, cash registers, additional kitchen equipment and such items as crockery, cutlery, and tablecloths are the responsibility of the tenant. Furnishings and fittings (including carpets and kitchen equipment) supplied by the authority cost about \$33 000, of which about \$28 000 is included in the building cost quoted above.

2. Open tenders were called in the usual manner for the operation of the licensed tavern by advertisements.

3. The successful tenderer submitted a list of previous and current catering contracts, which satisfied the authority that the firm had adequate and comprehensive experience. On this list were: current operation of a prominent city hotel and catering for a number of organisations, including a well-known yacht squadron.

4. to 7. The lessee will pay \$330 a week, including the occupation of a resident caretaker's house, subject of course to the granting of a liquor license. The lease is for an initial term of one year, with a right of renewal for a further three-year term, subject to satisfactory performance. There is provision for adjustment of rental after the first year.

8. No such facility is presently planned for other State Planning Authority reserves.

APHID

395. **Mr. NANKIVELL** (on notice):

1. Are quarantine restrictions still in force against the introduction of lucerne varieties resistant to the spotted alfalfa aphid?

2. Is it proposed to lift these restrictions to enable the multiplication of seed for commercial purposes on selected properties under quarantine control and, if not, why not?

3. Is it proposed to continue restrictions on the

introduction of these varieties until the potential danger from the blue green aphid has been assessed and, if so, when is the assessment likely to be completed?

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

1. Yes.
2. A modification of quarantine regulations has been allowed for lucerne varieties which have a satisfactory level of resistance to spotted alfalfa aphid and blue green aphid. So far, CUF 101 and WL 514 have qualified for entry under these modified rules.
3. A number of damaging pests or diseases could be introduced if quarantine restrictions were completely lifted. Such action would obviously be irresponsible. Instead, the modified quarantine rules will allow the introduction of lucerne seed for commercial purposes where the variety has satisfactory resistance to both aphids and, where it has agronomic characteristics of importance to the industry not already provided by CUF 101 or WL 514.

NEWTON BUS SERVICE

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

1. Did the Minister indicate to residents of Athelstone, through the former member for Coles, then Mr. L. J. King, that the Newton bus service would be extended when new buses became available in October 1975, subject to availability of a bus turning loop?

2. What has been done to ensure that a turning loop is available?

3. What is the reason for the delay in extending the service?

4. When will the service be extended?

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

1. Yes.
2. The subsequent bus planning group's report recommended that the Newton bus service be extended to Athelstone Park so that the proposed turning loop was no longer required.
3. Non-availability of buses and a reassessment of priorities for route extensions and service improvements as a result of cut-backs in Federal financial support.
4. Just as soon as finances permit.

NATIONAL PARKS

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

1. Is it the intention of the Government that the unnamed park in the north-west of the State and south of the Amata Aboriginal Reserve should remain a national park and, if not, why not?

2. Has the Minister now been able to ascertain any information from his department which would cause concern in regard to the future of the area of land as a national park?

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

1. No claim by Aboriginal people in respect of this area has yet been made. No question of change in conveyance presently arises.
2. Vide 1.

VALUER-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

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

1. Which members of the Valuer-General's Department were responsible for the valuations carried out at Monarto at the time of the acquisition of land in that area?

2. When did each valuer receive his/her valuer's certificate?

3. What level of certification did each hold at the relevant time?

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

1. No member of the Valuer-General's office was responsible for the acquisition and negotiation of land at Monarto. The Land Board, Lands Department, was responsible for such work. The members of the Land Board responsible for the work were:

Mr. L. Diercks (Chairman) (now retired)
Mr. J. Richards (Deputy Chairman)
Mr. A. DeCaux
Mr. D. Spurway
Mr. J. Fournie (now retired)

plus valuers attached to but responsible to the Land Board:

Mr. H. Pinkus (Supervising Valuer)
Mr. P. Clift
Mr. B. Dunow
Mr. D. Adderley
Mr. E. Polden

The members of the Land Board were all qualified valuers.

2. Mr. L. Diercks1964
Mr. J. Richards1963
Mr. A. DeCaux1963
Mr. D. Spurway1957
Mr. J. Fournie1951
Mr. H. Pinkus1965
Mr. P. Clift1969
Mr. B. Dunow1968
Mr. D. Adderley1972
Mr. E. Polden1972
3. Mr. L. DiercksRDA AAIV ATA
Mr. J. RichardsRDA (Hons) AAIV ATA
Mr. A. DeCauxRDA AAIV ATA
Mr. D. SpurwayHDA AAIV ATA
Mr. J. FournieFAIV
Mr. H. PinkusAAIV
Mr. P. CliftAAIV
Mr. B. DunowAAIV
Mr. D. AdderleyRDA AAIV ATA
Mr. E. PoldenAAIV Lic. Broker

The bulk of the acquisitions were undertaken by board members but random specialised work was done by valuers attached to the board. In 1976 the valuers attached to the board were incorporated in the Valuer-General's office which became a part of the Lands Department.

PREMIER'S STAFF

408. **Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice): Do any of the Ministerial staff of the Premier or other Ministers have the regular use of Government registered vehicles and, if so, which staff members are involved?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Two members of the Premier's staff have regular use of a Government vehicle, namely, the Executive Assistant, who is head of our Policy Division, and the Private Secretary, Administrative Head of the Ministerial staff. When the need arises, all Ministerial staff have access to Government registered vehicles in their relevant departments.

EYRE PENINSULA HOUSES

410. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice): How many homes for purchase or rental does the Housing Trust intend to build

this financial year on Eyre Peninsula, including Whyalla, and where will they be built?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The following is a schedule of the number of houses to be built by the Housing Trust, this financial year, on Eyre Peninsula: Ceduna 4, Port Lincoln 30, Streaky Bay 2, Tumby Bay 2, and Cummins 2.

MOTOR REGISTRATIONS

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

1. Is the Government concerned at the reduction in the number of motor vehicles registered in South Australia over the past few months and if so, what action does the Government intend to take to rectify this situation?

2. Has the Government given consideration to reducing stamp duty charges?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government does not propose to increase taxation in the face of a very difficult financial situation, but it would be unrealistic to contemplate further remissions at this stage. I pointed out to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition some months ago that the Commonwealth sales tax on cars is far higher than the State stamp duty. This is still the case notwithstanding the decrease in sales tax announced in the Commonwealth Budget.

PARKING LEGISLATION

418. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Is it the intention of the Government to introduce amendments to legislation affecting special parking provisions for physically handicapped people and, if so, when and what form are these amendments to take?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Yes. It is hoped to introduce amendments to the Motor Vehicles Act and the Road Traffic Act during the present session.

VANDALISM

421. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Is the Government concerned that penalties handed down by courts on people convicted of vandalism are sufficient to deter other members of the public from engaging in similar activities, and has the Government considered amending legislation to bring about harsher penalties as well as some form of community service on weekends?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee dealt with penalties in its fourth report and recommended a division of penalties for offences involving assault, damage to property, endangering transport, endangering property, common assault, interference with property and trespassing on land with fire arms. The Government intends implementing these recommendations and legislation is currently being drafted. The penalties proposed are generally more severe than the existing penalties for these offences. Of course, the imposition of penalties is strictly a matter for the court to decide within the limits laid down by the law.

CONTACT REGISTER

423. **Mrs. ADAMSON** (on notice): Does the Minister intend to advertise the contact register and if so, what form will the advertisements take, how often will they be placed and where will they be placed?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: There are no plans for any further advertising of the Adopted Persons Contact Register in the immediate future.

INSPECTORS

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

1. How many inspectors are employed by the Department of Labour and Industry to police the Shop Trading Hours Act?

2. What is the sum of the annual salaries of these inspectors?

3. Do the inspectors have other duties and if so, what proportion of this time (i.e. man hours per year) is spent on policing the Act?

4. Have there been any convictions under the new Act and if so, how many?

5. Is the Minister aware of any difficulties in policing the Act and if so, what are they?

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

1. 24.

2. \$313 642.

3. The principal duties of the inspectors are to police the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act (and the awards and agreements made under it), the Long Service Leave Act and the Workmen's Compensation Act. About 5 per cent of inspectors' time is spent policing the Shop Trading Hours Act, 1977.

4. Yes, 18.

5. The main difficulty in policing the Act is to secure evidence of alleged breaches being committed by a few used car dealers and caravan dealers.

CURB REPORT

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

1. Have any significant changes been effected to the CURB Report and, if so, what are those changes?

2. At what stage of development is the CURB plan in respect of the various regions and is the rate of development being hindered in any region and, if so, what are the reasons and the plans to overcome any such difficulties?

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

1. No significant changes have been effected to the CURB report.

2. (a) Implementation of the CURB proposals has proceeded to a considerable degree. The uniform regions have been adopted by most State Government departments and a number of Commonwealth agencies, as well. Departments seeking specific exemptions from the CURB proposals in terms of regional boundaries, regional administrative centres or timing of implementation have made submissions to the Co-ordinating Committee on Regional Administration. The co-ordinating committee has examined these submissions and will shortly be recommending to Cabinet on exemptions.

(b) The rate of development with respect to regionalisation is not being hindered in any region. Development is naturally subject to other priorities and the availability of resources. The recent appointment by the Public Service Board of a Regional Co-ordinator for the South-East region will facilitate a variety of improvements in regionalisation which can then be extended to other regions. It is anticipated that similar appointments will be made to other regions as circumstances permit.

ANSTEY HILL RESERVE

In reply to **Mrs. BYRNE** (21 July).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is proposed to bring together interested parties to prepare an overall concept plan for development of the Anstey Hill Reserve to coincide with the hand-over of the Tea Tree Gully quarry by Quarry Industries Limited at the end of 1980. Meanwhile, the manner of working of Tea Tree Gully quarry has been amended by agreement between the authority and Quarry Industries Limited to ensure safety of future users.

In addition, landscaping and tree planting aspects of the indenture are currently being amended to the mutual benefit of both parties. Old worked-out areas at the eastern edge of Anstey Hill Reserve will be used as a source of filling for the restoration of the main quarries and will themselves, in the process, be restored and replanted to a "natural" condition. It is proposed that, as with Anstey Hill Reserve, the quarry will be developed with facilities that serve regional needs. The quarry has particular attributes which favour certain recreational activities. These pursuits are typically sports which, by their danger or appearance (for example, archery), need to be shielded from other users of a regional park.

TRAWLING INDUSTRY

In reply to **Mr. BLACKER** (3 August).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Present trawl fisheries are established as follows: South-East, from Beachport to Portland along the coastal shelf. Bight waters from about Port Lincoln to Albany to the 200-mile limit. South Australia has committed \$70 000 to exploring the South-East trawl fishery. To date, \$30 000 of this has been expended. Trawl fisheries on the whole will be under direct Commonwealth Government management. The South-East fishery may be administered on a joint basis. The South Australian Government feels that now that the South-East fishery has been plotted by survey vessels at Government expense, it is up to fishermen to develop it. South Australian fishermen are doing this. New purpose designed vessels are being built here (one finished, one under way, several more being negotiated). A similar situation exists in Western Australia but not in Victoria or New South Wales where fishermen are adapting old vessels previously used for a multiplicity of purposes. South Australian Fisheries Division is adopting a cautious attitude to the potential and this is reflected by fishermen examining the possibilities of investing in the new fishery. The South-East resource on present estimates could sustain about five to six vessels working from South Australian ports. The South Australian Fisheries Department is licensing all *bona fide* fishermen who apply to fish in the trawl fishery. A Commonwealth licence is freely available.

The South Australian Government is proposing to the Commonwealth that the whole South-East trawl fishery remain open to all wholly Australian vessels. However, we also strongly favour a limitation on size and length of vessels used in the fishery, for example, about 300 tonnes displacement and a maximum length of 32 metres, with a firm prohibition on vessels over 45.7 metres in length for all vessels (including foreign-owned vessels) in all known trawling areas within the 200-mile Australian limits. This will protect South Australian fishermen from unfair competition both from within Australia and from "foreign" vessels.

The South Australian Government is resisting the development of joint ventures with foreign interests unless

it can clearly be established that there is significant local benefit to be gained, for example, processing. We are against a "mother" ship venture, again unless there is a clear local advantage from processing benefits and/or the proving of a further resource (not trawling).

Markets: Care is being taken by the South Australian Fisheries Division to clarify the potential markets for trawl fish. This is one of the terms of reference for the working party investigating the fish processing industry in this State.

MR. CONNELLY

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Regarding Mr. Connelly, Chairman of the Outback Areas Development Trust, I have received the following information. His duties are as follows:

1. Conduct and arrange hearings and inspections in the areas of the trust;
2. Address and discuss with interested groups the activities of the trust;
3. Represent the trust to the community and liaise with Government departments and instrumentalities;
4. Oversee the administration, loan-raising and financial transactions of the trust;
5. Submit recommendations to the trust concerning proposed projects, and undertake periodical inspections on projects approved by the trust;
6. Implement and co-ordinate policies established by the trust;
7. Be responsible for the planning, despatch, collection, collation and analysing of information from various progress associations;
8. Chair meetings and associated committee work of the trust;
9. Interact with the Director of Local Government on operations of Local Government Office;
10. Obey and comply with all lawful orders and directions given to him from time to time by the Minister or any person authorised by the Minister or Governor of the State so to do;
11. Use his best endeavours to undertake and perform such responsibilities as he may from time to time reasonably be directed to undertake and perform;
12. Devote the whole of his time and attention during ordinary hours of business and also at all other times as may be necessary to the duties and responsibilities of the office of the Chairman and shall not enter into any other profession, trade or business without the prior consent of the Minister.

Mr. Connelly's salary shall:

1. During the first year of his appointment and employment hereunder be paid for his services an annual salary of \$18 265 and during the second year of his appointment and employment an annual salary of \$18 878 and during the third year of his appointment and employment an annual salary of \$19 552, provided however that such salary be varied whenever the salaries of administrative officers grade III in the South Australian Public Service are varied and in the same manner as that of such officers;
2. Be payable in arrears by equal fortnightly payments.

GRAND JUNCTION ROAD

In reply to **Mrs. BYRNE** (3 August).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The situation has not altered from that previously advised to the honourable member:

based on present priorities and the anticipated availability of funds, work on the above section of Grand Junction Road is not expected to commence before 1981.

LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

PETITIONS: VOLUNTARY WORKERS

Dr. EASTICK presented a petition signed by 47 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.

Mr. TONKIN presented a similar petition signed by 813 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

PETITION: DOG REGISTRATION FEES

Mr. OLSON presented a petition signed by 57 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would reject any legislation which increased dog registration fees to \$15.

Petition received.

PETITION: SOUTH ROAD CLEARWAY

Mr. CHAPMAN presented a petition signed by 4 560 electors of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to delay the declaration of the proposed 12-hour clearway on South Road until various road improvements were carried out.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME

MONARTO

Mr. TONKIN: Can the Minister for Planning say what the Government has now decided to do about Monarto and its funding, and what action is being taken to meet the outstanding debt that is continuing to increase with the accrual of interest? Federal funding for Monarto was refused by the Whitlam Government in 1975, and the South Australian Government chose to defer the project rather than abandon it.

As at June 1977, the total borrowings to be serviced and eventually repaid were almost \$19 000 000, and the annual interest bill was \$1 860 000; this represents \$35 750 a week or \$212 for every hour of every day. Total interest is nearly \$5 000 000 and, since it is being accrued, the total debt could now be approaching \$24 000 000. On 22 March the Minister said that the project would be deferred for at least five years, and the interest payable in that time will be about \$10 000 000, if no other repayments are made.

In 1983 we could be paying interest at a rate that could

approximate \$60 000 a week. In other words, taxpayers are facing a total debt of at least \$34 000 000 in five years with nothing more to show for Monarto, under the present Government's policy of letting future Governments and the people pay dearly for what is obviously a grandiose blunder.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It should be repeated that in 1975 assistance was provided in Whitlam's Federal Budget for Monarto of about \$500 000, and that it has been the Fraser Government that has refused to provide any assistance. The Whitlam Government made certain grants for the Monarto project, and other funds were provided on a loans basis. At the appropriate time I intend to discuss certain propositions with the Federal Minister in relation to this matter. In the meantime the Monarto staff is being wound down to 10 employees. The present number is 12, but that has come down by a further two over the past two weeks. At the level of 10 employees, the main work will be the overall care and maintenance of the site.

Mr. Richardson, General Manager of the Monarto Development Commission, is taking on other functions and is Chairman of the Jam Factory management. A good part of his time is taken up with that, but he is also involved in various other tasks as and when they arise. The payment of interest is a matter of concern that will certainly be taken up with the Fraser Government, as its refusal to fund that has caused the deferral of the project. In those circumstances, it seems to be a reasonable proposition that the Commonwealth loans should be converted to grants with the proviso that, should Monarto start again, the grants would revert back to a loan basis. Whether or not that sort of agreement could be reached with the Federal Government in the kind of filthy mood it has on expenditure is another matter.

It might help if the Leader would use his good offices with the Federal Government, if he has any, in order to provide some assistance on this matter. I shall certainly inform him when I am in a position to make an approach to the Federal Minister, and ask him specifically for his support in that approach. I gather from the Leader's nodding of his head that he will support the Government on this matter, and we will certainly appreciate that.

CHRISTIES BEACH HOSPITAL

Mr. DRURY: Can the Premier say whether the South Australian Development Corporation has agreed to guarantee the finance necessary for the proposed Christies Beach Hospital? The hospital will be erected in the district adjoining mine and my constituents will avail themselves of it. In the *Advertiser* of 4 August it was stated that the company involved in this matter was waiting on the corporation's backing for its finance.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Development Corporation has recommended support for the hospital development. In accordance with provisions of the Industrial Development Act, that recommendation has gone to the Industries Development Committee. As soon as I have a report from that committee I will be in a position, if the report is favourable, to grant the necessary guarantees, but I require the report from the Industries Development Committee that it has been recommended.

CO-OPERATIVE BUILDING SOCIETY

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: How does the Premier account for the fact that the information he gave at the opening of

the new Co-operative Building Society building is grossly at variance with that given by the co-op itself? The Premier, in one of his political speeches at the opening, gave information which appears to be quite inaccurate, as follows:

The co-op itself will account for only about one-third of the office space in this \$6 000 000, 15-storey building. Yet, already 96 per cent of the available floor space has been let to commercial and professional tenants. They are choosing to do business here in South Australia, where they know there's a future for the enterprising and the imaginative, and not fleeing to the balmy kingdom of Queensland, as some, quite falsely, are pretending.

The co-op's General Manager, Mr. Fischer, in his press statement, states:

We see the building as a good investment for our members.

Of the 15 floors, only about one-third of the available space will be used by the Co-op. The rest is already 96 per cent let to State and Federal Government departments.

How does the Premier account for this obvious discrepancy which appears to be a deliberate attempt to mislead the public of South Australia?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not an attempt to mislead the public of South Australia. My remarks were perfectly accurate and not inconsistent with the building society's information.

HOUSING FINANCE

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister for Planning say whether the Commonwealth, in its Budget, introduced any offset to the reductions in finance provided for housing through the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement? At the Premiers' Conference, the Commonwealth Government reduced, by 19 per cent, housing funds provided through the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. In the case of South Australia that was a reduction from \$60 330 000 to \$48 710 000.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I believe that the Commonwealth Budget contains the worst attack on the building construction industry generally that has ever been seen in a Commonwealth Budget. Not only is there a reduction Australia-wide of \$74 000 000 in the amount of funds provided by the Commonwealth under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement but there are other deductions as well. For example, tax deductibility on home loans interest has been removed, involving a saving of \$31 000 000 in a full year. In addition, there has been a \$14 900 000 reduction in the sum provided for the home savings grant scheme, a scheme resulting from a promise made at the 1975 election. The Commonwealth is claiming that it is not reducing the amount of the home savings grant, but is simply deferring the time when grants will be paid. I understand that it is proposed that there should be a delay of nine months in the payment of grants. Defence service homes expenditure has been reduced by \$10 700 000.

Those reductions (the advances under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, the reductions in home savings grants and in tax deductibility of home loans interest, and the defence service homes reduction) amount to a total reduction of \$130 600 000. There is also a further reduction (I suppose inevitable) in home building in the Northern Territory amounting to \$50 800 000. The only increase was for Aboriginal housing (an increase I welcome) of \$5 200 000.

In total, the reduction for housing in the Commonwealth Budget amounts to \$181 400 000, and the increase is \$5 200 000. I believe that this is an appalling policy of the Federal Government. There is no possible case, when industry is already depressed, for saying that further reductions in building and construction activity throughout Australia are necessary in order to minimise inflation. In the building industry at present the tendering climate is so difficult for builders that every margin is being cut to the bone, and in some cases subcontractors in particular are being screwed down below normal award wages in an attempt to get work. In these circumstances it is absolute nonsense for the Commonwealth to say that a further reduction in expenditure is required. The evidence is there for everyone to see that this Budget involves the worst attack ever on the building and construction industry in general and on the housing industry in particular. Mr. Kirby-Jones, the national secretary of the Housing Industry Association, made the following statement about the Budget:

The Federal Government has chosen to totally ignore industry advice and has effectively withdrawn from its commitment to providing the vast majority of Australians with home ownership opportunity. . . . On the other hand, the reduction in expenditure on the home savings grant means that there will be a waiting period of up to nine months for those who are eligible for the grant and this will have serious implications for the construction of new dwellings. We note that the Government has given nothing to the homeseeker as a *quid pro quo* for the substantial saving achieved by the abolition of the homes loans interest tax deductibility scheme.

Mr. Kirkby-Jones said that the analysis of the housing sector this year was as bad as, if not worse than, that offered in the Budget Papers last year. For example, last year the Treasury forecasted a return to the high levels achieved during mid-1976. In the event housing activity fell to the lowest level for 10 years and is now described as a "sizeable fall". Nowhere in the Budget Papers is there reference to the work of the Indicative Planning Council and its fore-shadowed desirable, feasible and recommended goals. The "sizeable fall" is now attributed by the Government to overbuilding in 1976 and the need to dispose of excess stocks.

Not only has it seriously attacked home building in this Budget but I believe the Federal Government is also guilty of negotiating in bad faith the new Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. Mr. Newman, who conducted the negotiations over that agreement, made clear that the logic of the new agreement required an increase, not a reduction, in funds for the States. Every State Minister involved in those negotiations would certainly have believed that the new agreement would lead to increased support from the Federal Government.

The attack on housing is an attack not just on employment in the building industry but on young people who are trying to gain their first home. The younger generation is being penalised in so many ways, not just in terms of employment but also in terms of promotional opportunity and now in terms of ability to own their own home. After all the mouthings of the Prime Minister and other leaders on the need to protect home ownership, this feature of the Budget is utterly disgraceful.

MONARTO

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister for Planning, if he has caught his breath after that last answer—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: —say what indication there is that so strongly supports the commitment of taxpayers' funds necessary to maintain the deferred Monarto plan, and what is the future of the Monarto Development Commission? The Minister would be aware that the commission is now not involved in the development of Monarto, and that its staff has been greatly reduced. The Bill to give the commission additional powers is due to expire on 31 December of this year, and it appears that the commission's staff does not have any charter for the future. I should be grateful for any further information the Minister can give the House.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The staff who are continuing to be employed by the Monarto Development Commission are concerned with matters relating to the site as a whole. Seven staff members are employed on the Monarto site, and a considerable amount of work must be done in relation to its overall care. Much of the site is leased out and is being used for agricultural purposes, and various other projects are in hand. The Monarto Development Commission, using help from the Commonwealth under the Aboriginal employment scheme, and also SURS money, has developed a residential camp site surrounding one of the old homesteads that is now being extensively used by schools. The Schubert farm has been partially developed as a museum, indicating the activities and the equipment used in the area in years gone by. A considerable planting programme is still being undertaken in order to assure some degree of reforestation in the overall site area. Certain other propositions are being considered. I realise that the honourable member is not really interested in any answer I give on this matter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: He is interested only in asking the question. The site is very large, covering about 15 000 hectares. A considerable amount of work is necessary to improve the existing situation and to undertake the various arrangements that have to be made in relation to it. There are some 40 houses on the site. These are fully occupied, and the rental from them is used as part of the income of the commission.

AMPHOMETERS

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Can the Minister of Transport provide any information to the House in relation to the accuracy of the amphometer? The effectiveness of this measuring device for speed was questioned recently in the courts by a special justice. I think the suggestion made was that at speeds of more than 100 km/h there was some doubt as to the accuracy of the instrument. As this will cause some discussion within the community, I should appreciate any information the Minister can provide.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I was rather surprised to read the press report. If it is accurate, some action must be taken to try to overcome the difficulties contemplated by the special justice. To the best of my knowledge, the amphometer is an accurate measuring device which has been tested and found correct. Whether it has been tested for speeds of more than 100 km/h, which is the point raised by the special justice, has yet to be determined. I shall be looking for further information and for a report from my officers. As soon as that is available, I shall inform the honourable member and the House.

ENERGY RESOURCES

Mr. WOTTON: Does the Minister of Mines and Energy believe that there is a necessity to conserve the finite energy resources, particularly oil, and does he agree that the Federal Government has taken a responsible attitude by increasing the price of crude oil to close the gap between the Australian price and world parity? In a speech last February, at a seminar entitled "Energy Strategies in South Australia for the 1980's" arranged by the South Australian Branch of the Australian Institute of Petroleum, the Minister said:

Let me say categorically that I firmly believe that a national programme for the conservation of liquid fuels is essential . . . Ideally, increases in prices of petroleum should provide the signal for and lead to energy conservation.

Recently, when addressing the Brighton Rotary Club on the subject of future energy needs for South Australia, the Minister was quoted as saying:

The energy crisis was already looming large and would cause considerable economic and political problems. People have become accustomed to ever-rising living standards and will possibly even object and blame our present economic system and Governments. But no political Party has any easy answers to the energy crisis and removing one group of politicians will not produce another which can solve it. Without question, transport will be an immediate problem, with steep rises in petrol prices and severe penalties on private transport, especially large cars. People must be made more aware of this immediate problem which will start having effects very soon.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have been on record any number of times pointing out that, by 1984 or 1985, Australia's self-sufficiency in oil will decline from the present level of 70 per cent to about 30 per cent, and this inevitably will mean very sharp rises in the price of petroleum, even at the current world parity price. I have also gone on record as saying that I expect the price of oil will be significantly higher by 1984 or 1985, and that this also will be reflected in the price of petroleum in Australia. For the honourable member's benefit I have also gone on record as saying that the import bill for oil within a few years will rise above \$2 000 000 000 a year and that this may create a serious balance of payments situation within Australia, and that price alone will not necessarily be sufficient to control demand.

I think there is much evidence from other areas, such as New Zealand, Europe, and elsewhere, to suggest that the demand for petroleum is relatively inelastic to price and, if it were necessary to conserve our liquid fuels, measures other than price would be necessary. For example, I have also been on record as suggesting that the Australian Government should require from motor car manufacturers certain economy standards in cars produced in Australia or imported into this country. Notice obviously has to be given to the motor car manufacturers that this will be done, but there is a case, in my view, for differential rates of sales tax to apply to motor cars, depending on the degree of fuel economy that the particular car has.

The prospective situation regarding petroleum is serious indeed for Australia, first, because transport costs enter into our total costs to a greater extent in Australia than virtually in any other country, so the competitiveness of our industry is at stake if the cost of transport rises dramatically, and, secondly, because our cities are designed on the assumption that everyone will have individual transport available to them. Consequently, the mobility of people in our cities depends very much on the use of private transport. If we reach the stage where our

import bill for petroleum is so great that a future Federal Government introduces some form of petrol rationing, and people do not have enough petrol available in order to get around in our cities, we will have a drastic situation ahead of us. That is one reason why a project such as NEAPTR is so important.

Fundamentally, this message has been clear for a long time to anyone who has thought about the matter. I am not embarrassed, if the honourable member thinks I am, about any of the previous statements I have made on the subject. Members probably know, and the public at large should know, that no immediate discovery of petroleum in Australia will solve the problem. Any new oilfield that is discovered will not come on-stream before the mid-1980's. Therefore, the liquid petroleum shortage that will face us in this country is now unavoidable. I would suggest to the honourable member that he might care to take up with his Federal colleagues the point that it is not sufficient to do what has been done so far and that there must be movements in the direction of greater fuel economy in motor cars in the same way as the United States of America has already moved. So far there seems to have been no recognition at all by the Federal Government of the need to take action in this area.

NORTHERN RAILWAY SERVICES

Mr. KENEALLY: I ask the Minister of Transport if he has yet received a reply from the Federal Minister for Transport (Mr. Nixon) to the advice tendered to Mr. Nixon that the South Australian Government would oppose the closure of the Peterborough-Quorn and Gladstone-Wilmington railway services?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have received a reply and, I regret to say, it is bad news for South Australia. I know the Leader is happy about that; he is laughing about it.

Mr. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Unfortunately for South Australia—

Mr. Becker: Sit down!

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

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister is imputing actions to me that are not factual. I know that he is slightly paranoid about the whole business, but that does not give him the right to make imputations about me.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I know that the Leader is sensitive about this matter, but I did call on the member for Eyre and the member for Rocky River to support me in my call to the Federal Minister—

Mr. Gunn: You did nothing of the kind.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:—not to proceed with the closure of the Gladstone-Wilmington and Peterborough-Quorn lines. Obviously from the mutterings of the member for Eyre, he had done nothing about it. I cannot get a comment from the member for Rocky River because, unfortunately he is not in the House. The Commonwealth Minister for Transport has today advised that he will not withdraw his intention to close the Gladstone-Wilmington and Peterborough-Quorn lines. To me, that is bad news for South Australia. Indeed, it is a direct lie to the claim that Nixon made that he was not aware of any rail cuts in South Australia. Only a week ago in the *Advertiser*—

The SPEAKER: Order! I think I heard the honourable Minister say "lie". I hope that he will withdraw that remark.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I certainly will withdraw it and

say that this advise is completely contrary to the public statement made by Mr. Nixon when he criticised me by saying that he was not aware of any cuts in the rail services. That criticism was published in the *Advertiser* of 15 August, and seven days later he makes a statement that is completely contradictory. I cannot call it a lie, but it is a complete contradiction of that claim. How can one rely on a Federal Minister of that calibre? It is a tragedy that neither the member for Eyre nor the member for Rocky River is prepared to stand up in the interests of the people of their districts and demand that these services be maintained, notwithstanding the fact that I have had, and I am sure the members concerned have had, representations from local government, the Hospitals Board and other interested parties in the area to retain those services. One wonders what sort of weak-kneed representation those areas have to suffer. Regrettably, those weak-kneed representatives—

Mr. Nankivell: What sort of weak-kneed Government gave them away?

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

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Unfortunately, those weak-kneed representatives are mirrored in Canberra by Nixon, who will do absolutely nothing for South Australia. Let me place on record what Mr. Nixon conveyed to me today in a telex, which states:

I regret you have now decided to withhold your agreement to these lines being closed.

What a crocodile tear he was dropping!

Mr. Mathwin: Why don't you buy them back?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That remark is typical of the member for Glenelg.

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

Mr. Arnold: Why did you sell them in the first place?

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

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In the light of the comment just made I will not offer any comment to the member for Glenelg. I do not want him thrown out, because we need him.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable Minister will continue with his answer to the question.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: One of the good points, I think, in Mr. Nixon's reply (and at long last he is starting to think the way we do about open Government) was as follows:

In the light of the position you have taken—that is Nixon to Virgo—

I have decided to release the officials' report, for no other reason than to have it on public record without controversy surrounding its release.

I wish to God bloody Fraser would put out what he believes instead of telling lies like he has.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Minister to withdraw that remark.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I withdraw the remark in deference to you, Sir. I ask in all seriousness that the member for Eyre, who is doing a fair bit of muttering at the moment—

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the Minister will confine his remarks to the answer he is giving.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I hope the member for Eyre will ask the member for Rocky River to support South Australia to have these lines retained in the interests of the rural community in those areas, in support of local government in those areas and in support of the hospital boards in those areas. In addition, if Mr. Nixon is not prepared to retract from his present position of demanding

that there be arbitration, we ask that Mr. Nixon support the nomination of the arbitrator South Australia has put forward, Mr. Lean.

The House ought to be aware of Mr. Lean's qualifications. From 1940 to 1946 he was industrial officer for the Hendon ammunition works under the Commonwealth Department of Supply; from 1946 to 1966 (20 years) he was personnel manager of Philips Industries; from 1966 to 1978 he was a commissioner in the South Australian Industrial Commission; and he was Chairman of the South Australian Railways Advisory Committee from 1970 to 1978. Mr. Lean has retired, as all members probably know.

Mr. Chapman: What has that got to do with the question?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is typical of the intelligence of the member for Alexandra.

The SPEAKER: Order! One of the complaints during Question Time has been about continual interjection; the member for Alexandra is interjecting, and I call him to order. I think the honourable Minister has reasonably covered the situation, and I hope that he can complete his answer soon.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will round off my answer quickly if the Opposition keeps quiet. In 1977-78 Mr. Lean undertook the task as Royal Commissioner in the matter of shop trading hours. The point I am making is that Mr. Lean is adequately suited and equipped to carry out the task of arbitrator. We have put forward his name to Mr. Nixon, who unfortunately has not accepted it. I think that is a tragedy for South Australia and I hope that members of the Opposition, who are so prone to call on the Government to use its good offices from time to time, will on this occasion use their offices, whether good or bad (I suspect they are probably the latter), in support of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. If they continue I will take the necessary action.

RAILWAYS

Mr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Transport say when and for what reason he has completely changed his attitude to the closure of rail services in South Australia? In the *Advertiser* on 10 June 1970 the Minister was reported as follows:

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.

On 27 October 1971 an article which was headed "Rail loss alarms Government" and which appeared in the *Advertiser* stated:

The Minister of Roads and Transport (Mr. Virgo) said yesterday that the South Australian Railways deficit had risen to alarming proportions.

He indicated that something had to be done about it. A supporting editorial in the *Advertiser* dealing with this matter of mounting rail deficits stated that the Minister had indicated that the drifts would not be allowed to continue and that another possible way to cut losses was to curtail rail services and close more of the most unprofitable lines.

On 3 January 1974 the Minister of Transport announced in a press statement at about 11 o'clock in the morning that, apart from metropolitan rail fare increases, railways

services from Mount Barker to Victor Harbor, Kingston to Naracoorte and Glanville to Semaphore, and the passenger service from Adelaide to Tailem Bend, would be discontinued. The Minister then did a colossal about-face after being summoned to Trades Hall about the matter. The Minister has consistently, as can be seen from these reports, advocated the closure of lines. I would like to know when he changed his mind so completely and for what reason he has had an about-face on this matter.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I appreciate the dilemma in which the Leader finds himself in his constant endeavour to prop up the Fraser Government, and I sympathise with him.

Mr. Becker: It is a matter of record.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Hanson that, if he continues in that way, I will name him.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have not changed course on this at all. As the Leader has quite truthfully reported, in the early 1970's I said that I believed and advocated that there were lines which could not be sustained. I have not resiled from that. The comment the Leader made about some insidious change that took place at the Trades Hall is, regrettably, the figment of imagination of some reporters. I know the Leader gets a hell of a lot of pleasure out of seeing South Australia destroyed. It is on his face at the moment. He is always downgrading South Australia. He is always happy when something is happening to the detriment of South Australia; The Government is not, and that is the real difference between us and the present Leader.

The South Australian Government has concurred in the withdrawal of the Naracoorte-Kingston passenger rail service. The South Australian Government has concurred in the withdrawal of what is called the Tailem Bend wayside passenger train. Perhaps if the Leader will confer with someone who knows something about railways he will find out what that means. The South Australian Government has never concurred in the closure of the Gladstone-Wilmington service or the Peterborough-Orroroo-Quorn service. The Leader's support of Nixon is an indication of his anti attitude towards South Australia. It is as simple as that. He will knock out—

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

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Leader will knock out anything that is in the interest of South Australia, and the fact that the Leader seems conveniently to ignore, as does Peter Nixon, is that the basic principle regarding the transfer (which the Leader opposed and which his colleagues in the Upper House opposed until they were instructed by the electorate to reverse their attitude) was that the rail system that was transferred should be operated by the Australian National Railways—not that it should be dismantled.

The Premier and I, in the negotiations, made sure that there was a provision hopefully to prevent the dismantling. I remind the House that it was Peter Nixon who in the Federal Parliament opposed the transfer; he was the only member in the House of Representatives to do so. It was Peter Nixon when he became Minister who raced off to an allegedly eminent barrister in Victoria to try to dismantle the agreement, and it is Peter Nixon who has done his level best ever since to destroy what is now called the Australian National Railways Commission section, which was formerly the non-metropolitan section of the South Australian Railways.

South Australia is getting the rough end of the pineapple, and surely this is one occasion when members on the Opposition benches ought to be joining with the Government to stop the dismantling of the former South

Australian section, but we find that the member for Mount Gambier is completely unconcerned about the withdrawal of the Mount Gambier passenger service. We find the member for Eyre is completely unconcerned about the withdrawal of the passenger service to Peterborough. We find all the country members, the farmer members, unconcerned that there is to be an increase of 25 per cent in livestock rates. What are they doing? They are attacking the South Australian Government, which is trying to protect the interests of South Australia.

PATAWALONGA OUTLET

Mr. GROOM: Will the Minister for the Environment give consideration to recommending the excavation of a channel from the Patawalonga outlet to the sea, to improve access for small craft? Recently, it was reported in the *Advertiser* that a small craft capsized near the outlet. The constant build-up of sand frequently makes the outlet channel hazardous for boating, and the excavation of a channel may reduce the danger.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member earlier today indicated to me his interest in this matter, and I have obtained a brief report from the Coast Protection Division of the department, which for several months has been investigating the most satisfactory way of improving the Patawalonga outlet for boating. Various methods of reducing shoaling, by pumping sand from south of the breakwater to North Glenelg, have been assessed. However, conventional by-passes of this type have not been universally successful, and there is a real danger that shoaling would not be effectively controlled by this means. An alternative method is being explored with the help of authorities in the United States, but it is a recent development and no long-term performance information is yet available to the department. These investigations will continue but, in the meantime, consideration is being given to dredging a channel and maintaining it by conventional floating equipment.

This would involve the removal of about 8 000 cubic metres of calcareous sand and clay, which would be pumped ashore. A simple suction dredge, operating mainly during summer, would keep this channel swept clean, by discharging sand on to the North Glenelg beach. Should the technique being investigated in the U.S.A. prove feasible as a long-term solution, the dredged channel would be suitable for the installation of the unit.

BOARDS OF HEALTH

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say when the Government intends to adopt an attitude to the future role of local boards of health? Many local government bodies have expressed grave concern at what they claim to be the indecent haste with which they were required to respond to the Corbett Report when it was directed to their attention specifically in respect of the future role of local boards of health. One council group has commented on the report as follows:

1. It fails to give sufficient recognition to the very great overlap between health and community development.
2. It seeks to set up community development boards which cannot be representative and accountable.
3. It fails to recognise that local government has the electoral base, the accountability and the proximity to the community to provide the sort of advice sought.
4. It fails to recognise the need for co-ordination of community development, health and planning at a local level.

5. Its proposals have tremendous scope for empire building, unproductive overheads and duplication. On the basis of this attitude, a number of local government bodies believe that the restriction that reports to the Corbett Committee had to be made by 31 July was unrealistic, and that is the basis of my question of whether it is likely that a decision on this matter is imminent.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I think the honourable member will recall that there was an earlier closing date for submissions relative to the recommendations and the content of the Corbett Report that was subsequently extended by Cabinet for a month. It seemed that that was a suitable additional time to allow, and it was the sort of period that had been suggested by some people who indicated that they had not supplied their submission. I think it would be fair to say that that was also a suitable extra time, as was adjudged by the number of submissions received during the extra time. I cannot recall exactly how many there were, but over 80 submissions were received overall. I think that I have informed the House previously that, when the time had closed for these submissions to be received, they would be collated by officers of my department and I would be taking recommendations to Cabinet on the matter. That position has not changed. The collating, as it were, and the getting together of the total number of submissions have just been completed, and I will soon be going to Cabinet with recommendations on that matter.

RESIDENTIAL CARE WORKERS

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether residential care workers at McNally Training Centre have his confidence and support in the difficult work that they are undertaking with young offenders placed in that institution? I have some knowledge of the benefits gained from the philosophy based on rehabilitation rather than solely on punishment. I also have some knowledge of the level of skill and dedication required in carrying out this rehabilitative task. I know that there is an awareness at all levels of the department of the importance of the work carried out by residential care workers at the various training centres. It has concerned me, therefore, to hear that the member for Glenelg has attempted in this House to create divisions between the various levels of staff in this area of juvenile offending where, to my knowledge, no such division exists.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I can give the House and the honourable member that assurance. Residential care workers at McNally and other training centres throughout South Australia have my full support and confidence in the difficult task they are called on to undertake. I can also assure the House that senior residential care workers, deputy supervisors, centre duty officers, night staff, supervisors, specialist staff and support staff involved in the back-up service to that and other training centres also have my full confidence and support.

It has concerned me for some time that the member for Glenelg has in this House attempted to show (and I stress "attempted to show") that some division occurs on matters that he has raised in this place about the various levels of staff, particularly at McNally Training Centre. Whether or not the honourable member realises it, he has been calling into question the honesty and integrity of the officers of my department, regardless of the positions they hold.

Mr. Mathwin: Is that why you won't answer my questions?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member has suggested to me privately and in this place that I am given by senior officers puffed and padded reports that are not true and honest accounts of events at McNally.

Mr. Chapman: You're breaking a confidence now, are you?

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

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am not breaking a confidence that has not already been broken. Earlier in this House, the honourable member referred in exactly the same sentiments to something that he said had taken place between him and me, and he used that term. That is why I have chosen to reply in this way. What the honourable member has done is to cast a despicable slur on people, many of whom have given a lifetime of service to young people in trouble with the law.

The allegations that he makes are without foundation and would not be worth answering were it not for the fact that these attacks have been placed on the record of proceedings in this House and must therefore be refuted. If I can instruct the honourable member in what transpires at McNally in relation to incidents that occur, perhaps we can in future look to some better behaviour from him on this question.

I do not simply receive, as he alleges, reports from those he has described as "eggheads and intellectuals". I receive detailed signed reports from each and every person on duty giving their account of what happened in a unit in which an incident occurs. So much for the honourable member's allegations that certain people placed at an intellectual level in the department are not giving me a true picture of the incidents that have occurred from time to time at McNally. I receive signed reports from the persons on duty who are involved at the time in the incident.

Mr. Mathwin: Which incident?

The SPEAKER: Order! I have called the honourable member to order once. I will give him another chance. I warn the honourable member that I will name him if he continues to interject.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member has made much play of and has been given a free rein for some time in the House to talk about such things as residential care workers being front-line forces. I agree that they are front-line forces; they have the day-to-day contact with some of the most difficult and disturbed youth in this State at centres such as McNally. What worries me is that the honourable member implied that senior officers up the line in my department have no conception of residential care work. He ignores that most of them have come up through the ranks and have had first-hand experience; he ignores that the Director-General of my department ran some of the most difficult youth training centres in Victoria at a time when those centres contained not the smaller numbers of youths that we have in this State but hundreds of youths. To say in these circumstances that there is inadequate understanding in the department of the work done by residential care workers is nonsense.

I met residential care workers earlier this year at all three training centres to discuss proposed changes to the treatment of and services to young offenders. Those people were invited to raise with me any concern they may have not only about the proposals that we were discussing but also about any other matter. Many of them took the opportunity and raised a number of professional concerns. At no stage did I detect the general low morale which the member for Glenelg insists is present.

Further, the Director-General has since held discussions with all levels of staff at the three centres and has reported

to me that the response was positive and constructive. Neither the Director-General nor I observed amongst staff during those discussions, as the member for Glenelg seems to be suggesting, a lack of sympathy with the present system.

In recent debates the member for Glenelg has been invited to say what he would do about the situations he alleges are prevailing at McNally. The only undertaking I could find, after reading *Hansard*, was that he promised to whisper the solution into the shell-like ear of the member for Mitcham. I suggest that the member for Mitcham should not have too great an expectation of what might be whispered into his shell-like ear.

I make clear to the House that I hold no brief for youths at McNally who assault staff members. That is another matter referred to on occasions by the honourable member in attempting to show there is dissension or a lack of morale amongst the different levels of staff. Every act of this kind that is committed is placed in the hands of the police. Sadly, when youths do involve themselves in such incidents, their return to the outside world may be delayed. The Bill that the Attorney-General is introducing this session, the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Bill, will contain some new provisions that will apply in this area.

I repeat my assurance to the honourable member by stating that the staff at McNally has my full confidence and support on this matter, as do officers throughout this department. I suggest that, without exception, they have the support of members of this House; certainly they have the support of members on this side, and I know and feel confident that most members opposite support the important work that is being carried out amongst the youth of the State who have come into some trouble with the law.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: LEADER'S ABSENCE

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The SPEAKER: Each time before a member speaks I shall always remind the honourable member that he may explain matters of a personal nature but that he may not debate the matter.

Mr. TONKIN: Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last, during my absence from this House, the Premier said:

As far as I am aware, the Leader of the Opposition is now absent from this State, using his allowance to fly interstate to represent views on behalf of the Liberal Party in the State to the Federal Treasurer.

In so doing, he misrepresented my actions. With the member for Chaffey, I travelled to Melbourne to make representations to the Federal Treasurer in respect of excise on Australian brandy. I acted on behalf of a significant group of grapegrowers and other South Australians in the industry, particularly from the Riverland, who are in a critical position because of the present excise situation. Some of those people may be members of the Liberal Party, but I acted entirely on behalf of South Australia and South Australian members of the brandy-producing industry.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: RAILWAY SERVICES

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. GUNN: During the course of an answer today, the Minister of Transport personally maligned me in relation to my representation on behalf of my constituents. The Minister implied that he had approached the member for Rocky River and me in relation to the closure of certain railway services. The Minister has made no approach to me; I do not know what approaches he has made to the member for Rocky River. In relation to the Peterborough passenger railcar, the only comment I was asked to make resulted in my saying that I was opposed to the closure of that line.

The Minister has claimed that the South Australian Government had no information relating to the proposal, yet about three weeks ago I understand that the Premier met a deputation from the Peterborough Railway Preservation Society, and the society was able to obtain about \$20 000 from the State Government towards purchasing three steam locomotives that were to run on the narrow gauge line from Peterborough to Ororoo, I think, when that line was closed. Further, I introduced a deputation to the Commissioner of the Australian National Railways (Mr. Smith), who agreed to assist that organisation.

I want to put the record straight. The Minister has not been correctly informing the House. He took an opportunity, when answering a question, to malign members on this side in an inaccurate and incorrect manner.

The SPEAKER: Order! Towards the end of his remarks, the honourable member has moved away from an explanation. I hope he does not do that in future.

Mr. GUNN: I do not in any way wish to transgress Standing Orders, Sir, but I do want to put the record straight in relation to the continual inaccurate attacks by the Minister of Transport on members on this side of the House.

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

Mr. Gunn: I've finished.

The SPEAKER: I remind the honourable member of what I said earlier about personal explanations.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. ALLISON: During the Minister's tirade in reply to a question he implied that the member for Mount Gambier—

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable member will keep to his personal explanation.

Mr. ALLISON: The Minister implied that I was completely unconcerned about the potential closure of the Mount Gambier railway line. I told the Minister in confidence during the past few days that, in fact, as soon as he had made an announcement unilaterally saying that the Mount Gambier railway line was possibly to be closed, I contacted the Federal Minister (Mr. Nixon) through the Federal member for Barker and sought his affirmation that the line would not be closed.

Mr. Tonkin: The Minister—

The SPEAKER: Order! I spoke to the honourable Leader earlier. I call him to order this time.

Mr. ALLISON: The next morning the Federal Minister was reported as denying that the Mount Gambier line was involved in any way in future potential closures.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

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

That he have leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1934-1978.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I desire to speak to this motion and I oppose it.

The SPEAKER: Order! It has been the practice of the House not to debate this motion, as it is purely procedural. I hope the honourable member will respect this practice and reserve his remarks for the more appropriate second reading debate, as set out in Erskine May.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I take a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have looked at Erskine May, and it is obvious that debate at this juncture is permissible. It should not be a lengthy debate. Page 485 of Erskine May reads:

In moving for leave to introduce a Bill a member may explain the object of the Bill and give reasons for its introduction, but normally this is not the proper time for any lengthy debate upon its merits.

I noticed that the Minister did not bother to say anything when moving this motion. Erskine May continues:

If the motion be opposed—
and, indeed, I am opposing it—

or if there is a likelihood of its being negated—

The SPEAKER: Order! I uphold the honourable member's point of order, but I have pointed out that there is a more appropriate time for debate, during the second reading stage.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not propose to speak at length on this matter, but I want to voice my deepest opposition to this motion. This is a motion for leave to introduce a Bill to increase the number of Cabinet Ministers (if I am correct in my interpretation of public announcements that have been made by the Premier and others) from 12 to 13. In my view, that is totally unnecessary and undesirable. I opposed the idea as soon as I heard of it and I was gratified that the very next day the Leader of the Opposition, having at first equivocated, joined me in his opposition to the proposal.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have told the honourable member already that the appropriate time to debate the matter is during the second reading stage. I hope he will abide by that, and confine his remarks to the subject matter contained in the Bill before the House. I do not intend to let the honourable member continue for much longer. I call on his good sense to leave his remarks until the second reading debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not propose to debate the matter. I simply give notice that I intend to divide the House on this motion. I hope that, in view of the opposition the Leader expressed in following my lead, members of the Liberal Party will support me in opposing this motion on the division.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): On the question before the Chair, which is that the Minister have leave to introduce a Bill, I cannot agree in any way with the member for Mitcham.

Mr. Millhouse: Well, you're a fool then.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has made such remarks on several occasions during the course of this session, and I do not intend to allow him to carry on in that way. The remark the

honourable member just made was untoward, and I warn him that if he continues in that manner I will take the necessary action.

Mr. TONKIN: I would just like to make quite clear that I believe it is a denial of freedom of speech and of one of the fundamental principles of this Parliament, and any Parliament in the Westminster system, that a Bill should not be allowed to be brought in for the consideration of the House. If the House ultimately decides that it does not want the Bill, that it is not satisfactory, it has the opportunity of debating the Bill and throwing it out. I believe that the action taken this afternoon by the member for Mitcham is not only most unusual but is petty, to say the very least.

Question—"That the Minister have leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1934-1978"—declared carried.

Mr. Millhouse: Divide!

While the division was being held:

The SPEAKER: There being only one member on the side of the Noes, I declare that the Ayes have it.

Motion carried.

Bill read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill increases the maximum number of Ministers from 12 to 13. The Government believes that the appointment of an additional Minister is now justified in view of the increasing demands placed upon the Ministers by their departments and by the public. The particular reason for the increase of the Ministry at this stage arises from the studies which the Government has done in the area of community development services. The community development services study followed on the Government's need to take over a number of services vacated by the Commonwealth under the Australian Assistance Plan. It is quite clear that the community development services at the moment being delivered are disparate and at times overlapping and inefficient.

The report of the Corbett committee of inquiry into the community development area and the operation of community councils for social development recommended that in fact the integration of these activities occur through the operation of a committee of Ministers. It has been our experience that operating in that way is a particularly inefficient way of operating and that it does not produce the effective rationalisation and elimination of overlapping services seeing to it that the proper priorities are given between related areas of community development that should properly occur. After considerable consideration had been given to this, the Government came to the view that the only way in which this could properly be done was by the provision of an additional Minister, who would have the whole of the programme for community development, and matters which I will outline to the House, directly under his control.

A portfolio of this kind will not sit adequately with any of the existing portfolio areas. To give the whole of that work to any one Minister will in fact markedly overload that Minister. The areas that need to be covered are the areas of community development, those which were covered by the Australian Assistance Plan or were already involved with the Community Welfare Department with the provisions of the community councils for social development which had originally been established under the Minister of Community Welfare (then Mr. King).

In addition to this, it is necessary for library services to be associated in this area, and quite clearly the arts development area, which is now very much more concerned than at the outset of its work with the development of community art programmes, the devolution of arts development activity more into local community areas, and the provision of the Regional Cultural Centre Trusts, which need to be integrated with other community development areas and regions: all of these things would need to come under the one Minister.

Mr. Dean Brown: It does not sound very convincing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have never found that the honourable member was convinced by anything he did not want to be convinced about.

Mr. Venning: That's not fair.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Indeed, it is being more than fair to that member. If the honourable member has been able to convince the member for Davenport, he has done better than anyone else I have yet met.

Mr. Venning: He's a very honourable member.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I am sure: so are all honourable members honourable gentlemen. The last increase in the size of the Ministry took place in 1975, when the number of Ministers was increased from 11 to 12.

I point out to honourable members that, even allowing for the proposed appointment of an additional Minister, South Australia will still have a smaller Ministry than has any other mainland State. The Ministry in Western Australia, which is a smaller State in population than ours, is larger than is the proposed new Ministry here. The Ministry in Queensland is very much larger than is the Ministry here, as is the case in Victoria and in New South Wales.

Clause 1 of the Bill is formal. Clause 2 amends section 65 by extending the maximum number of Ministers from 12 to 13.

Mr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industries Development Act, 1941-1978. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

From time to time the Government is approached by representatives of industries which have established, or are proposing to establish, operations in this State, seeking the Government's approval of some form of agreement or arrangement that will be necessary if industrial or commercial operations are to be carried out profitably. The Trade Practices Act, 1974, of the Commonwealth provides a mechanism (under Part VII of that Act) by which an approval or a clearance can be obtained in respect of an agreement or arrangement of this kind which might otherwise fall foul of that Act.

In the past, the Government has been prepared to support applications under Part VII of the Trade Practices Act where it is clear that a particular agreement or arrangement is necessary for the efficient conduct of industry or commerce and does not prejudice the interests of consumers. However, the procedures under Part VII have their disadvantages: an elaborate application is usually involved and uncertainty as to the result of an application may in some cases be sufficient to deter the application being made in the first place. Indeed, at times it can bring the whole arrangement undone. The

Government believes that, where an agreement or arrangement is clearly for the benefit of this State, there should be a simple mechanism for ensuring that it does not fall foul of the Trade Practices Act; that is, that the facility given to State Governments under the Trade Practices Act should be made use of directly.

The present Bill therefore provides that regulations may be made authorising any Act or thing that might otherwise result in a contravention of the Trade Practices Act. Section 51 of that Act contemplates the existence of such a power of authorisation under the law of the State, for it provides that in determining whether a contravention of Part IV of the Trade Practices Act has been committed regard shall not be had "to any Act or thing that is, or is of a kind, specifically authorised or approved by, or by regulations under, an Act passed by the Parliament of the State".

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 enables the Governor, on the recommendation of the Treasurer, to authorise any act or thing that might otherwise constitute a contravention of Part IV of the Trade Practices Act. The Treasurer may make such a recommendation where he is satisfied that it is in the public interest to do so.

This is a simple means of providing a quick and efficient method of doing what the Government has done in a number of previous instances: that is, to support some specific arrangement. The member for Mount Gambier quite possibly will be aware that certain arrangements in relation to industries in his district were the subject of applications to the State Government, and we supported those industries and the arrangements made before the Trade Practices Commission. If we had had this power, we could have got ahead with that thing without difficulty within the State at that time. This has been supported to the Government by a number of leading industrialists in the State, and I seek the support of the House for the Bill.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

BOATING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Marine) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Boating Act, 1974-1975. 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 of the Bill inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Boating Act, 1974, has now been in operation for some time and experience has suggested a few areas in which amendment might facilitate the administration of the Act. This Bill therefore covers a number of miscellaneous matters. The most significant amendments extend the powers of authorised officers in the policing of the Act and provide for the expiation of offences.

The Bill also extends the definition of "boat" to include all motor boats other than those used and operated solely for commercial purposes. Consequently, hire vessels used for pleasure boating are now clearly included under the provisions of Part II and Part III of the principal Act, which require registration of the vessel and licensing of its operator. Provision is made to exempt operators of any proclaimed motor boat or class of motor boats from

holding an operator's licence; this is complementary to the provisions of Part II, under which any proclaimed motor boat or class of motor boats is exempted from the requirements of that Part.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the Act must be reserved for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure and shall commence on a date to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 amends section 5 of the principal Act by providing an amended definition of "boat" to include all vessels other than those used and operated solely for commercial purposes. Clause 4 amends section 12 of the principal Act. The requirement that an application for registration must always be signed by the owner of the boat is removed. The amendments contain specific provisions fixing the time from which a renewal of registration operates and the time at which registration lapses in the event of non-renewal.

Clause 5 amends section 14 of the principal Act to provide for the display of the current identifying marks assigned to that boat and of the current registration label. Clause 6 amends section 15 of the principal Act in a corresponding manner. Clause 7 amends section 23 by providing for the exemption, by proclamation, of any motor boat or class of motor boats from the provisions of Part III of the principal Act. This will obviate the need for operators of such motor boats to hold a current operator's licence. Clause 8 amends section 25 of the principal Act and is consequential to the amendment to section 31. Clause 9 repeals section 31 of the principal Act and includes in its place a new section to empower a member of the Police Force or person authorised in writing by the Minister to board and inspect a boat, to direct the operator of a boat to stop the boat or manoeuvre in a specified manner, to produce his licence within a specified time at a specified place, and to require persons suspected of committing an offence against the Act or witnesses to such offences to state their names and addresses. Clause 10 amends section 32 of the principal Act to achieve consistency with other provisions of the Act providing for the appointment of authorised officers. Clause 11 inserts a new section 35a to provide for the expiation of certain offences by payment of a fee fixed by regulation.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

SWINE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Swine Compensation Act, 1936-1978. 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

Section 12 of the Swine Compensation Act provides for the establishment of a fund, the main purpose of which is to compensate producers for loss of pigs found to be infected with certain diseases. That section further provides that the fund is to be applied to the general administration of the Act, and payment of compensation and research into problems of the pig industry to the extent of \$25 000 each financial year. Any moneys

remaining after these commitments have been met may be declared by the Minister to be surplus to the Swine Compensation Fund and, in the last three years, these surpluses have averaged \$100 000.

The Swine Compensation Fund is largely financed from a stamp duty imposed in respect of the sale of pigs under section 14. At present the levy is 1c for each \$3 of the purchase price of a pig or carcass, with a maximum of 21c in respect of any one pig or carcass. The effect of the present Bill is to provide that the levy is to be fixed by regulation. The present amounts are to become maxima beyond which the levy cannot be increased.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 provides that the duty upon sales of pigs, or pig carcasses, is to be a prescribed amount not exceeding 1c for each \$3 of the purchase price. There will be a prescribed maximum levy in respect of any one pig or carcass, and this will not exceed, in any case, 21c.

Mr. RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION AND YOUNG OFFENDERS BILL

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the protection, care and rehabilitation of children; to repeal the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971-1975; to amend the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, 1978, the Education Act, 1972-1976, the Guardianship of Infants Act, 1940-1975, and the Justices Act, 1921-1976; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Bill repeals the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971-1975. In October 1976 the South Australian Government established the Royal Commission into the Administration of the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971-1975, and other associated matters. The report of the Royal Commission was in two parts. Part 1 of the report dealt with two terms of reference relating to the administration of the Juvenile Court and allegations made by Judge Andrew Wilson; part 2 of the report dealt with the third term of reference of the Commission, namely:

Whether having regard to the policy of the Government as enacted in section 3 of the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971-1975, namely:

3. In any proceedings under this Act a Juvenile Court or a Juvenile Aid Panel shall treat the interests of the child in respect of whom the proceedings are brought as the paramount consideration and with the object of protecting or promoting those interests shall in exercising the powers conferred by this Act adopt a course calculated to—

(a) secure for the child such care, guidance and correction as will conduce to the welfare of the child and to the public interest;

(c) conserve or promote as far as may be possible a satisfactory relationship between the child and other members or persons within his family or domestic environment and the child shall not be removed from the care of his parents or guardian except where his own welfare or the public interest cannot in the opinion of the court be adequately safeguarded otherwise than by such removal.

any and if so, what changes by legislation or otherwise, are necessary or desirable for the proper implementation of that policy.

The Royal Commissioner presented part 2 of his report to the Government on 18 July 1977. I take this opportunity of recording the Government's appreciation for the work done by Judge Mohr and his staff.

Following the report of the Royal Commission a working party was established to develop legislation based on the report. The working party consisted of Judge Kingsley Newman (Chairman), Senior Judge of the Juvenile Court, Mr. Gordon Bruff, Deputy Director-General of the Department for Community Welfare and Ms. Anne Rein, Research Officer, Attorney-General's Office. The Royal Commissioner, Judge Mohr, was consulted on a number of occasions in relation to the preparation of the Bill, and the Government would like to thank him for his assistance.

The area of young offenders and child protection is a complex one involving both legal and social issues. In any period of rapid social change such as we are experiencing now it is important that social legislation is flexible and is regularly reviewed to ensure that it is meeting changing needs. In recent years, South Australia has become the leading State in Australia in the field of juvenile justice and child protection. This Bill represents a further development in the juvenile justice system. It provides a balance between the needs of the child and the need to protect the community.

Under the Bill, a number of important changes in the system of administration of justice for juveniles are proposed. While the composition of the Children's Court will be substantially the same as that of the Adelaide Juvenile Court the judges of the court will go on circuit to Mount Gambier, Berri and Port Augusta as from 8 January 1979 in accordance with the Government's policy.

Under the Bill there will be a much clearer distinction between the civil jurisdiction (dealing with cases of children in need of care) and the criminal jurisdiction (dealing with children who are alleged to have committed offences) of the court. Existing care and control orders, and ancillary orders committing a child to a home for 21 days will be abolished. The Juvenile Courts Act appears to a certain extent to make no satisfactory distinction between children who are neglected or uncontrolled and children who have allegedly committed offences—both are treated as children "in need of care of control". The provisions in the Bill make quite clear the distinction between the two categories of children and the way in which they are to be dealt with.

The court has a wider range of powers in relation to children in need of care than formerly. This flexibility will enable the court to make orders which are most appropriate in relation to the special circumstances of the case rather than having to necessarily remove the child totally from the guardianship of his parents.

The concept of screening panels as outlined in the Bill is new in South Australia. With the expansion of the children's aid panels to cover all children up to the age of 18 years (other than those charged with homicide) the screening panel procedure will provide a uniform method whereby cases can be referred to either the Children's Court or the children's aid panels. A screening panel consisting of a police officer and a community welfare officer will meet quickly and informally for the purpose of deciding whether a child should be dealt with by the court or an aid panel.

Throughout the Western world there is a consistent trend towards the development of juvenile justice systems under which as many children as possible have their cases

dealt with by some less formal means than formal court procedure. In South Australia the less formal means will be through the children's aid panels. Under the Bill, the children's aid panels will have similar powers to those of the existing juvenile aid panels which have proven a very effective means of dealing with offenders. The recidivism rate for children appearing before juvenile aid panels has been very low; 87 per cent of children appearing before a panel do not subsequently appear before a juvenile court.

Under the Bill, children will be able to request trial by jury where the child is charged with an indictable offence if he or she so desires. Hence, in such circumstances the child will have the option of being dealt with by a children's court or an adult court.

One of the major features of the Bill is the procedure whereby a child can be committed to an adult court for trial or sentence upon application of the Attorney-General. This will provide a means whereby children who have committed a very grave offence or have persistently committed serious offences can be dealt with by an adult court.

The increased flexibility in sentencing which will be available to the Children's Court under the Bill will enable the court to deal more appropriately with the child concerned. The court will be able to sentence a child to a fixed period of detention in a training centre, following the abolition of care and control orders. If the court decides to place a child on a bond, there is a wide range of conditions which the court may impose. The court also has power to impose fines and order suspended sentences.

Another major initiative in the Bill will be the establishment of a Training Centre Review Board to review the progress of children who are detained in training centres. The Training Centre Review Board will have power to order the release of a child from a training centre subject to such conditions as the board determines. Children on bonds will be reviewed by departmental review boards. Where the child is under the guardianship of the Minister a review of the progress and circumstances of the child will be made at least once a year.

The question of whether the press should have free access to the Children's Court is an area where competing interests are involved. On the one hand, there is the idea that it is in the interests of the child that no publicity should surround his appearance before the court and on the other hand that the public has the right to know what goes on in courts of justice. Of course, there are other views between these two extremes. The Bill has followed the recommendations of the Royal Commissioner in re-enacting a provision similar to the provisions of the Juvenile Courts Act, 1941. In most cases the result of proceedings in relation to offences committed by children may be published, provided the identity of the child and of any witness who is a child is not revealed.

Finally, the Bill provides for the establishment of a Children's Court Advisory Committee. The major function of the advisory committee is to monitor and evaluate the operation of the new Act. This will assist in the development of a flexible system of juvenile justice which can be adapted to changing needs and social situations.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that, should it be necessary, the operation of certain provisions of the Act can be suspended. Clause 3 sets out the arrangement of the Act. Clause 4 provides the necessary definitions. The definition of "child" provides that a person who had not attained the age of eighteen years at the time of committing an offence is to be treated as a child notwithstanding that he may be well over that age at the time he comes to trial. Clause 5 repeals the Juvenile

Courts Act, 1971-1975. Clause 6 effects the necessary transitional provisions. Generally speaking, orders made under the existing Juvenile Courts Act will be treated as if they were orders made under the new Act so that the benefits of the new Act will be available to all children. Orders made under the present Juvenile Courts Act placing a child under the care and control of the Minister pursuant to a complaint arising out of an offence will expire either upon the expiration of two years from the date of the orders or upon the expiration of three months from the commencement of the new Act whichever last occurs. These orders at the moment often continue until the child attains the age of eighteen years even though the alleged offence may have been committed at an early age.

Clause 7 sets out the principles to be observed by any court or person who deals with a child under this Act. The overall aim is that a child will be treated in a manner that will lead to the proper development of his own personality and also to his development into a responsible citizen. On the one hand, certain factors must be considered which would lead to the rehabilitation of the child, but on the other hand, the desirability of making the child responsible for his misdeeds, and the need to protect the community at large from the wrongful acts of a child, must also be kept in mind in appropriate cases. Part II sets out the constitution of the Children's Court.

Clause 8 constitutes a separate court to be known as the "Children's Court of South Australia". Judges of the Children's Court will be drawn from the body of judges or acting judges under the Local and District Criminal Courts Act. Certain special magistrates will be designated as members of the Children's Court and all special justices and justices of the peace will automatically become members of the court. The Governor is given the power to appoint a senior judge and an acting senior judge of the Children's Court. The senior judge is given power to delegate to another judge or magistrate of the Children's Court certain of his purely administrative powers.

Clause 9 provides that no complaint against a child, whether it be a complaint for an offence or a complaint dealing with another matter, may be heard in any court other than the Children's Court. Where the Children's Court is dealing with guardianship proceedings under this Act or under the Guardianship of Infants Act or is hearing an appeal under the guardianship provisions of the Community Welfare Act, it has all the powers of a local court. Where the Children's Court is dealing with criminal proceedings in relation to a child it sits as a court of summary jurisdiction and the provisions of the Justices Act apply subject to any necessary modifications.

Clause 10 provides that the jurisdiction of the court is exercisable by a judge, special magistrate or special justice sitting alone or by two justices of the peace sitting together. Clause 11 provides that the Children's Court should not sit in any building while adult court proceedings are being conducted therein. Part III deals with the protection of children who are in need of care. Clause 12 gives the Minister of Community Welfare the power to apply to the Children's Court in any case where he is of the opinion that a child is in need of care because of maltreatment, neglect, inadequate supervision, failure to maintain or abandonment. Such an application will be dealt with as an *inter partes* matter and the child and each guardian of the child are independent parties.

Clause 13 obliges the Minister to serve a copy of the application upon each guardian of the child and also upon the child if he is of or above the age of 10 years. Clause 14 sets out the various orders that the Children's Court may make if it finds that a child is in need of care. First, the court may place the child under the guardianship of the

Minister for a specified period of time. Alternatively, the court may order that, without making any change to the guardianship of the child, the child be placed under the control of the Director-General for a specified period of time in respect of specified matters. Orders may also be made in the latter situation directing the child to reside with a specified person or directing any guardian of the child to take certain specified steps in relation to the care and control of the child. The court may not place a child under the guardianship of the Minister unless it has considered a report on the child from an assessment panel. The court is given power to make interim orders for a period of not more than three months where it thinks it proper to do so. Any party to the application can apply to the court before the expiration of that three-month period for a final determination of the matter. No order made by the court under this section can extend beyond the time when the child turns eighteen. A guardian who fails to comply with an order of the court under this section is guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding \$500.

Clause 15 sets out the manner in which any orders made under the preceding section may be varied or discharged. A child of or over the age of 10 years is permitted to make an application under this section. Clause 16 sets out the general power of the court to adjourn any proceedings under this Part. In order to ensure that proceedings under this Part do not trail on for inordinate periods of time, it is provided that the court may only adjourn proceedings for two successive periods of 28 days. Any further adjournment may only be made with the approval of the senior judge. If it deems it to be necessary, the court may place a child under the guardianship of the Minister for the period of the adjournment. Clause 17 makes provision for several procedural matters. First the court is not bound by the rules of evidence. Secondly it is provided that a fact is proved if it is proved on the balance of probabilities. Certain persons who have an interest in the welfare of a child are permitted to make submissions to the court in any proceedings under this Part in relation to that child. The court is given the power to seek medical reports in respect of any child.

Clause 18 provides that the court may make an order for costs against the Minister in a case where the court dismisses an application made by the Minister under this Part. Clause 19 provides that, if an application under this Part has been made in respect of a child, a member of the court may order that the child be removed from any place. An authorised departmental officer or a member of the police force may, without any warrant, remove a child from any place if he suspects that the child is in immediate danger. Such a person is given the power to enter or break into any place for the purposes of removing a child. Where a child has been removed from any place, the Director-General may cause him to be held in custody until the application in relation to the child is heard. Where a child is held in custody his application must come on for hearing before the court no later than the next working day.

Clause 20 provides that only a judge or special magistrate of the Children's Court can hear and determine an application under this Part. However a special justice or two justices of the peace may take the initial hearing of an application for the purposes of adjourning the matter. Such a special justice or justices of the peace could place the child under the guardianship of the Minister for the period of the adjournment, if necessary.

Clause 21 spells out the duties and powers of an assessment panel that is required to furnish a report on a child before the child is placed under the guardianship of the Minister. Clause 22 provides that the Minister is the

lawful guardian of the child to the exclusion of all other persons while the child is under guardianship pursuant to this Part.

Clause 23 sets out the various ways in which the Director-General can provide for a child who is under the guardianship of the Minister under this Part. The child may stay with or return to any guardian or relative or may be placed with a foster parent or any other suitable person. If necessary he may be kept in a home established or licensed under the Community Welfare Act. The Director-General is obliged to inform the guardians of a child of all steps taken by him in relation to the child. An authorised departmental officer may, without any warrant, remove a child that is under the guardianship of the Minister under this Part from any place. Clause 24 provides that the Minister shall cause each child who is under his guardianship under this Part to be reviewed at least once in each year of that guardianship.

Part IV deals with the treatment of young offenders. Clause 25 provides that the screening panel provisions do not apply in relation to a child who has been charged with homicide, certain offences under the Road Traffic Act (the more serious offences under this Act will be prescribed) or truancy. Truancy is automatically dealt with by a children's aid panel. Clause 26 requires the Director-General to maintain a list of persons who are qualified to act as members of screening panels. Members of the Police Force approved by the Chief Secretary and officers of the Community Welfare Department approved by the Minister are qualified to be members of screening panels. Clause 27 provides that each screening panel shall consist of one member of the Police Force and one departmental officer.

Clause 28 provides that no complaint may be laid against a child for an offence unless the matter has first been referred to a screening panel. Where a child has been apprehended without warrant (that is, no complaint having at that point been laid) the child's case must forthwith be referred to a screening panel. A screening panel must consider the allegations made against a child and any departmental or police reports on the child, but is not permitted to take submissions from any person. The screening panel then decides whether the child should be dealt with by a children's aid panel or whether he should be brought before the Children's Court on the complaint.

Clause 29 provides that, in the event of disagreement between the two members of a screening panel, a judge or special magistrate of the Children's Court shall make a final decision on the matter. Clause 30 provides that, if a screening panel has decided that a child should be dealt with by a children's aid panel, then no complaint shall at that point be laid against the child and if the child has been detained or required to enter into a recognizance for the purpose of bail then he may be released from that detention or discharged from that recognizance. If a screening panel has decided that a child should be brought before the Children's Court in relation to that offence then a complaint shall be laid against the child. It is made clear that this does not oblige the police to lay a complaint if in fact they decide not to proceed with a prosecution.

Clause 31 obliges the Director-General to keep a list of the persons who are qualified to be members of children's aid panels. Members of the Police Force approved by the Chief Secretary, departmental officers approved by the Minister, and Education Department officers approved by the Minister of Education are qualified to be members of children's aid panels. Clause 32 provides that a children's aid panel shall consist of a member of the Police Force and a departmental officer where an offence is alleged. Where the offence of truancy is alleged a departmental officer and

an Education Department officer constitute a panel. Where the offence of truancy is alleged in addition to any other offence then the panel consists of a member of the Police Force, a departmental officer and an Education Department officer. A person who has sat on a screening panel is not debarred from sitting on a children's aid panel for the purpose of dealing with the same child.

Clause 33 provides that as soon as a matter is referred to a children's aid panel then the panel must immediately inform the child of that fact. It should be made quite clear at this point that all cases of truancy will be dealt with by children's aid panels in the first instance. At the same time as notifying the child of the children's aid panel hearing, the panel must inform the child clearly of the allegations made against him and must advise him that if he does not admit the allegations then his case will be brought before the Children's Court for hearing. Clause 34 provides that a children's aid panel may request certain reports to be made on the child. Clause 35 imposes certain obligations upon a children's aid panel that is dealing with a child. The panel must explain the allegations to the child and must satisfy itself that the child admits those allegations. The child must be informed that he is entitled to ask for a trial in the Children's Court. A panel may, in dealing with a child, warn or counsel the child and his guardians, request the child or his guardians to enter into certain written undertakings and may at any time vary the terms of an undertaking or request a fresh undertaking. An undertaking may not extend for a longer period than six months. A panel is not empowered to require a child to change his place of residence.

Clause 36 sets out the circumstances in which a children's aid panel may refer a matter to the Children's Court. A referral must be made if the child so requests or if the child does not admit to the allegations made against him. A panel may refer any other matter where the child or any guardian fails to appear before the panel or refuses to give an undertaking requested by the panel. A panel may also refer a matter to the Children's Court where it is satisfied that a child has broken an undertaking. No such referral may be made where a guardian has broken an undertaking.

Clause 37 provides that where a children's aid panel has dealt with a child then no criminal proceedings may be brought in relation to the alleged offence, except where the matter has been referred to the Children's Court, whereupon a complaint may be laid against the child notwithstanding any time limits provided under any Act. Clause 38 provides that a child is not entitled to be represented by any person when he is appearing before a children's aid panel but the panel is given full power to hear submissions from any person involved with the child. Panel hearings are closed hearings. Clause 39 provides that evidence given before a children's aid panel is not admissible in any subsequent proceedings in relation to the alleged offence. Clause 40 ensures that no appearance of a child before a children's aid panel may be alleged in any proceedings before a court, except a court which is dealing with the child under this Act, and furthermore, no such appearance may be disclosed by any person acting under this Act except with the approval of the Minister.

Clause 41 provides that a children's aid panel shall not sit in a courthouse or police station. Clause 42 provides that if a complaint for an offence has been laid against the child then any justice may either issue a summons against the child requiring him to appear before the Children's Court, or issue a warrant for the apprehension of the child. A member of the Police Force is given the power to apprehend the child without warrant and to enter or break into any place for that purpose. Where a child has been

apprehended the Director-General may cause him to be detained until he is brought before the Children's Court for the purpose of remand. A child who is so detained must be brought before the Children's Court for remand not later than the next working day. Clause 43 provides that a child may be released on bail first by the member of the Police Force in charge of the station to which the child is brought, or secondly by a justice if the police officer refuses bail.

Clause 44 sets out the orders the Children's Court may make upon remand. It may allow the child to go at large, release him upon bail, remand him into the custody of any person or remand him in custody for a period not exceeding 28 days. The court may remand a child in custody only if it is of the opinion that he is likely to abscond or if it believes that it is necessary to do so for the protection of the child, the general public or any person or property. A child cannot be remanded to a prison. Clause 45 provides that a child who is charged with homicide must be tried in the Supreme Court. Clause 46 provides that a child who does not plead guilty to an indictable offence may request that he be tried in an adult court (that is, the Supreme Court or a District Criminal Court, whichever is appropriate). Before a Children's Court complies with a request of the child under this section it must satisfy itself that the child has received independent legal advice.

Clause 47 empowers the Attorney-General to apply in certain circumstances for a child to be tried in an adult court. The Attorney-General may make such an application if he believes that the particular offence is sufficiently grave or that the child has been found guilty of a series of serious offences. An application under this section must be made to a judge of the Supreme Court. The child and each guardian of the child must be served with a copy of such an application and shall be entitled to make submissions on the application. A judge hearing an application under this section may request a preliminary examination to be held in the Children's Court before making any order.

Clause 48 provides that the Children's Court shall conduct a preliminary examination in a case where a child is to be tried in an adult court. Clause 49 first provides that the Children's Court has full power to record alternative verdicts. Secondly, the Children's Court is obliged to deliver its verdict in any case not later than the end of the next working day after the day on which the case is concluded. The court must also give its reasons for reaching the particular verdict in relation to any indictable offence other than a minor indictable offence. Clause 50 sets out the orders that the Children's Court may make upon it finding a charge proved against a child. It may convict the child and sentence him to a period of detention in a training centre of not less than two months nor more than two years. However, before detention is ordered the court must obtain a report on the child from an assessment panel. The court may, whether or not it records a conviction against a child, discharge him upon a good behaviour bond. Such a bond may also contain a condition requiring the child to be under the supervision of a departmental officer or other person, a condition requiring him to attend a youth project centre or any other project or programme nominated by the Director-General, a condition that he will reside with a particular person or in a particular place, a condition that he will attend before the court at specified times for review, and any other condition the court may see fit to impose. The court may, whether or not it records a conviction against the child, impose a fine which in any case may not exceed five hundred dollars. Finally, the court may, without convicting a child, discharge him without any penalty at

all. Subclause (2) makes it clear that the Children's Court cannot sentence a child to imprisonment, fine him, require him to enter into a bond, or disqualify him from holding a driver's licence otherwise than as provided in this Part. Apart from that restriction the court may make any other order in relation to a convicted child that may be provided by any other Act or law. A bond may be for a period not exceeding two years and in the case of a simple offence or a minor indictable offence is limited to a sum not exceeding \$200.

The court is empowered to suspend a sentence of detention upon a child entering into a good behaviour bond. The court is given a wide power to disqualify a child from holding or obtaining a driver's licence in any case where the court is of the opinion that either the child is not a fit and proper person to hold a licence, or that disqualification is an appropriate penalty. Such an order for disqualification may be made even though the child has not reached the age of 16 years. The child may apply to a judge or special magistrate of the Children's Court for variation or revocation of such an order for disqualification. When a child attains 18 years he is then entitled to apply for revocation of disqualification under the Road Traffic Act as an alternative to applying for revocation under this section. Subclause (11) makes it quite clear that the court is not bound by any minimum penalty that may be prescribed in any Act. Where a child is found guilty of a group I or group II offence, the court must record a conviction against the child unless the court believes that there are special reasons for not doing so.

Clause 51 provides that if a charge of truancy has been proved against a child the only penalty that may be imposed by the court is a bond. If the court does not require the child to enter into a bond then the child must be discharged without conviction or penalty.

Clause 52 empowers the Children's Court to reduce the amount of any fine having regard to the means of the child and his ability to pay a fine. The court may order that a fine be paid in instalments or on any future specified day.

Clause 53 provides that, wherever it is practicable, a group I or group II offence must be dealt with by a judge of the Children's Court. The senior judge may direct that a special magistrate can deal with a group I or group II offence if a judge is not available. Group III offences must be dealt with either by a judge or special magistrate. Orders under those sections of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act dealing with offenders suffering from venereal disease and offenders who are incapable of controlling their sexual instincts may be made only by a judge of the Children's Court. Special justices or justices of the peace are not empowered to sentence a child to detention, to impose a fine over \$100, require a child to enter into a bond for more than one year, or require a child to enter into a bond upon any condition other than that the child be of good behaviour. A special magistrate is not empowered to sentence a child to detention for more than one year or to impose a fine of over \$300. Where a special magistrate, special justice or justice of the peace is of the opinion that a penalty should be imposed in any case that he is not empowered to impose he must remand the child for sentence and refer the matter to the senior judge for direction. The senior judge may in his discretion direct that the person who referred the matter should sentence the child within the limits of his powers or that some other member of the court should sentence the child.

Clause 54 provides for the treatment of a child who has been convicted of murder by the Supreme Court. Such a child shall be detained in a place during the Governor's pleasure and under such conditions as the Governor may direct. The Parole Board or, if the child is in a training

centre, the Training Centre Review Board may recommend to the Governor that the child be discharged on licence subject to such conditions as may be recommended. A licence may be revoked for breach of any condition. (This section is substantially the same as the corresponding section in the present Juvenile Courts Act.)

Clause 55 provides for the sentencing of a child who has been found guilty by the Supreme Court of homicide other than murder, or who has been found guilty of any other offence by an adult court pursuant to an application by the Attorney-General. The court in these cases may deal with the child as if he were an adult or may make any order that the Children's Court is empowered to make. Alternatively, the court may remand the child back to the Children's Court for sentencing. Clause 56 provides that where a child is tried in an adult court pursuant to his own request the court may only make orders that the Children's Court is empowered to make or may remand the child back to the Children's Court for sentencing. Clause 57 provides for the imprisonment of a child who has been sentenced to imprisonment by an adult court. The adult court may order that any specified period of that sentence of imprisonment be served in a training centre, but not beyond the time at which the child turns eighteen. A child will be subject to the Parole Board while he is in prison, but during any time that he is in a training centre, he will be subject to the Training Centre Review Board. Clause 58 provides for the variation or discharge of bonds entered into under this Act, upon the application of the Minister, the child, a surety or a guardian. It is made clear that a child may make an application under this section notwithstanding that he has turned eighteen.

Clause 59 provides that the court must explain to a child the conditions that the child is required to observe and must give him a notice setting out those conditions in simple language. The Minister is obliged to cause reviews to be made of the progress of all children who are under supervision pursuant to a bond at least once in each period of six months. Clause 60 provides that the Minister or the Commissioner of Police may cause a complaint to be laid against a child who has failed to observe any conditions of his bond. The court may make certain orders in relation to the breach of a bond where the child is before the court on a complaint laid under this section or is before the court for another offence to which he has pleaded guilty. The court may make any order in relation to the original offence that it could have made in the first instance and may make an order for the payment of any amount due under the bond. Where a child is under a suspended sentence the court may order that the suspension be revoked and the sentence of detention carried into effect immediately. An order may not be made under this section if the child is not present before the court, unless he has failed to present himself before the court pursuant to a summons.

Clause 61 provides for the establishment of the Training Centre Review Board. The members of the board consist of the judges of the Children's Court, two persons appointed upon the recommendation of the Attorney-General, and two persons appointed on the recommendation of the Minister of Community Welfare. The latter four persons must have appropriate skills and experience in working with young people. When the Training Centre Review Board is sitting to review any matter it shall be constituted of a judge (who shall be Chairman) and two of the appointed members. Clause 62 obliges the Training Centre Review Board to review a child who has been sentenced to detention in a training centre at intervals of not more than three months. The Director-General can cause a review to be made at any other time. Clause 63

empowers the Training Centre Review Board to authorise the Director-General to grant a child leave of absence from a training centre. The Review Board may order the release of a child from a training centre subject to a condition that the child will be under the supervision of a departmental officer and any other condition the board thinks fit. The Minister may apply to the Training Centre Review Board for an order that the child be returned to a training centre where he has failed to observe any of the aforementioned conditions. The board may issue a warrant for the apprehension of the child where necessary.

Clause 64 provides that if a child has been released under the previous section the Children's Court may order that the child be discharged absolutely from a detention order. An application for an order under this section may be made by the child, a guardian of the child, or by the Director-General. The Director-General may not make an application under this section without a recommendation from the Training Centre Review Board. Applications under this section may not be made at intervals of less than three months. Clause 65 provides that a child under the age of ten years is not capable of committing an offence. Clause 66 provides that a child may not be charged jointly with an adult except where the child has to be tried by an adult court.

Clause 67 provides that reports on the social background of the child cannot be tendered to a court prior to a finding of guilty. If a child is found not guilty all reports prepared for that hearing must be destroyed. This section does not prevent a court from receiving the usual psychiatric and medical reports. When sentencing a child the court cannot take into account facts that have not been proved beyond reasonable doubt. Clause 68 provides that the court when dealing with an offence may order that a guardian of the child shall attend at the court. A guardian who fails to attend before the court in this situation is guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding five hundred dollars. Clause 69 makes it clear that a court may hear any submissions from a person who has been counselling, advising or aiding the child.

Clause 70 provides that a court shall not require a child to attend a youth project centre unless the court has obtained a report on the child from an assessment panel. Clause 71 sets out the duties and powers of assessment panels acting under this Part. Clause 72 provides that a judge or special magistrate of the Children's Court or an adult court may order compensation or restitution in respect of damage or loss arising out of an offence committed by a child. Such an order is made against the child and is only to be made if the court believes that it would contribute to the rehabilitation of the child. In any event such an order may not exceed two thousand dollars. A court may give the child up to six months to satisfy such an order either in one payment or instalments. In determining the amount of the order, the court must look to the means of the child and his ability to pay the amount. The person in whose favour the order is made may recover arrears as a civil debt. The court may not make orders for compensation or restitution against a child except under this section of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act. However, nothing in this section debars a person from suing a child for damages.

Clause 73 provides that the Commissioner of Police may furnish the name and address of a child who has been dealt with for an offence to any person who intends to commence civil proceedings against that child in relation to that offence. Clause 74 provides that the Offenders Probation Act does not apply in relation to a child unless the child has been sentenced as an adult. Part V deals with appeals and reconsideration of sentence.

Clause 75 provides that an appeal shall lie to a single judge of the Supreme Court against any order of the Children's Court under Part III of this Act (the guardianship provisions) or under any other Act (that is, the Guardianship of Infants Act and the Community Welfare Act). Clause 76 deals with appeals in relation to young offenders. Where a child has been dealt with in respect of a group I or group II offence, the Full Court of the Supreme Court shall hear any appeal. For all other offences, appeals will be dealt with by a single judge of the Supreme Court.

Clause 77 makes it clear that these provisions do not detract from the power of a judge of the Supreme Court to refer any appeal to the Full Court. Clause 78 provides that the Supreme Court may on an appeal make any order in relation to a child that may be made by the Children's Court. Clause 79 provides for the reconsideration by the Children's Court of any order made by the Children's Court in relation to a child who has been found guilty of an offence. The court may confirm or discharge an order convicting a child or may confirm or vary any other order imposing a penalty on the child. An application for reconsideration may be made by the child within one month of the order or may be made by the Minister at any time. All parties concerned must be given notice of the hearing of such an application. If an appeal to the Supreme Court has been instituted in respect of the original order, an application may not be made under this section by the child unless the notice of appeal is withdrawn. Similarly, where an application for reconsideration has been made, no appeal in respect of the original order may be made to the Supreme Court unless the application for reconsideration is withdrawn. An appeal may be made to the Supreme Court against an order under this section.

Part VI establishes the Children's Court Advisory Committee. Clause 80 provides that the Children's Court Advisory Committee shall consist of three members, of whom a Supreme Court judge or a judge under the Local and District Criminal Courts Act shall be the Chairman. Of the other two members, one is appointed on the recommendation of the Attorney-General, and one on the recommendation of the Minister of Community Welfare. Clause 81 provides for the payment of allowances and expenses to members of the Advisory Committee. Clause 82 contains the usual provisions relating to removal from, and vacancies of, office.

Clause 83 sets out the functions of the Advisory Committee. The committee will monitor the whole working of this Act and will collect data and statistics in accordance with any directions of the Attorney-General. Other functions may be assigned to the Advisory Committee either by regulations under this Act or by proclamation of the Governor. Clause 84 obliges the Advisory Committee to report each year to the Attorney-General on the administration and operation of this Act. This report will be laid before Parliament. Furthermore, the Advisory Committee must investigate any matter referred to it by the Attorney-General. Part VII contains sundry provisions of general application in relation to the Children's Court.

Clause 85 provides that, if it becomes apparent in any proceedings before any court that a person should be dealt with either as an adult or a child, where necessary the court must remand that person to the appropriate court. However, nothing done by any court or children's aid panel is invalidated by reason of the fact that the person before it should, by reason of his age, have been dealt with in another court. Clause 86 empowers a member of the Children's Court to seek the directions of the senior judge

in relation to the hearing and determination of proceedings if that member believes that they should be dealt with by some other member of the court.

Clause 87 provides that a child and his guardian must be given copies of all reports received by the Children's Court or an adult court in relation to that child and that they must be given the opportunity to cross-examine all relevant persons in relation to that report. However, the court may withhold the whole or any part of a report that the court feels may be prejudicial to the welfare of the child.

Clause 88 makes it clear that officers of the department may appear before a court for the purpose of conducting proceedings under Part III of this Act or for tendering any report in relation to the sentencing of a child under Part IV of this Act.

Clause 89 puts an obligation upon the Children's Court or an adult court to satisfy itself as to whether or not a child needs legal representation in any proceedings and, where necessary, to make such provision for the legal representation of the child as it thinks appropriate.

Clause 90 provides that the Children's Court or an adult court must satisfy itself that a child before the court understands the nature of the proceedings. Furthermore, where the child is not represented by counsel or solicitor, the court itself must explain to the child all allegations against him and the legal implications of those allegations, and, in relation to an offence, explain to the child the elements of the offence that must be established if he is to be proven guilty.

Clause 91 sets out the persons who are permitted to be present in court where the Children's Court or an adult court is dealing with a child. The persons who must obviously be present are the officers of the court, the officers of the department, the parties and their lawyers, the prosecutor where an offence is being dealt with, witnesses and the child's guardians. The court may specifically authorise other persons to be present and any member of the Children's Court Advisory Committee may be present at any sitting. The news media representatives may be present at a sitting of the court when the court is dealing with a child for an offence.

Clause 92 provides that reports of proceedings before the Children's Court or an adult court in relation to a child shall not be published by any means whatsoever. However, the result of proceedings in relation to offences committed by children may be published provided that the identity of the child and of any witness who is a child is not revealed. The court is given power to prohibit the publication even of the result of such proceedings if it thinks fit. At the other end of the spectrum, the court may, if it thinks fit, permit the publication of the result of such proceedings in such a manner as will reveal the identity of the child. A person who contravenes this section shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding ten thousand dollars.

Clause 93 empowers an authorised departmental officer to search any child who is under his care for the purpose of any court proceedings and to remove any object that he considers could be used to injure any person or property.

Clause 94 provides that a person who hinders a departmental officer in the exercise of his powers under this Act shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding two hundred dollars.

Clause 95 provides that the Minister may delegate any of his powers, duties, responsibilities or functions under this Act to the Director-General. The Director-General in turn may delegate to any officer of the department any of his powers, duties, responsibilities or functions, whether vested in him or delegated to him under this Act.

Clause 96 provides that no person may issue any order or warrant for the removal or apprehension of a child unless that person is satisfied by evidence given on oath that the allegations in relation to the child have been substantiated.

Clause 97 provides that a child may not be sentenced by any court to imprisonment for contempt of court or for the enforcement of any order for the payment of money. Such a child must be detained in a place approved by the Minister. The child is given the opportunity to apply to the Children's Court, right up to the time of the execution of any mandate for his detention, for further time in which to satisfy any order for the payment of moneys.

Clause 98 provides that a court making an order for the detention of a child in a training centre must issue a mandate in the proper form.

Clause 99 provides first that the Director-General, with the approval of the Training Centre Review Board, may transfer a child from one training centre to another. Secondly, it is provided that the Director-General may apply to a judge of the Children's Court for the transfer of a child who is of or over the age of sixteen years from a training centre to a prison if he cannot be properly controlled in that training centre or is a persistent trouble maker. The court may revoke any order transferring a child to a prison. While a child is in prison pursuant to this section, the Prisons Act applies in relation to him.

Clause 100 provides that proceedings in respect of offences against this Act shall be disposed of in a summary manner. Clause 101 empowers the senior judge of the Children's Court to make rules of court. Such rules may incorporate the rules or regulations made under any other Act.

Clause 102 provides for the making of regulations for the purposes of this Act. Such regulations may prescribe the practice and procedure of screening panels, children's aid panels and the Training Centre Review Board, may prescribe forms, may prescribe how a child is to be dealt with while he is being held in detention prior to court proceedings or while he is being conveyed to or from the court or is in the court, and may prescribe penalties not exceeding two hundred dollars for breaches of the regulations.

The schedule to the Act provides for consequential amendments to four Acts. First, the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act is amended so that all references to a juvenile court under the Juvenile Courts Act are substituted by references to the Children's Court. The definition of "appropriate court" is amended to the effect that an order for compensation from a child who is alleged to have committed an offence will be heard and determined by a judge or a special magistrate of the Children's Court. The Education Act is amended by the substitution of a new section relating to truants. A child of compulsory school age who habitually or frequently absents himself without lawful excuse from school when the school is open for instruction shall be guilty of an offence of truancy. No penalty is provided for this offence and such a child will be dealt with in the manner set out in the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act. The Guardianship of Infants Act is amended by vesting the jurisdiction under that Act in the Children's Court as constituted by a judge. At present this jurisdiction is vested in the Supreme Court or any judge of the Supreme Court or the local court of full jurisdiction closest to the residence of the child. The Justices Act is amended to the effect that a child who is of or above the age of 16 years and is charged with an offence under the Road Traffic Act may plead guilty to that offence in writing in the manner prescribed by section 57a of the Justices Act. The

provisions of that section will not be available to a child charged with any other offence. As the Justices Act now stands, the provisions of that section are not available to a child at all.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS) BILL

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to require the disclosure by members of the Parliament of South Australia of information relating to certain sources of income and for purposes incidental thereto. Read a first time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The object of this Bill is to establish a register of information relating to the sources of income and financial interests of members of Parliament and their immediate families. The Bill is substantially in the same terms as the Bill which I introduced to the house on Wednesday 30 November last year and which subsequently passed this House in March of this year. As honourable members will be aware, the Bill lapsed in another place at the end of the session. The reintroduction of this measure rests on the Government's belief that members of Parliament, as trustees of the public confidence, ought to disclose the particulars required by the Bill in order to demonstrate both to their colleagues and to the electorate at large that they have not been influenced in the execution of their duties by considerations of private personal gain. It is based on the Government's belief that, in the exercise of their duties, legislators should place their public responsibilities before their private responsibilities. When the Bill was first introduced to the Parliament it received widespread support and the announcement that the Bill was to be reintroduced has again brought strong support from the media and all persons concerned to ensure probity in public life.

When the Bill was previously before the House, suggestions were made by members opposite that the legislation had been introduced hastily and for some supposed short-term personal gain arising out of the Lynch affair. Regrettably, the passing into history of that sordid matter has not seen the end of allegations of a most serious nature against members of Parliament in this country. Only recently there have been most damaging allegations of political bribery in the Western Australian Country Party; there have been continuing land scandals in Victoria, with the eventual resignation of a Minister of the Crown as a result; and there is a feeling abroad in the community at large that further financial scandals involving Federal Government Ministers and tax avoidance and tariff ramps may break any day.

Already, the Federal Minister for Primary Industry, Mr. Sinclair, is under a cloud following the commencement of investigations into companies in which he has pecuniary interests. These sorry events have serious implications for the stability of the country's political institutions, and it is the Government's belief that now more than ever there is an urgent and pressing need for this legislation so that members of Parliament in South Australia can adequately demonstrate publicly that not only are they above reproach but are seen to be above reproach in their financial dealings. Legislation of this kind is not without precedent; similar provisions are in force in the United Kingdom and also in Sri Lanka.

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

Explanation of Remainder of Bill

Under the proposed South Australian Act, members will be required, every six months, to furnish an officer to be known as the Registrar of Members' Interests with a return setting out prescribed information regarding their source of income and other financial interests. The latter includes interests in companies, unincorporated profit-making bodies and real property. Insofar as it relates to income, the legislation will apply only to financial benefits in excess of \$200, or such other amount as the Governor may prescribe. Members will be required to furnish details both of their own income sources and financial interests, and those of their spouses, and children who are normally resident with them. On the other hand, the legislation does not cover financial benefits derived from a member of the recipient's immediate family, or from public funds.

It is intended that the public should have access to the information in the register. Moreover, the Act will require the Registrar, each year, to submit to the Minister an extract from the register containing all the information furnished during a specified period. The Minister will be required to lay a copy of this document before both Houses of Parliament, and all information contained therein will be printed as a Parliamentary Paper.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 defines certain expressions used in the Bill. Clause 4 provides for the creation of the office of Registrar of Members' Interests.

Clause 5 sets out the central provisions of the Bill. It provides that every member, within the months of January and July of each year, shall furnish to the Registrar a return containing prescribed information relating to any income source from which he, his spouse or child derived a financial benefit in excess of the prescribed amount, during the preceding six months. The term "child" only covers children normally resident with the member, including the child of a member's spouse, and "spouse" includes a putative spouse within the meaning of the Family Relationships Act, 1975. The member is also required, within the same period, to furnish a corresponding return relating to interests in companies, unincorporated profit-making bodies, real property and any other prescribed matters. New members will be required to furnish initial returns within one month of election.

Clause 6 of the Bill relates to the maintenance of the register, and the availability of its contents to members of the public. It also provides that on or before 30 September in each year the Registrar shall furnish the Minister with an extract from the register containing all the information submitted in respect of the twelve-month period preceding 30 June of the same year. The Minister is required to lay a copy of the extract before both Houses of Parliament within fourteen days of receipt. The information so laid before Parliament is to be printed as a Parliamentary Paper.

Clause 7 provides that any member who fails to furnish the required information, or who furnishes false information, commits an offence carrying a penalty of \$5 000. Clause 8 provides that proceedings for offences against the proposed Act shall be disposed of summarily, and clause 9 empowers the Governor to make any regulations which are necessary or expedient for the purposes of the proposed Act.

Mr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

URBAN LAND (PRICE CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

ART GALLERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

DOG FENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

ELECTRICAL WORKERS AND CONTRACTORS LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

ADMINISTRATION OF ACTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

MINES AND WORKS INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 3 August. Page 322.)

Dr. EASTICK (Light): Although the Opposition supports the second reading of the Bill I point out that, in due course, certain amendments will be moved. Although the amendments have been circulated, I am not sure whether the Minister is aware of them as yet.

The measures incorporated in the Bill fall into three categories; first, to upgrade the penalties, which were last upgraded in 1920, and, with the reality of those measures, the Opposition has no argument. The Government must decide whether it can substantiate the penalties it has brought forward. The Opposition may question some, and might believe that some others could be increased to a greater degree because of the nature of the measure for which a penalty is being extracted, but the Opposition accepts the recommendations contained in the Bill in that regard.

The Minister said that the measures were to clarify and, in a minor way, to extend the ambit of operation of the principal Act and regulations. In that regard, the amendments fall into four categories; first, a widening of "mining" to a number of descriptions that did not appear in the previous Act, such as clay, shale, other earthy substances, offshore mining, and machinery. Certainly the use of the term "machinery" in this sense is widening dramatically the natural meaning of the term, but we accept that as being practical in relation to current-day activities in mining.

The Minister also indicated that there were to be extensions into areas that might be termed ancillary to normal mining activities. As an example, he referred to pre-mixed concrete. We find it strange that, if the Minister was seeking to incorporate activities associated with pre-mixed concrete, he did not also include a reference to what one might term pre-mixed asphalt products, which are used for a purpose almost identical to that for which pre-mixed concrete is used. Indeed, we will consider that

matter later. It is also significant that there is no specific reference to the term "brickworks", which is a major area of activity associated with products such as clay and others mentioned elsewhere in the Act.

The third point made in this regard was that the Bill provides for the obtaining of medical certification of certain operators of machinery that might be regarded as dangerous to other persons on site if, for any reason, the operator was to lose control. We believe that this is not an intrusion into an individual's rights or into the area of an individual's health record, because the problem is far wider than is the individual himself. If he is going to work in an area of influence where his activity or lack of activity or inability to provide a proper operational base may cause difficulty to others, certainly that medical certification should be available, and we accept that matter.

The fourth measure intrudes into activities associated with the disposal of over-burden and other wastes. With the type of over-burden and other wastes likely to come from some mining operations in the future, we regard that as a legitimate extension of mining operation, and we believe that that matter should be included.

The third major measure the Bill introduces is the removal of certain limits on the power of the Governor to extend certain operations for a maximum period, which was three years, made up of an initial proclamation period of two years and the possibility of His Excellency's being able to extend that by a year so that there was a maximum of three years. When introducing the Bill, the Minister indicated that there were certain tunnelling operations that might in the future require a period in excess of the original three-year period, but he did not proceed to give any indication of a particular area of tunnelling he considered might give rise to need of change at present. When replying, I hope that he will take members into his confidence and give some indication of the nature of mining operation being tunnelling which the Government envisages this particular measure will cover.

We have heard tell of tunnelling operations through the Adelaide Hills so that transportation lines, which I extend to mean the transportation of water, and certain other services may be effected at a lower cost than that currently existing of having to lift the product, be it water or other loads, over the Mount Lofty Range, and let it run down the other side. For a long time, it has been recognised that a tunnel system through the Adelaide Hills would greatly reduce the overall cost of providing services to the metropolitan area. Whilst this may not be envisaged in the Bill, we would be pleased to receive any comment from the Minister on this matter.

The area of difficulty which the Opposition wants to take up in relation to the proposal relates to the frequent use of the term "proclamation". The Minister seeks in a number of areas to permit amendments to be made in the future to the principal Act by proclamation. As recently as last Thursday, Opposition members successfully sought an amendment to a Bill then before the House that removed the procedural method of proclamation to introduce the amendments by way of regulation.

That simple amendment was made because members fully appreciate that at least, when an alteration is made by way of regulation, the regulation can come under the scrutiny of either House of Parliament. If there is sufficient need led by members anywhere in the Parliamentary system, whether from the Government or from the Opposition, there is a chance that the regulation will be withdrawn, and the Government and its officers will reconsider the matter, and due heed will be taken of the issues raised. I referred to the Acts Interpretation Act to ascertain precisely what a proclamation was, and I

found that, in that Act and in other documents, "proclamation" is simply defined, and not a great deal of information is available on the overall aspects of a "proclamation".

I should like to develop that point because it is important in relation to the Opposition's attitude to this measure. "Proclamation", is defined in section 4 of the Acts Interpretation Act as follows:

Proclamation means a proclamation made by the Governor and published in the *Gazette*.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Executive government!

Dr. EASTICK: Exactly; an Executive action is taken. It is gazetted and becomes known to the public which, generally, has no way of bringing to bear on the Executive Government its feelings on that measure. The Minister may well say, "Don't you think that the Government would take heed of the attitudes of industry to a proclamation?" We accept that, but it would be an industry to Minister relationship; it is not a representative Parliamentary member to Government relationship, such as occurs through the disallowance procedures provided for subordinate legislation.

I refer to the Melbourne University *Law Review* Volume II, No. 2 of 1977, pages 189 to 222, which contains an article on this measure that is introduced by Francis Gurry, (LL.B. (Hons.), LL.M.(Melb.)), under the title "The Implementation of policy through Executive action". Mr. Gurry is a barrister and solicitor of the Supreme Court of Victoria. In the preamble to the article the following statement is made:

The implementation of policy decisions was formerly considered to be almost exclusively the right of the Legislature. Now Parliament has seen fit to delegate discretionary powers to the executive, and the proliferation of Public Service departments and statutory corporations provides a convenient means for effecting Executive decisions. Mr. Gurry here examines the sources and scope of the Commonwealth executive power in Australia as interpreted by the courts, and concludes that the needs of a community are better served by such an extensive power than by the limited subject matter of the specific constitutional heads of power. A warning is given, however, as to the acceptability of the exercise of this power in the absence of accountability or Parliamentary supervision.

I acknowledge that this article refers to the Commonwealth constitutional powers; however, it indicates a number of instances where there is a recognition of a slight variation in respect of the various States, and all members should examine this article. I want to comment briefly on one or two aspects of the article because I believe it advances the debate on this issue. At page 189 it is stated:

If an examination is made of the ways in which policy is implemented by the Federal Government in Australia today, it is clear that the distinction maintained in the traditional classification between Legislative and Executive functions has, to a large extent, become obscured.

We could accept without question that the same position relates to the South Australian scene. The article continues:

The distinction separates on the one hand the activity of legislation, which determines the content of a law as a rule of conduct or a declaration as to powers, right or duty, and on the other hand the function of executive authority which applies the law in particular cases. An analysis of contemporary governmental practice indicates that there has been a steady accumulation of power in the Executive arm of government so that many functions which would undoubtedly have been characterised as legislative in the terms of the traditional classification are now exercised by the Executive arm.

Two reasons for this development seem apparent. First, it is manifest that, while Parliament may exercise a general supervisory function over the activities of government, it is ill-equipped to involve itself to any further extent in the processes of government.

That is the attitude that may prevail, and members may wish to give due thought to it. The Opposition is concerned about the degree of Executive intrusion into a number of areas of legislation in this State. We are not suggesting impropriety on the part of the Ministers who have responsibility for that legislation. I am not going to point to any particular proclamation that has been made to which we could now take exception. However, proclamations can be made where it is not then possible for Parliament adequately to address itself to the influence of that proclamation in the same way as it can bring before the House and the public problems as we see them introduced by way of regulation, when we can move a positive motion of disallowance to give effect to the comments we are making.

The article continues at some length to indicate the problems associated with the delegation of authority or what has now become known as "delegated legislation". We acknowledge that regulations are a form of delegated legislation, and we accept that a proclamation is another form of delegated legislation. Of the two, as is quite apparent from the earlier comment I made, we accept the regulation authority as being the lesser of two possible evils.

I am not fool enough to believe that the system is foolproof. In a debate last Wednesday, I pointed specifically to section 70 (a) of the regulations to the Planning and Development Act and illustrated how, immediately the Parliament brings about a disallowance, the Government can, as soon as the session is prorogued, re-introduce the regulation in precisely the same form. That argument will be developed in another debate.

I now want to quote briefly from the article something about the prerogative that exists. At pages 194 and 196 of Mr. Gurry's article, historical reference is made to the Royal prerogative and to the prerogative of the Executive. I refer to the delegation of power, as dealt with on pages 207 and 208. Under the heading on page 207 of "Delegated legislation", the article states:

Despite the prevalence of criticism, the practice of delegating legislative power to the Executive has been pursued with vigour by the Legislature. The practice of delegation embodies a number of advantages which reflect the necessity for its continuation and which may be summarised as follows:

The summary is contained in the Report of the Committee on Ministers' Powers of the United Kingdom, a report that was brought down in 1932. The summary appears at pages 51 to 53 of that document. Mr. Gurry's article continues:

- (1) It relieves pressure on Parliamentary time and the withdrawal of procedural matters from Parliament's sphere of responsibility leaves more time for the consideration of essential matters.
- (2) It enables matters of a technical nature to be dealt with by those expert in the relevant area.
- (3) It facilitates the rapid utilisation of experience in areas involving highly innovative or experimental legislation. If all policy is enshrined in the Act, amendments even of the most uncontroversial nature will require the passage of another Act through all the Parliamentary stages in both Houses.
- (4) It is the most effective method of accommodating emergencies when quick response to new developments is required.

The main criticisms which the practice of delegating power has provoked are as follows:

- (1) The executive arm of government is directly concerned with the formulation of legislation and thus plays a considerable role in the creation of its own powers. Such a concentration of power can be undesirable.
- (2) Acts may be passed merely in skeleton form, and containing only the barest general principles, leaving the formulation and implementation of practical principles to the delegate of the power.
- (3) The facilities afforded to Parliament to scrutinise and control the exercise of powers delegated to Ministers are inadequate.
- (4) Powers are often loosely defined, so that the area intended to be covered cannot be clearly ascertained.

I now turn to the situation in South Australia. It has often been stated on this side of the House that Opposition members are concerned about the large number of Bills coming to our attention that provide for regulations. We have certainly expressed a point of view today in relation to those Bills which allow for proclamation, but we have never suggested that the Government of the day should not have any regulatory powers.

The reality of the matter is that there must be a regulation-making power. The Opposition has criticised and will continue to criticise, in a number of areas, the breadth of that regulatory power, but we accept that there shall be regulatory powers. It is on that basis that I draw to the Minister's attention the Opposition's attitude, that it sees this power as the lesser of two evils. The third criticism to which I referred states:

The facilities afforded to Parliament to scrutinise and control the exercise of powers delegated to Ministers are inadequate.

That is not the position in South Australia, because we have (and other Parliaments do not have) a Subordinate Legislation Committee, which has the opportunity to take evidence and scrutinise in depth measures which are tabled in this House.

A conclusion that appears at page 213 of this article is also relevant to the overall debate. It states:

It has been conceded in most quarters that without delegated legislation "effective government would be impossible".

Opposition members accept the validity of that argument. It becomes an argument of degree, and that is the proposition I have been putting to the House this afternoon. The conclusion continues:

However, the unsystematic growth of the practice has produced a creature of uncertain dimensions. In Australia, it is clear that the practice of delegating legislative powers is prevalent and the nature of the powers delegated has been such as to leave wide discretions in the hands of the Executive in relation to the formulation and implementation of policy. The High Court has found no constitutional objection to this practice and while the Parliament has proved to be a fertile progenitor of delegated powers it has also been a neglectful parent.

I acknowledge that last point because, indeed, all members of this Parliament have been neglectful parents on a number of occasions in respect of many of the measures which were before them. Other remarks in this article highlight the fact that few members of Parliament give due consideration to the regulations that are tabled; even fewer take the opportunity of going through the *Government Gazette* to look at the proclamations, which are a follow-through from legislation which they, as members of Parliament, have helped to authorise.

Let me say clearly that in the approach I am making to

the Minister this afternoon, in saying that the Opposition believes that the use of the proclamation power is overdone in the measures the Minister has brought to us, we are hopefully being seen to be "neglectful parents" in the past who are wanting not to be seen as "neglectful parents" in the future. We believe that this is a measure that should receive greater attention and that, by advancing this argument, hopefully, that will be the case.

Another book to which I refer and which is available in the library is Pearce's *Delegated Legislation*. He is a barrister and solicitor of the Supreme Court of South Australia, the Australian Capital Territory and the High Court of Australia. He is reader in law at the Law School, Australian National University, and published this book in 1977. The book refers to delegated legislation in Australia and New Zealand. A number of the features of this book support the argument I have been presenting to the House this afternoon. The acknowledgements in the book indicate the support that Mr. Pearce had from the member for Florey (Mr. Wells) the then Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, Mr. Hull, an officer in another place, and Mr. Bowering, of the Crown Solicitor's office in the preparation of details specifically relating to South Australia. At page 3, this book contains a history of delegated legislation, as follows:

The Donoughmore committee cited an enactment concerning the Staple made in 1385 as the earliest example in England of an Act empowering the making of delegated legislation. Perhaps the most famous of the early statutes delegating legislative power to an authority was the *Statute of Proclamations* passed in 1539. The main provisions of that Act stated that "The King for the Time being, with the Advice of his Council, or the more Part of them, may set forth Proclamations under such Penalties and Pains as to him and them shall seem necessary, which shall be observed as though they were made by Act of Parliament". The use of powers of this kind to make wide-ranging legislation underlay much of the disputation between the Parliament and the Crown in the seventeenth century. The success of the Parliament in this struggle resulted in a quiescent period of legislative activity on the part of the executive which lasted until the nineteenth century. From that time onwards, there has been a steady increase in the use of delegated legislation in the United Kingdom; the volume of such legislation now far exceeds that of Acts of Parliament.

If members go through the *Government Gazettes* published in South Australia during a 12-month period and compare them with Acts of Parliament they might well find that we are in precisely the same position. At page 4 of the book, Pearce indicated some of the fears existing in the minds of members of Parliament and of other people in the community as follows:

The primary arguments directed against the use of such legislation were, first, if the executive has power to make laws, the supremacy or sovereignty of Parliament will be seriously impaired and the balance of the constitution altered. Secondly, if laws are made affecting the subject, they must be submitted for consideration and approval to the elected representatives of the people. (See, for example, Allen *Bureaucracy Triumphant* (1931) and the earlier editions of *Law and Orders*; Hayek *The Road to Serfdom*.) In less temperate tones were the famous views of Lord Hewart in *The New Despotism* [1929] where he suggested at 14 "... a mass of evidence establishes the fact that there is in existence a persistent and well-contrived system, intended to produce, and in practice producing, a despotic power which at one and the same time places Government departments above the Sovereignty of Parliament and beyond the jurisdiction of the courts".

Lord Hewart's prospective despot was seen as being able

to achieve his purpose if he could "(a) get legislation passed in skeleton form; (b) fill up the gaps with his own rules, orders, and regulations; (c) make it difficult or impossible for Parliament to check the said rules, orders, and regulations; (d) secure for them the force of statute; (e) make his own decision final; (f) arrange that the fact of his decision shall be conclusive proof of its legality; (g) take power to modify provisions of statutes; (h) and prevent and avoid any sort of appeal to a Court of Law" (at 21).

I will not quote further about this matter. I believe other members will speak about this problem, which members on this side of the House believe should receive more consideration in future. I accept the Minister's explanation that this Bill does provide a skeleton, but we believe the flesh should be added by way of regulation rather than by proclamation. I repeat that we see regulations as the lesser of two evils. I thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the discretion you have exercised in allowing me to advance these arguments which might not be directly associated with the Mines and Works Inspection Act but which are pertinent to this Bill. I have indicated that we support the second reading. I hope the Minister will reply to the questions I have put to him, and that in due course he will consider the amendments that will be moved during the Committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

Dr. EASTICK: I move:

Page 2, lines 24 and 25—Leave out "by proclamation under this section" and insert "by regulation".

I have fully explained why the Opposition has put forward this amendment.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): The proclamation procedure is much simpler than the regulation-making procedure. I suggest that any change which is basically an administrative change that needs to be carried out quickly and without difficulty can well be done by proclamation. In this definitional clause many things are proposed to be done by proclamation, particularly in relation to the definition of "mineral" in the future when we are dealing with off-shore mining. There might be a proposition for the mining of marine fibre, and it might be appropriate to apply the Mines and Works Inspection Act to that activity and regulate it in that way, and it might be necessary to do that quickly. However, marine fibre might not be a substance defined under paragraph (c) (XIV). It would not be an earthy substance. If one wanted to apply the Mines and Works Inspection Act to marine fibre one would have trouble unless one had a simple and straightforward means of bringing that substance within the ambit of the Act.

That sort of change would be non-controversial, and it is excessively cumbersome to require it to be made by regulation. A similar position obtains in relation to the term "mining operation" because that again relates to the definition of minerals that is already provided. The definition of "works" could involve controversy. There has to be a line of division between the Industrial, Health, Welfare and Safety Act and the Mines and Works Inspection Act, and in most cases when we are talking about works it is appropriate for them to be covered under the former Act through the inspectors of the Labour and Industry Department. The normal mining works that are brought under the Mines and Works Inspection Act invariably relate to operations carried on immediately adjacent to a mining operation. A pre-mixed concrete plant is often adjacent to a deposit, and some gravel pits

have works related to them directly, and the normal division between whether it is covered by the Mines and Works Inspection Act or the other Act is for that reason.

If an attempt was made to do something by proclamation that broke down that normal division and led to some confusion as to which Act applied or even as to the possibility that a particular operation was being covered by both Acts unnecessarily, you may well get a controversial situation and I am happy that, instead of on page 3, lines 12 and 13, providing "any works declared by proclamation under this section not to be works", we should accept an amendment leaving this to regulation, so that we had to promulgate a regulation and bring it down before Parliament. If some industry felt it was adversely affected as a consequence, it would have an opportunity to make regulations and have the matter considered further by the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. I do not see in relation to the other forms of proclamation proposed that the matter could be potentially sufficiently difficult to require the cumbersome procedure to be adopted rather than the simple procedure.

One must guard against excessive power being exercised by the Executive, but one must also guard against red tape. We do not want to impose excessive red tape and excessive administrative procedures when they are not necessary. For that reason, I suggest that the proposal to include asphalt mixing and coating plants and brickworks under the Mines and Works Inspection Act is not acceptable at this stage. There may be circumstances in which we might want to do it. Then, if I were to accept the amendment, it would have to be done by way of regulation. I do not see that it is necessary to specify it at this stage.

Broadly, I am willing to accept the approach that declaring additional works to be works under the Mines and Works Inspection Act should be done by regulation, but other matters should be dealt with by proclamation. I therefore oppose this amendment. Perhaps the issue could be discussed generally at this stage, using the amendments now before the Committee to discuss the general question.

Dr. EASTICK: The Bill provides a vehicle with which to promote the views I advanced on behalf of the Opposition in the second reading debate as to the relative merits of regulations and proclamations. The Minister has indicated why he cannot accept one amendment which I proposed to move but would be in a position to accept another. The information given by the Minister and the comments I have made need to be looked at by a group of people very shortly. Whilst I would not press at this stage for the acceptance of the amendment which the Minister has indicated he will not support, I do not want the Minister to think that I will not be seeking support from colleagues in another place to press for it later. I assure the Minister, however, that there has been no discussion along those lines as yet.

I can see some of the difficulties the Minister has pointed out. Whilst the definition of "mineral" refers to anything on or under the ground or in the sea or in any other waters, it probably would allow for the inclusion of marine fibre.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Those words qualify the words "earthy substance".

Dr. EASTICK: It may well qualify only the preceding words. The definition of "mineral" goes beyond the natural meaning of the word. We see that situation so often in legislation that we accept a definition as encompassing a general range of substances within one area. I should like to look at the matter in greater detail and perhaps represent it elsewhere later. I should be grateful for the acceptance of the amendment in relation

to "works" at a later stage, because I think the validity of that argument is accepted.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think we are at the stage where we can go through the individual amendments.

Amendment negated.

Dr. EASTICK moved:

Page 2, lines 31 and 32—Leave out "by proclamation under this section" and insert "by regulation".

Amendment negated.

Dr. EASTICK moved:

Page 2, lines 33 and 34—Leave out "by proclamation under this section" and insert "by regulation".

Amendment negated.

Dr. EASTICK: I move:

Page 3, after line 4—

Insert subparagraphs as follows:

(ixa) asphalt mixing and coating plant;

(ixb) brickworks.

I do not put forward asphalt mixing and coating plants and brickworks as the only other works which eventually might be called into question under the definition of "works". Certainly, they are areas of activity so closely involved with the mining industry that they were almost like neon signs, blinking out their absence from the measure put to us. The definitions of mineral, mining, mining operation, and works are much more straightforward than were those applying in the original legislation. The Bill indicates to the public or to those working in the area the specific activities at which the department is looking. The areas of asphalt mixing and coating plants and brickworks are closely associated with the products defined under "mineral", and in many cases they are adjacent to or part of a mining operation. We believe that those two additional subparagraphs should stand part of the definition. I ask the Minister to reconsider his earlier expressed attitude and to accept them as completely legitimate areas of activity which should be contained within the new legislation.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There must be a line of division between the Mines and Works Inspection Act and the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act. They involve separate administrations—the Labour and Industry Department and the Mines and Energy Department—and two separate groups of inspectors. Before any change could be made to the definition of "works", we would need to effectively sort the matter out with the Labour and Industry Department.

It may mean that we might have to transfer an inspector from one department to another in order to cope with the change. Road-base plant might well include asphalt mixing and coating plant; it could well, under certain interpretation, be covered by that. In relation to any of these works, they are not covered unless they are situated on or adjacent to the place at which a mining operation is carried out; that is a restriction on the overall definition.

I will accept the honourable member's next amendment, so that any change in the definition of "works" must be done by regulation rather than by proclamation, thus meaning that it will come back to both Houses of Parliament. I ask him to accept my assurance that the two suggestions, namely, asphalt mixing and coating plant and brickworks, will be considered and, if it is appropriate, after discussion with the Labour and Industry Department and after the Bill has become an Act, we will introduce the necessary regulations to make the change.

I am having a few dollars each way, but I am suggesting that, if we are going to be more careful and do things by regulation as against proclamation in relation to what is to be defined as a mining work, we should also be careful about taking the two extra suggestions the honourable

member made and do some checking out with the departments involved before we do it and, if we are going to do it, do it by regulation, which will bring it back before the House.

Dr. EASTICK: I accept the situation as explained, but I hope that those preliminary discussions will take place between now and when the measure is considered in another place. Whilst we are accepting a situation which, by way of regulation, can correct any error or deficiency, we should strive in the first instance to pick up the obvious in the initial document, and then there is no doubt in the minds of people who are associated with the industry or who may be looking in from outside that suddenly they have to look beyond amendments to the Act and take into consideration regulations, which documents might not be immediately available to them. That is another area of difficulty with regulations. I will not force the issue now. The Minister has indicated that consideration will be given in the widest sense, and that, after all, is the real purpose of the debate today.

Amendment negated.

Dr. EASTICK moved:

Page 3, lines 12 and 13—Leave out "by proclamation under this section" and insert "by regulation".

Amendment carried.

Dr. EASTICK moved:

Page 3, lines 14 and 15—Leave out "by proclamation under this section" and insert "by regulation".

Amendment carried.

Dr. EASTICK moved:

Page 3, lines 16 to 28—Leave out all words in these lines.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This is a consequential amendment. As a result of what we have done, I suggest that the amendment be simply to strike out all the words in lines 24 to 26. We are still retaining proclamations in relation to declaring any substance to be a mineral or declaring any operation or class of operations to be or not to be mining operations, but we have removed the right to declare by proclamation any works or class of works to be or not to be works. Those words need to come out, rather than the whole wording of the new subsection as originally proposed. Will the honourable member accept my suggestion to alter lines 16 to 28 to lines 24 to 26?

The CHAIRMAN: It might be more appropriate if the honourable member was to move an amendment to strike out lines 24 to 26.

Dr. EASTICK: Very well; I move:

Page 3—Strike out lines 24 to 26.

The information that has been proffered is legitimate, and I accept it.

Amendment carried.

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister discussed this clause and the Bill as a whole with members of the Andamooka and Coober Pedy Opal Mining Associations, which are still considering it? If so, have they agreed with it? Having read the Bill, I realise that there are several areas about which they would not be pleased.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This clause does nothing to affect the situation of opals or opal mining. Opal was a mineral and operations in relation to opal mining came under the Mines and Works Inspection Act automatically. The clause does nothing one way or the other to alter the position with respect to opal mining.

Mr. Gunn: What about the other clauses?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member should ask about them when we reach them. I would not like to experience the wrath of the Chair.

Clause as amended passed.

Clauses 4 and 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Disqualification for office of inspector."

Dr. EASTICK: The alteration in paragraph (a) is to introduce the word "knowingly". I suspect that it has been effected for some particular reason. Is it for a person who had shares in a unit trust and who would not necessarily know that he was involved? Has the measure been introduced to offset that type of situation, or is there some other aspect to the matter?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That type of situation and also the possibility that someone might buy shares when a relatively young person, throw them in the bottom of a drawer somewhere and for years and years they were relatively valueless, and forget all about them or that he had them. Suddenly the operation starts up again and he has an interest in it, but he has not knowingly got an interest. He would be caught by the words that exist in the Act at present. This amendment does not arise from any particular instance. It was suggested, I think, by the warden from an excess of caution more than anything and in recognition of what would be fair in the circumstances.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 to 11 passed.

Clause 12—"Employment underground of certain persons prohibited."

Dr. EASTICK: I see that we have advanced to the point where sexism will no longer be associated with the mining industry, and henceforth women may go down a mine. Has there been a demand or a request for female staff to undertake any activities in mining that hitherto have been the province of men? More particularly, provision is made whereby persons who are under the age of 18 years may not be employed underground in a mine, except with the consent of the Minister. In what circumstances would the Minister expect to give such consent?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It was argued in relation to a proposed draft of the Bill that we should not include in the Bill a sex discrimination provision but should instead require that, if an exemption were necessary so that a mining operator operating underground thought that he should not employ a woman, he could apply to the Sex Discrimination Board for an exemption. We believe that that is the appropriate way to deal with this matter, since we have passed the Sex Discrimination Act. The removal of the female component in the old section 17 of the principal Act was done for that reason. If someone does not wish to employ a woman underground for a commercial proposition he must apply to the Sex Discrimination Board for an exemption for that purpose.

Regarding the other matter, I suspect that the original provision in section 17 of the Mines and Works Inspection Act dates back to the time when great concern was held about child labour in the mines in England, and legislation was passed in this country to prevent the possible repetition of the kinds of situation that occurred there. The old section provided that no boy under the age of 18 years or no girl or woman of any age shall be employed underground in any mine. "Employed" is the operative word. If a 17-year-old could not get work anywhere but underground in a mine, although in normal circumstances the Minister would not give approval for his employment, there might be circumstances where the employment of a 17-year-old was justified. It seemed to us at this stage in the advance of civilisation that we could include such a provision without any danger of charges of child labour being involved.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (13 to 16) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SAVINGS BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 3 August. Page 319.)

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill.

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

STATE BANK ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 3 August. Page 319.)

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I agree with the provisions of this Bill.

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

RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 15 August. Page 519.)

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I have discussed this Bill with the Renmark Irrigation Trust and there appear to be no problems so far as the trust is concerned. Therefore, I support the Bill.

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

SHEARERS ACCOMMODATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 3 August. Page 324.)

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): This measure is of immense interest to rural people. This is only a short Bill, but as drafted it contains far-reaching consequences. The Bill was discussed with the Stockowners Association and the United Farmers and Graziers Association. As a result of those discussions, there have been conferences with the Labour and Industry Department about some of the consequences of the Bill. Although it comprises only two clauses, the Bill gives additional powers to an inspector to go on to a property and require the owner, his manager or agent to answer certain questions. Inspectors in the past had difficulty in a specific case. I do not think the Minister told me this; it may have come from a manager in my district. I have not been able to isolate that specific case. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

Section 8 of the Act sets out the powers and duties of an inspector appointed under the Act with respect to the inspection of shearing sheds or buildings used for the accommodation of shearers. While the Act provides that obstructing an inspector in the exercise of his powers and duties under the Act is an offence, there is no provision in the Act to require a person on a property to which the Act applies to answer questions concerning shearers' accommodation put to him by an inspector.

In the specific case which gave rise to this measure an issue arose when an inspector had difficulty getting answers he required about shearers' accommodation. The case came

before a magistrate's court but was dismissed for want of evidence. This has resulted in a straight lift-out from the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, which provides that a manager or his agent must answer questions.

The police carried out these inspections previously and under their Act had the power to require a person to answer questions. The conference held about this matter was satisfactory, and I understand that the Minister has some amendments to put forward. The Opposition is concerned because new subsection (7) inserted by clause 2, provides:

A person is not obliged to answer a question put to him under this section if the answer to the question would tend to incriminate him of an offence.

I think that some people know that a police officer is required to warn a person being questioned that that person does not have to answer any questions which may tend to incriminate him. I am not sure, however, that the average person would know that, and I would like to see it spelt out more clearly in the Bill. I would like to hear from the Minister, either in his reply to the second reading or during the Committee stage of this debate, what will be the consequences of that. Will the inspector warn the person he is questioning about answers that tend to incriminate that person?

I think most people on the land understand that people who work for them are entitled to reasonable and fair accommodation. I think that in the main that applies. It is unfortunate that this one case arose.

One thing that does not appear in the Bill that the Opposition will seek to have inserted is that when a grazier, owner of a property, or a manager is to be visited, he should be notified of that visit. Because of the assurances I have received from the Stockowners Association and the United Farmers and Graziers that the agreement of the conference will make the Bill workable, I support the second reading.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): There is not much to reply to. As the honourable member has indicated, there is, I believe, reasonable agreement about the Bill. Conferences have taken place between the union, the industry and my department. I believe the matters under question will be best dealt with in Committee stages during which I will be moving amendments. The honourable member referred to the warning that should be given by an inspector when asking someone to answer questions. I am quite sure that my inspector, who has been on this job for seven or eight years, would be fair in his approach to all these matters, and in no circumstances would he try to take liberties beyond those that could be expected in normal areas.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Powers of inspectors."

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

Page 1—

Lines 12 to 15—Leave out all words in these lines.

Line 16—Leave out "any such inspection" and insert "an inspection under this section".

Mr. RODDA: I had arranged with the draftsman for an amendment which is not yet ready.

The CHAIRMAN: All the amendments on file are to clause 2. I understand that the amendment to be moved by the member for Victoria is to line 10, and this means that the Minister will have to withdraw the amendments he has already moved to amend lines 12 to 16, so that the member for Victoria can move his motion.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: That is a problem for the member for Victoria, not for me.

The CHAIRMAN: If the Minister will not withdraw his motion, which is perfectly legitimate and is the property of the House, we will have to go on to the motion of the Minister and the member for Victoria will not be able to move his amendment.

Mr. RODDA: If we cannot do that, we would then have to oppose the Bill. This puts me in an invidious position and the Committee into a foolish position. I think it was brought about by the speedy passage of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: As the member for Victoria did not move his amendment at the appropriate time, is the Minister prepared to allow the member for Victoria to have the opportunity to do so?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: This is not my fault, as the Bill has been before the House for a fortnight. However, we will report progress.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 648.)

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I support the Bill, which is an attempt at least partly to overcome the effects of the Trade Practices Act, a Federal Act. Section 51 (1) of the Trade Practices Act provides;

In determining whether a contravention of a provision of this Part has been committed, regard shall not be had—

(b) in the case of acts or things done in a State—except as provided by the regulations, to any act or thing that is, or is of a kind, specifically authorised or approved by or by regulations under an Act passed by the Parliament of that State;

The Trade Practices Act can cause certain problems to industry. It places specific restrictions on mergers. Because of its requirements, it can be difficult for mergers to proceed, and costly and time-consuming applications need to be made to the Federal Minister. The Trade Practices Act allows State Governments by way of a specific Act or regulation to exempt any particular act or kind of act.

The purpose of the Bill is to allow the Treasurer, through regulation, to declare a certain act a specific act and so exempt it from section 51 of the Trade Practices Act. The Federal Minister still has the right to override this provision by issuing a further regulation under the Trade Practices Act, as I understand it, so that in a specific case, if he believed there was cause for investigation or for the merger to be referred to the Federal Minister and examined, he could still pass a specific regulation that that be included under section 51.

I believe that this provision is in the best interests of South Australian industry. We are a small State. Our industry needs to compete against large companies in other States, and such a provision gives the Treasurer some scope to allow mergers to occur in this State without unnecessary delay or expense. I support the Bill.

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

SOIL CONSERVATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (AGRICULTURE) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

TRAVELLING STOCK RESERVES

The Legislative Council transmitted the following resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

That portions of the travelling stock reserves adjoining sections 216 and 219, in the hundred of Copley, sections 14 and 15 in the hundred of Gillen, section 1 in the hundred of Handyside and pastoral block 1146 north out of hundreds as shown on the plan laid before Parliament on 5 April 1977 be resumed in terms of section 136 of the Pastoral Act, 1936-1976, for railway purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. ABBOTT (Spence): The Leader of the Opposition said, during a recent adjournment debate, that he had one of his officers finding out the number of times that the Federal Government had been blamed by the State Government during this session for the State's ills, beginning with His Excellency's excellent Speech with which he was pleased to open Parliament. I thought that statement rather amusing, especially coming from the Leader, and I should like to make several comments about it.

It is pleasing to note that at least the Leader agrees that His Excellency's Speech was an excellent one. However, it is quite obvious from listening to the Leader's colleagues on the other side that they do not agree that the Speech was excellent. The Deputy Leader, for instance, was most critical; he found the Speech of the Governor a very uninspiring document, and that was putting a charitable complexion on it. Clearly, it seems that members opposite cannot agree whether a speech is a good one or a bad one.

What amused me more than anything else was that the Leader had one of his officers checking the number of times the State Government had blamed the Federal Government for this State's ills. In my opinion, that was quite a joke. The Leader must have a short memory. Perhaps Prime Minister Fraser has been talking to him in the same manner as the Prime Minister recently spoke to Robinson. If that is all the Leader's officers have to do, it does not say very much for the office of the Leader of the Opposition. Surely, there are more important things for his officers to be doing. For example, they could be drafting letters for the Leader to send to the Prime Minister asking for something to be done about unemployment. That would be a much more useful occupation for his officers to perform.

In addition, while the Leader's officer is checking out this matter, I wonder whether that officer would be good enough to find out the number of times Opposition members blamed the Whitlam Administration, when in office, for this nation's ills. Even today, we continually hear members opposite blaming Whitlam, even though he has been out of office for almost three years. I am confident that a survey would show that the Opposition was way out in front with its inane bleatings assigning blame.

I would not like to disappoint the Leader, but if he thinks that, as a result of his outbursts, members on this side are going to stop placing blame where it correctly belongs, he has another think coming. If it hurts, that is too bad. It is the truth, and the Leader knows it. The community and the business people know it, as do the workers, the students, and the school councils. All know where the blame lies.

I have received a number of letters criticising the actions of the Federal Government. Recently, a primary school council in my district wrote to me following a council meeting, expressing great concern at the announced cut-back in Federal funding to schools. In the light of the needs of that school and of other schools, the school council deplored the cut-back, and strongly urged that the matter be reconsidered shortly.

I have received a copy of a letter sent to the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations (Mr. Tony Street) by the Smithfield Plains High School, protesting at the disruption to the career education of year 10 students at that school. I will read the letter, to prove the point I am making. The letter, dated 30 June, states:

We wish to protest at the disruption to the career education of year 10 students at Smithfield Plains High School being caused by the failure of your department to supply the job manual for South Australia for our students by mid-June as indicated by previous correspondence from your department.

Staff at this school have spent considerable time and energy with generous assistance from the South Australian Education Department's Career Education Project, developing career education courses, but, as the collection of recent information of the volume and nature of that we expected to be contained in the job manual is beyond the extent of our resources, we had come to rely on the promise of your department's publication as a major student resource in our year 10 course. As this course needs to be in action by early July at latest, we have been forced to use the now out-of-date information provided in *Careers and Courses in South Australia, 1977*. The provision of up-to-date information about careers has been made impossible by the disappointing performance of your department.

We would appreciate a letter from you advising us of the steps you have taken to rectify this situation when the job information manual of South Australia will be available, and of action you will take to ensure that there will be no repetition of non-supply of promised resource material which has disadvantaged students.

We also wish to protest over the cessation of publication of *Careers and Courses for South Australia*. At a time when your Party and its partner are cutting back on public sector spending, the axeing of a largely self-supporting reference like careers and courses, and its promised replacement by a Government-funded reference seems an inconsistent and unnecessarily centralised action on the part of your department.

The letter is signed by the Career Education Project Officer, the Acting Senior Social Studies Officer, the Social Studies and Career Education Teacher, and the Senior Student Counsellor.

That clearly demonstrates, in my view, that there is a marked contrast between the efficiency of the Federal Government and that of the South Australian Government.

Following my recent question to the Minister of Education about work experience programmes for secondary school students in South Australia, he has provided me with some additional information on that matter that shows that, over the past five years, work experience programmes for secondary school students

have gained wide acceptance, both in schools and in the community. In 1977, over one-half of the secondary schools in this State's education system had some form of work experience in their curriculum, involving over 5 000 students and 1 700 co-operating employers. During the past two years, the expansion of these programmes has been rapid, and this has been achieved largely through the efforts of the Standing Committee on Work Experience in its continuing negotiations with representatives of employer and employee organisations, relevant Government departments, and the schools. I understand that it is the opinion of the standing committee that there seems to be no impediment to the successful expansion of the scheme to an even greater number of schools and students in 1978-79.

The Budget announced last Tuesday clearly shows that the Federal Government is continuing its attack on all the basic and important social matters that affect most severely this country's workers. The Commonwealth Budget is bad for the worker and his family; it is especially bad for children; it is bad for pensioners, the sick, and the elderly; it is bad for school students and school leavers, and it does nothing for the unemployed, except to make unemployment worse. The emasculation of Medibank—

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

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): Today has seen the release of a report that is of most serious consequence to everyone in South Australia. It is a report on the outlook for manufacturing in South Australia, an attitude study prepared by two firms of management consultants (Eric White Associates Proprietary Limited and W. D. Scott and Company Proprietary Limited), those two firms enjoying the highest reputation not only throughout Australia but also throughout the world. The findings of this report are alarming and most depressing. Significantly, they follow the most recent (July 1978) Australian Bureau of Statistics figures on employment in South Australia in various sectors. The figures, starting as they do in the publication from June 1973, and moving down finally through the months of 1977-78, show a steady drop in employment in the private sector. Indeed, they show a drop from the corresponding period of April 1977 from 184 600 to 170 500, which is a marked and considerable drop.

Employment in the manufacturing sector shows a drop since April from 87 700 to 81 400. That depressing state of affairs has been outlined by the Opposition regularly over the past 12 months. We regret that this position has to be outlined, but it is true. On reading the report, one can see exactly why this state of affairs is occurring in South Australia, and I quote from the introduction, as follows:

This report presents a summary of the findings from an attitude survey of South Australian manufacturers. The independent survey was undertaken during May, June and July 1978 by the Adelaide branches of Eric White Associates Proprietary Limited and W. D. Scott and Company Proprietary Limited. The purpose of the survey was to assess the level of confidence in the future for manufacturing in this State. Fifty-three senior executives from manufacturing companies in South Australia provided comments and opinions on a range of issues dealing with:

The outlook for manufacturing in South Australia and in Australia over the next three years; their expectations and plans for their own activities in the future; and their views on the opportunities and the problems confronting manufacturers in South Australia and Australia over the next three years.

For obvious reasons, in the short time available to me, I cannot cover all the comments that have been made, but I will try to give a picture of the thrust of the report generally. The report continues:

The majority of respondents are pessimistic in their outlook for South Australian manufacturing. Their outlook is slightly brighter for Australian manufacturing overall. About 90 per cent of respondents rated the outlook for manufacturing in South Australia as "unsatisfactory" or at best, "static", over the next three years; . . . 33 per cent of respondents named "high costs" or in some cases, "the cost disadvantage here" as being the major factor behind their pessimistic outlook for South Australia; 20 per cent of respondents mentioned State Government legislation, interference, and overspending as the reasons for their lack of confidence in the future; . . . a minority of respondents indicated that they were optimistic for the future of manufacturing in South Australia. Their views were closely tied to a brighter outlook for Australia as a whole. As well, improved prospects for the rural sector were mentioned as a positive factor in their outlook.

With the breaking of the drought and the increased activity that is likely to result in the rural sector, we will see an upsurge in manufacturing industry in those fields, particularly in the field of agricultural implements. I predict that Horwood Bagshaw, Shearers and other firms of that nature will increase their turnover and manufacturing activity during the next 12 months. I welcome that; it just goes to show how much we depend on the rural industry and the seasons that industry enjoys.

Mr. Rodda: There's gold in them thar hills.

Mr. TONKIN: There is indeed. The report continues:

More than half of the respondents are planning to commence major projects in the next three years—usually aimed at upgrading, or automating existing plant and equipment. Seventy-five per cent of the respondents with firm plans for further investment in manufacturing facilities indicated that at least part of that investment will be made in their South Australian facilities. Conversely, about 50 per cent of respondents with firm plans for investment projects said that the major share of funds will be committed to projects outside South Australia. Indeed, 25 per cent of respondents who will commence projects, indicated that they have no plans for further investment in their South Australian facilities.

That is a worrying state of affairs that should cause all of us great concern. The report continues:

Almost 80 per cent of respondents believed that employment in manufacturing in South Australia would continue to decline with the reorganisation of manufacturing activities. The majority of respondents see no change in the scale of their involvement in South Australia. However, some companies are planning to reduce their activities here through consolidation of their Australia-wide activities in the eastern States . . .

Twenty per cent of respondents said that they would expand their operations interstate and overseas while maintaining the present level of activity here. Federal Government policy, State Government legislation, elimination of any wage cost advantage, and the freight cost burden were the major issues raised by those respondents who are planning to reduce their involvement in South Australia . . .

The labour cost structure in Australia, State Government legislation and other cost disadvantages associated with location in South Australia are the major concerns expressed by manufacturers . . .

Thirty per cent of respondents said that the costs associated with State Government legislation, and the uncertainty caused by proposed State Government moves

were their major concerns at this time . . . The majority of respondents regarded State Government plans for industrial democracy with extreme suspicion.

That was a factor that was repeated later in the summary. The report, which is most alarming and depressing, does not auger well for the future of South Australia under a Labor Government.

A considerable time ago we put out as an Opposition an eight-point plan for the recovery of the private sector in South Australia and for the stimulation of the economy generally. The eight points included immediate pay-roll tax incentives; overhaul of workmen's compensation legislation; an immediate revision of restrictive and oppressive provisions, with licensing regulations and consumer protection increasing costs and inhibiting development; the restoration of South Australia's cost advantage by way of transport cost incentives; the introduction of capital tax incentives to enable South Australia to fall into line with the Commonwealth and other States on succession and death duties; a campaign to actively promote industrial and mineral development; the adoption of a policy of industrial democracy that involves voluntary participation and not worker control; and the immediate investigation of schemes for the restructuring of industry and the retraining of workers. That eight-point scheme has received general approbation throughout the private sector, particularly private enterprise.

The State Government's failure to promote actively mineral and industrial development in South Australia is one of the major obstacles to the State's development. I feel for the Minister of Mines and Energy because he knows perfectly well that until his Party adopts a sensible and sane attitude towards uranium we will continue to see this State stagnate. The State Government must take urgent action on this report. It has refused to face reality until now. Indeed, even today, the Premier calls people who have been the respondents in this report "troglydites, friends of the Liberal Party" and refuses to accept the seriousness of the situation.

Unless the Government puts aside its ideological commitment and puts the welfare of South Australia first, we may well pass the point of no return for industrial—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TONKIN:—development in this State.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows only too well that when the Speaker stands he must resume his seat.

Mr. Tonkin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I have stopped other members; this is not the first time. The honourable Leader once admitted that he had his back to the Chair and went on. The honourable member for Henley Beach.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Henley Beach): It is strange to hear the Leader carrying on here this afternoon in relation to difficulties confronting South Australia and again using documents to try to suggest that the considerable difficulties that industry and all employer organisations in this State are suffering under the Federal Government's policies are the fault of the State Government. One would have thought that he would start to realise, as has been pointed out by so many members on this side of the House, that it is time he started to take up these matters with the Commonwealth Government in the interests of South Australia, which he is supposed to represent.

Over the weekend I saw a clear example of Liberal thinking throughout Australia. The Prime Minister is reported to have said that the Budget had been exceptionally well received by Australians. He said:

I have spoken to many Australians over the past few days and, almost without exception, they said that we had produced a good Budget.

Like the Leader, the Prime Minister is living in a cloud cuckoo land. Immediately after making that statement I noticed, with much amusement, on a later film news report that the Prime Minister headed off to the football. It is a pity he did not stop there and speak with the many Australians there to ascertain what they thought of his Budget. Immediately he hit the football ground about 50 000 people indicated clearly what they thought of him and his Budget.

The Prime Minister is obviously living in a world of his own and the State Leader of the Opposition is living in his own little world, too. After the Budget, the Leader said that he was pleased that low-income earners and the socially disadvantaged would be the least affected by the Budget changes. Apparently, he thinks that low income earners do not smoke, like a drink, drive a car, do not have any children who go to school or do not need health care.

Mr. Slater: What about the maternity allowance?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: As the honourable member reminds me, the final pleasures of life have been taken from them, too, with the removal of the maternity allowance. I was willing to forgive the Leader for that error that he made the day after the Budget was announced because he believed he had to say something and said the first thing that came into his mind. On Wednesday evening I saw him on a news report when he was asked what he thought of the Budget. He gave stupid replies such as that to which I have just referred. He said, "We must remember that we are too fat; we must tighten our belt." That may be all right for the Leader and his other fat colleagues and friends, but what he should be doing is considering the needs of the people he indicated earlier—the socially disadvantaged in the community.

Instead of pointing out the difficulties confronting industry in this State, about which we have been talking for so long, and trying to suggest that the State Government holds all the solutions to the problems, why does he not join those on this side of the House to encourage people to canvass Liberal Federal members to see that the Federal Government policies are changed to improve the situation in the South Australian community.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Perhaps the Federal Budget was a result of the Leader's advice?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: In the light of the advice he tends to give other people in this State, that could well be so. I want now to comment about the honourable member for Mitcham's general criticisms and his suggestion, following an outburst in this House last week, that this Parliament is not functioning as it ought and that it is not sitting long enough. All honourable members will recall the way he reacted when the Deputy Premier promptly pointed out that he was hardly in a position to criticise because of the little time he spends in it. I could not agree more with that criticism.

It seems to me that since this session of Parliament commenced the honourable member has spent all of his time at the court. When the court closes at 4.30 or whatever time it ceases its business, the honourable member enters this Chamber, takes a seat, has his name recorded in the record and then, usually, there is an outburst from him in an attempt to get some cheap publicity to suggest to people that he has been here for some time.

I think the member for Mitcham is perpetrating a fraud on the people of this State, because he has been elected as a member of Parliament to represent his constituents and,

if a member shows such a lack of attention to his constituents and to the welfare of this Parliament, it is my view that Parliament should be looking to see whether it can change the system to ensure that people who act as irresponsibly as does the member for Mitcham in their attendance in this Chamber are not paid for the work they are supposed to be undertaking.

Mr. Evans: Is he paid for his court work? He might give his services free in the courts.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I do not think his services are free. Perhaps they ought to be, for the value they would be. Irrespective of that, the honourable member is the first to criticise any wage increase or improvement in conditions for members of Parliament and to suggest that they are unwarranted: in his case, they certainly are. I resent the honourable member's attacking other members' conditions and treating the Parliament with contempt, as he does.

While speaking of the honourable member for Mitcham, I want to refer to recent charges he made relating to massage parlours. On 19 July the honourable member gave what he felt was the correct description of a prostitute. He described them long-windedly as unintelligent, inarticulate, illiterate, lazy, selfish, bad tempered, ill-educated, emotionally unstable, socially irresponsible, dishonest, naturally incompetent, devoid of wit or humour, and immoderate in the use of alcohol, tobacco or drugs.

Mr. Chapman: Who are you talking about?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Certainly not the honourable member. The honourable member's description of prostitutes led me to the conclusion that he knew a large number of them very well. However, later he said

that his comments about prostitutes had come to him word for word from a manager in the business, so it seems that the member for Mitcham is prepared to take the word of a person who lives off the earnings of prostitution and then to report publicly on what he holds to be an apt description of women of that nature.

Mr. Abbott: He also knows what the charges are.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes, he does. I saw that reported the other day. His knowledge seems endless. On a radio talk-back programme soon after that statement was made somebody criticised him for his comments, and the honourable member said that he did not know whether it was true or not because he did not know any prostitutes, so he had made that statement on the word of another person.

Mr. Venning: You must be very interested in that.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am interested in the matter; it is of some concern to members of this Parliament. I know the member for Rocky River has a deep interest in the subject; he has mentioned this on a number of occasions.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The don't call him the "cocky from Rocky" for nothing.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: No. I am simply making the point that the member for Mitcham is prepared to grab publicity on almost any subject and then, later, confess that he knows nothing whatever about the subject and has relied on other people for his information. That is typical of the honourable member.

Motion carried.

At 5.45 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 23 August at 2 p.m.