HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 24 August 1978

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

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2) 1978

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

PETITION: VOLUNTARY WORKERS

Mr. TONKIN presented a petition signed by 71 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.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

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

SAMCOR

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The operations of the Port Lincoln abattoir have been scaled down due to the unavailability of livestock for slaughter. Because of the reduced livestock numbers on Eyre Peninsula, it is not anticipated that the existing work force will be greatly increased in the near future: indeed, it is Samcor's intention to endeavour to maintain a stable work force throughout the year without large peaks. The Port Lincoln abattoir, although registered with the Department of Primary Industry as an export abattoir, has not been registered with the United States of America Agriculture Department since May 1971.

CORBETT INQUIRY

In reply to **Mr. WILSON** (20 July).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Stock cards for the recording of issues of foodstuffs, groceries, and medical and surgical disposable items were removed from Government hospitals in August 1973. This action was the result of a survey of stock card procedures in hospital stores and had the approval of the Supply and Tender Board and the Auditor-General.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Happy Valley Primary School Replacement,

Stirling Sewerage Scheme (Headworks and Sewage Treatment Works).

Ordered that reports be printed.

QUESTION TIME

SAVINGS BANK

Mr. TONKIN: I direct my question to the Deputy Premier, in the absence of the Premier. What will the Government do to reduce the hidden tax payable by Savings Bank depositors, many of whom are schoolchildren, because of the provisions of the Savings Bank Act Amendment Act, 1974? In 1974 an Act was passed which, for the first time in the history of the State Government, required the Savings Bank to pay 50 per cent of its profits to the State Treasury. In the first year this hidden tax netted the Government $525 000 of depositors' funds. Since then, this figure has climbed to $2 732 000 for 1977. The Savings Bank has traditionally been regarded as the people's bank, with emphasis on encouraging schoolchildren to save a portion of their pocket money by making regular weekly deposits through the Savings Bank's School Banking Department. By maintaining this tax on their savings this Government is guilty of penny-pinching in every sense of the word.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition is commenting.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Whilst I am not familiar with the matter raised by the Leader, I point out that one of the cries that emanates from the Opposition benches every time a State instrumentality is talked about or formed is that that instrumentality does not compete fairly with private interests in the same area. The Opposition always complains that there is unfair competition between the State Bank and the Savings Bank on the one hand, as opposed to other banks, because State instrumentalities allegedly do not have to pay tax.

The Leader has suggested that the tax is on savings, but I, without knowing much about this matter, suggest to him that he is wrong. The tax would be on the operations of the bank or on any profits made by the bank in relation to its operations. I suggest to the Leader that, rather than being critical, he ought to see that this is in line with the Opposition's normal attitude: this is putting the bank in a more competitive position with others that compete for business with it. As I have said, I am not familiar with the point raised by the Leader, but I will have it checked out and I will get a detailed report for him.

PARKS COMMUNITY CENTRE

Mr. BANNON: What is the reaction of the Minister of Education to the reply he has received from the Federal Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development concerning the Commonwealth's financial contribution to the Parks Community Centre? Some time ago the South Australian Minister of Education wrote to Mr. Groom, the Federal Minister, asking him to re-examine the Commonwealth's contribution to this vital community development project, which the Commonwealth has been involved in and interested in since its inception, and pointing out the cost escalation that had occurred through no fault or inefficiency of those responsible for the project, but simply through a combination of effluxion of time and the detailed planning and cost estimating. The Federal Minister has replied to our Minister stating fairly baldly that, despite the significance of the project and the difficulties facing the South Australian Government, the Commonwealth is still not prepared to increase the level of Commonwealth assistance.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I do not have the official reply with me, and I thank the honourable member for making clear to the House exactly what the reply was. I would think that probably the reply was fairly predictable. It would be in line with the sorts of response that the State is now getting from the Commonwealth and in line with the sort of philosophy outlined in the recent Commonwealth Budget, which has come in for so much merited criticism. All I say is that the Commonwealth has sought from time to time to take some credit for this initiative in the honourable member's district. The Commonwealth should remember that an increasing percentage of the total outlay for this initiative is, in fact, from the State, because the Commonwealth was able to wriggle out of it with merely a cash commitment, instead of a percentage commitment, to the total project.

All we asked was that the Commonwealth give some additional cash commitment so that, in percentage terms, its original commitment would be adhered to. We will ensure that the Parks Community Centre operates in the way that it was originally intended to operate, but it is no thanks to Mr. Groom, or his Government, that that is to happen.

STATE BANK

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Because the State Bank in 1977 paid $1 600 000 as a direct contribution to the State Government, can the Deputy Premier say whether the Government, as a result of the severe shortage of housing funds, will now reduce the amount it requires the bank to pay in order that increased State Bank funds for housing will be available? State Bank contributions to the South Australian Government have increased from a meagre $515 000 in 1969 to a massive $1 600 000 last year. This is obviously money that should be used for extra housing funds instead of lining the State coffers.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member has not been very observant during the period to which he refers, because if he had examined the position, he would have realised that the Government has injected about $23 000 000 into the State Bank of South Australia for housing purposes during that time. I guess that included in that amount would be the $1 500 000 he is saying has been sunk into the State coffers. If we consider the matter in that light, we are losing about $22 000 000 on the deal.

HIGH SCHOOL CURRICULUM

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Education have his department examine seriously the possibility of having the high school curriculum brought more in line with present employment, or I should say in today's circumstances, non-employment, opportunities? For many years high schools have included shorthand and typing in their curriculum for girls. It seems that the curriculum should, basically, provide young people with training that will assist them to obtain work and not train them in an area in which they will never practise. I refer particularly to girls, because those who live in a heavy industrial environment should be prepared at school to accept employment in heavy industry, even if it is on the factory floor, and should not be trained in a field in which few opportunities exist for their future.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Two recent initiatives will assist in this area. The honourable member has clearly isolated a problem which exists and which, of course, has been recognised by others. First, the prime initiative for the curriculum rests with individual schools and, on the face of it, one would imagine that this would provide a wide range and diversity in courses offered and that these courses would be a reaction to the local situation and needs of that community, including the employment needs among other things.

What we find is a much greater uniformity of curriculum offerings than this pattern would tend to suggest. The reason is that history of public examinations for secondary schools in this State still survives in the form of the Matriculation public examination. There tends to be an assumption that a significant number of students from our high schools will attend tertiary education and that they therefore must be prepared for the entrance examination to the tertiary system, that is, the P.E.B. That, in turn, affects the configurations of curriculum down through high schools to year 8.

This produces, therefore, a higher degree of uniformity than might otherwise have been expected and a higher degree of academic bias in the curriculum than might otherwise be the case. There are two things which, apart from changing community expectations, generate a more realistic appreciation on the part of parents that not all their children will be doctors, lawyers, teachers, or something like that. First, the reorganisation of the Education Department has produced a so-called curriculum directorate, which is working to provide a better definition of the core curriculum and greater assistance for schools in the development of curriculum materials. We hope that there will thus be greater flexibility to respond to local needs in that way.

The second thing that is happening is that the former Director-General of Education (Mr. Jones) is heading a committee of inquiry into year 12 assessment in the schools, and that committee may make recommendations to the Government about modification of the existing form of year 12 assessment. At present, there is a two-tier system, the traditional P.E.B. Matriculation examination and a form of year 12 assessment. That may be changed when the committee that Mr. Jones is heading reports to me, and probably that will be about Christmas time this year. I hope that those changes will also help schools to be more flexible in curriculum offerings and, therefore, to be able to better discharge their obligation to the people for whom the honourable member has such understandable concern.

ELECTRICITY TRUST

Mr. EVANS: Will the Deputy Premier say whether the Government will reduce the amount that the Electricity Trust of South Australia is required to pay to the State Government by way of direct contributions, and does he agree that the $7 000 000 paid to the Government in 1977 is a major contributing factor to the State's cost disadvantage? In 1971 the contribution from the trust to State Government coffers was about $500 000 and, in the year ended June 1977, the contribution was $6 900 000. During the intervening time, the State Government has also increased from 3 per cent to 5 per cent the amount that must be paid. I ask the Deputy Premier whether the Government intends to reduce the amount that the trust is required to pay to the State, because of the disadvantage that the contribution creates for industry, in particular.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The reply is "No". The line of questioning by the Opposition this afternoon seems to be directed towards State revenue being reduced, while the Federal colleagues of members opposite are increasing taxes at the same time as they are giving the States less. I

do not know what the Opposition's plot is.

Mr. Chapman: It's on the—

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot quite follow the logic of what the Opposition is doing; it is difficult for me to see any sense in it.

GOODWOOD OVER-PASS

Mr. ALLISON: Can the Minister of Transport say when a contract will be let for rebuilding the Goodwood tramway over-pass for which tenders closed on 14 June, having been called with some urgency?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The tenders are at present being evaluated and in due course a tender will be let.

REDCLIFF PROJECT

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy tell the House the current position of Loan Council deliberations on the priority of the Redcliff petrochemical project? I am sure this information would be of great benefit to all members. As some of the lead times involved in this project are critical, I am anxious that the Minister should inform the House of the present position.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: When it met at the time of the Premiers' Conference, Loan Council appointed a working party, consisting of State Under Treasurers and the Federal Secretary to the Treasurer, to assess the relative position of each of the projects that the States had submitted to the Commonwealth for additional Loan Council funding. That working party has met, I think, on three occasions. The provision of additional information by the States in relation to each of their projects has been completed. Each authority has had an opportunity of questioning any State in relation to its submissions. Those questions have been answered, and I understand that the working party is now in the process of drafting the report; hopefully, that report will be available for Loan Council at the end of this month.

We in this State have asked for a further Loan Council meeting, hopefully early in September. One complication is that, at this time of the year, the Federal Treasury and the State Treasuries are all heavily involved in Budget matters and, whilst we in South Australia have completed everything that has to be done in relation to the matter and are willing to attend any meeting that is called, I understand there are one or two difficulties with some State Under Treasurers in arranging times to finalise the working party's report to the Loan Council.

We have expressed the view on occasions that the work of the working party is a matter of extreme urgency in relation to the Redcliff proposal. I understand that, about 10 days ago, the Premier wrote to the Prime Minister formally requesting a further meeting of Loan Council early in September to consider the report of the working party, and hopefully to make a decision to give approval in principle for the additional borrowing by Government authorities that is required for the Redcliff project.

CITRUS INDUSTRY

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Deputy Premier say whether the Government supports the submission made on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture to the Industries Assistance Commission inquiry into the citrus industry? Part of the submission and the recommendations of the State Government to the I.A.C. inquiry recommends that the level of assistance to the orange sector be a tariff of either 6 cents on a single strength litre of orange juice or 25 per cent. The Government is well aware that, at the moment, the citrus industry has a tariff protection of 65 per cent on imported juice concentrate.

In further correspondence from the Government to the I.A.C. following the report, in a letter it was stated that the South Australian Government was in general agreement with the I.A.C. draft recommendations for long-term assistance to the citrus industry, and that the level of tariff protection was comparable to that recommended by the South Australian Government in its submission. The I.A.C. recommendation was for a reduction from 65 per cent to 20 per cent. It is considered by industry leaders that, if the Federal Government were to act on the recommendation of the South Australian Government, and since South Australia is the major citrus producing State of Australia, the citrus industry in Australia would be annihilated, because 50 per cent of citrus produced in Australia goes into juice. Not only would the juice market be wiped out, but enormous pressure would be thrown on the fresh fruit market, ruining that market, also. Can the Minister say whether it is Government policy for tariff protection to be reduced to 25 per cent?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot recall any transaction of the type to which the honourable member has alluded, but I will certainly get a report for him as quickly as possible to see whether the points that he has made in fact are correct, because there seems to be some discrepancy somewhere.

NATIONAL PARKS

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Can the Minister for the Environment say whether the present policy of the National Parks and Wildlife Division is being directed towards the purchase of additional national parks, or towards the management of existing national parks? Recent figures show the substantial area being held by the Government as national parks, and obviously there is a need to provide the community with facilities within those parks.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I appreciate the honourable member's interest in this matter. As a former Minister for the Environment, he was involved in the purchase of land that has been set aside as national parks. From memory, I think we have some 193 national parks, representing more than 4·6 per cent of the State's total land mass. I think it was in 1967, when I was Minister of Lands then responsible for the National Parks Commission, as it was then known, that the Government took a policy decision to aim to set aside at least 5 per cent—that was not to be the maximum—of the State's total land surface as national parks.

It was also decided as a matter of policy at that time that the financial resources of the Government that were devoted to this area should be utilised in the purchase of land suitable for national park purposes, and that policy has been followed until recently. I believe that policy was decided on quite correctly, because we were afraid that if we did not act as quickly as we could, given financial limitations, there would be nothing suitable left to set aside for national park purposes.

I believe, however, that we have reached a stage where there needs to be, and there will be, a change in policy. More of the financial resources devoted to this area will be directed towards the development and management of

national parks.

Mr. Gunn: Hear, hear!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The first step towards that situation has, of course, been taken. As the honourable member for Eyre will appreciate, it will require a fair sum of money. I am in the throes of establishing a trust that will do a specific job in relation to various national parks. The Black Hill Conservation Park Trust, which has been established and is going well, will cater for both scientific interests and passive recreation.

I recently indicated to the House that I would establish a further trust to take over the operations of those recreation-type parks in and near the metropolitan area. I will establish another trust to look after Cleland Park, which can be further developed for the benefit and enjoyment of people not only from Adelaide and this State but also from interstate and overseas. This will enable the national parks to have an injection of funds, because each of these trusts will be capable of borrowing up to $1 000 000 a year, which will be serviced from general revenue. I hope that in a relatively short time we will see a great improvement in those parks which have a lot of visitors and at which the greatest wear and tear occurs.

The establishment of such a trust will also enable the department to look further afield at the development of parks in other parts of the State. In many cases, there is inadequate or no fencing at all on parks, and there are certainly no plans for developing many, if not most, of them. We will try to put this matter right as soon as possible. However, I think honourable members understand that it will take some little time to do this, as much expense is involved. We will need additional staff for the National Parks and Wildlife Division. Indeed, I made representations, successfully, to the Government before the manpower freeze, but unfortunately I will have to start again from scratch. However, I have been successful until now in gaining 10 additional positions, which will be filled shortly, in national parks.

I hope that this change of policy and the steps that I have already taken will show the South Australian public a rapid improvement in this area in the next two or three years and, in the longer term, a marked improvement in national parks across the whole State.

NATURAL GAS

Mr. WILSON: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say what is the present position regarding South Australia's natural gas reserves and what plans have been made to conserve them, bearing in mind that such reserves could be vital for use in any future adoption of the Urenco method of uranium enrichment?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will answer the latter part of the question first. I do not see a relationship between those reserves and the gas centrifuge method of uranium enrichment. No gas from the Cooper Basin would be used for uranium enrichment if it was established in South Australia. The gaseous diffusion method of uranium enrichment requires large amounts of power, probably at least equal to if not greater than South Australia's current generating capacity. Obviously, the gaseous diffusion method is not a practical proposition for South Australia or for probably most other States. However, the centrifuge method involves not large amounts of power but an amount that would be within the normal capacities of our system.

Gas reserves are obviously of vital importance to this State both for the South Australian Gas Company and for the Torrens Island power station. Once the northern power station is built, being a base-load station, it will result, to an increasing extent, in Torrens Island's becoming a peak-load station. Torrens Island is on an interruptible gas supply so that, if gas is required for other purposes, Torrens Island can be switched over to oil as and when required, although, because of the price of oil, it mainly uses gas.

The Government is concerned about the level of reserves in the Cooper Basin. In the course of development of the Cooper Basin indenture and the unitisation of interests in the basin, the Government took action to ensure that future contracts were written with the gas suppliers (that is, the Cooper Basin producers) to make sure that, provided the gas is in the basin, South Australia has first right of supply. At that time, contracts were written with the Cooper Basin producers, first, to provide a further 100 billion cubic feet a year from 1988 to 2005 and, secondly, to give the South Australian Pipelines Authority the first option on any further gas that was discovered. At that time, the Government started to consider the need to upgrade the amount of exploration being carried out in the Cooper Basin.

An exploration indenture entered into with the Cooper Basin producers required them to spend $15 000 000 prior to February 1979. In addition, at the time price change was negotiated in the middle of last year, agreement was reached with the Cooper Basin producers for the Government, initially through the pipelines authority, but now through South Australian Oil and Gas, to undertake $5 000 000 worth of additional exploration each year in the Cooper Basin. We are in the process of renegotiating the licences for the Cooper and Pedirka Basins, and further agreements are in the course of being negotiated relating to future exploration, as the exploration licences have to be renewed next February.

The only other factor that has changed recently is that the Australian Gas Light Company, in Sydney, is taking only 50 per cent of the contracted quantities of gas. Under the terms of the A.G.L. contract, A.G.L. is up for 80 per cent take or pay. If it does not take 80 per cent, gas that has not been taken is available for its use in future years of the contract. However, anything over 80 per cent reverts for the use of South Australia.

So, the fact that A.G.L. is not even up to 80 per cent of its contracted quantities has already meant that some gas that was allocated to A.G.L. has not been taken up by it. The problem that A.G.L. has relates to the competition with fuel oil in Sydney. The refinery situation in Sydney is such that large quantities of fuel oil are being dumped on the Sydney market. Despite the high price of oil, the fuel oil available in Sydney is probably the cheapest in the world. Whether the recent changes in excise will affect that situation to any significant extent and make A.G.L. somewhat more competitive with fuel oil than it has been so far remains to be seen. Certainly, while from South Australia's future gas supply point of view there is no worry, and while the Cooper Basin producers have carried out the development expenditure in order to have the capacity to sell gas in Sydney, they are not selling the quantity of gas that they expected to sell, and their overall financial position is not as good.

The other problem that arises out of that position is that the National Pipelines Authority must be having chickens every time it looks at its accounts, because the amount of gas being transported down that Sydney line is nowhere near enough to finance the pipeline. I noticed that about $14 000 000 was provided in the Federal Budget this year for a transfer to the National Pipelines Authority, no doubt to meet the losses that that authority is experiencing.

TOURISM

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Deputy Premier say whether the Government subscribes to its Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department's policy advice to hotel and motel proprietors that they should "go broke" and be damned? Recently, an interstate traveller indicated that he had been unable to obtain accommodation in Clare on a Sunday evening. The proprietor had been unable to provide service economically on the weekend. Subsequently, a letter was received from the department indicating (as the *Northern Argus*, the local paper, commented yesterday) the following:

> The suggestion from the division, over the name of its publicity officer, Mr. J. Myers, and obviously written by the direction of, and with the blessing of, the Director of Tourism, Mr. Geoff Joselin, would almost make a saint swear. Open up at weekends, pay no heed to penalty rate expenses, work seven days a week, is the "fatherly" advice of these hard-headed civil servants from the city.

The full context of the letter written by the department to the hotel proprietor was and is available from a previous edition of the *Northern Argus*. It is clear that the department has told all hotel and motel proprietors that they are expected to provide this service to the public regardless of whether it is economic for them to do so. The final words in the editorial of the *Northern Argus* are:

> "Go broke, Mr. Publican," that is the considered advice of the Department of Tourism, "but smile bravely while you are doing it."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I take it that the portion of the report to which the honourable member referred was the paper's interpretation of the letter and not the actual words contained in the letter?

Dr. Eastick: It was the content of the letter previously directed to the paper.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I want to know whether the statement about opening up seven days a week and paying penalty rates, etc., is contained in the letter or whether it is the paper's interpretation.

Dr. Eastick: It was contained in the letter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am talking about the words printed, as opposed to the tone of the report. I believe I am right in assuming that it is the paper's interpretation of the letter that was received. Of course, I do not know anything about the matter and will certainly have it considered. I was under the impression that a provision in the Licensing Act required hotel keepers to provide this sort of service if it was requested and the hotel was not full. Maybe that situation has changed, but I am not aware that it has. That is the requirement, and it is known by the licensee at the time he applies for a licence. As I say, the situation may have changed, but I will certainly check up on the matter to see whether or not the statement referred to was made in the letter. I have not heard of too many publicans going broke lately.

INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF THE CHILD

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister of Community Welfare provide the House with up-to-date information on preparations for next year's celebrations of the International Year of the Child? Does the State Government intend to make a grant available to community groups to cover the cost of administration and publicity?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I thank the honourable member for raising this matter as it will allow me to bring members up to date with planning preparations for the International Year of the Child, 1979, an important event in the life of children, not only in South Australia but throughout the world. Most members would be aware from recent media coverage that a State steering committee, comprising 31 members from community, voluntary and Government areas, has been set up and that it operates on a co-chairing basis, being chaired alternately by Mr. Ian Fairweather, of channel 9, and the Director-General of my department. The Secretary of the committee informed me only today that he is receiving many requests from community groups, organisations and individuals seeking information and, what is more important, seeking involvement in community activities for that year.

Members would also be aware that a committee of children has been established with the help of the steering committee's education subcommittee. The children's committee comprises 26 children aged from nine to 12 years and represents Government, independent and Catholic schools. It will be the task of that committee to remind members of the State steering committee that children may have a point of view on their needs that could differ from the adult view. The schools that these children represent will soon be asked to set up internal committees of children to ensure a wider involvement in I.Y.C. activities. In that way I hope a greater "kid" level input can be made in connection with the activities that will occur next year.

To ensure that we can involve the widest number of children, letters will be sent out soon from the steering committee asking Regional Directors of Education to establish regional committees of children throughout the State and seeking the involvement of all primary schools, whether in the city or the country.

In reply to the honourable member's second question with respect to finance, I point out that the State Government has committed $25 000 to cover administrative and publicity costs for I.Y.C. and to enable grants to be made to local community groups on a ceiling basis.

FROZEN FOOD FACTORY

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Deputy Premier table in Parliament at the earliest opportunity a complete listing of all food dishes and their respective weights and costs for all frozen food supplied to Government institutions from the Frozen Food Factory? In addition, will the Deputy Premier table all cost quotations given to all other organisations or institutions for the supply of frozen food from that factory? How does the Deputy Premier explain the discrepancies between actual costs and the Premier's stated average of $1·25 a meal during 1978-79? In Parliament on 3 August 1978, the Premier said the Frozen Food Service had been asked to budget on the basis of $1·25 a meal in 1978-79. He also said an average of the existing meals from the Frozen Food Service was $1·18 a meal. However, I know that, if a patient orders grilled lamb chops, vegetables and baked plum pudding, the cost will be as follows:

	$
Cost of the two loin lamb chops in each serve ...	1·56
Cost of one roast potato	0·11
Plus cost of other two vegetables, depending on the type of vegetable	0·20
	1·87
Plus dessert of baked plum pudding	0·22
Total meal	$2·09

This meal cost of $2·09 differs greatly from the $1·18 that the Premier claimed was the average cost. The cost of $2·09 also differs greatly from the $1·25 which is supposed to be the average cost in relation to the current financial year. This morning I had some steak and kidney prepared from frozen food and produced by a private company. It was delicious, and I stress that it was delicious despite the fact that it was 35 per cent cheaper than the equivalent food produced by the Government's Frozen Food Factory.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: How much gravy was in that steak and kidney pie?

Mr. Venning: How much horse flesh?

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In view of the inaccuracy of the information given by the Leader of the Opposition in connection with another line of food from the Frozen Food Factory, I will certainly have the figures given by the member for Davenport thoroughly checked. I do not know why he needs all the information he has sought.

Mr. Tonkin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the honourable Leader of the Opposition to order. I cannot hear the answer.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Perhaps the honourable member needs this information so that he can go back to his private company, which can then compare the prices and see whether it can improve its game.

A member interjecting: Perhaps there's less water.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: There could be less water and all sorts of things. He seems to know a fair bit about it. It is not a bad meal for $2·09. I would not mind being able to feed my eight kids on that sort of fare. It would be cheaper than the food I am getting at the moment.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do quite often, because I like their company, not because the food is cheap. I will confer with the Minister of Health and find out whether he considers this is a reasonable request. If he does, and supplies the information the honourable member has requested, I will then supply it to the honourable member.

DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. WOTTON: Can the Minister for the Environment say why there is to be a substantial increase in the salary advertised in the media for the new Director of National Parks and Wildlife Services? Is the increase a reflection of the hike in senior public servants' salaries in 1978-79, or does the increase represent an element of danger money for having to work in close proximity to the Deputy Premier?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Obviously, the Opposition enjoys the honourable member's warped sense of humour. As I have often said to this House, I am a gentle, kindly and considerate person.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: And very humane!

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: And very humane. Also, I never lose my temper, even if I must say so in my own defence. There is no truth at all in this rumour, which the honourable member has obviously picked up off the lavatory wall, that the increase from the level of EO1 to EO2 is due to the person's having to work in close proximity to me.

It is a recognition by the Government (by the Public Service Board, in fact) that the position carries many responsibilities and that the responsibilities will increase in future. It was my intention to have the salary of the Superintendent of Field Operations (who is effectively second-in-command to the Director) upgraded also, but there was a problem about parity, which I hope I can overcome soon. However, that position has been called at a slightly increased level, again for the same reason; that is, that it is a recognition by the Public Service Board and the Government of the added responsibility that will be thrust upon the shoulders of that man.

GUN LEGISLATION

Mr. BECKER: Can the Attorney-General inform the House when legislation will be introduced to prevent the sale and purchase of replica guns and pistols in South Australia? An advertisement appeared in the *Australian Post* on 10 August 1978 regarding a "snub-nose revolver" for $9·95. The advertisement states:

> Blank firing pistols that load and fire loud blanks as fast as you can pull the trigger.

Included in the advertisement is mention of an automatic pistol for $9·95. It contains an application form with blanks for name, address and postcode and states:

> Enclosed: cash, money order or cheque.

The advertisement also states:

> See our showroom at the Gold Coast.

These guns can be purchased from the Collectors Armoury, Box 444, Burleigh Heads. In very small print the advertisement states:

> We regret that, under the New South Wales Firearms and Dangerous Weapons regulations, purchase of these items is prohibited in New South Wales.

The Australian Bank Officials Association wrote to the Attorney-General on 9 August drawing his attention to this advertisement. The letter states:

> Quite frankly, the association in this division is horrified that such "weapons" can be purchased through the post and, if the drawing can be believed, then only an expert could tell the difference between the real thing and replica. I would draw your attention to the small print wherein it states that the sale of these weapons is prohibited in New South Wales by law—that State is to be commended for this action. It is my understanding that some similar legislation is being prepared in South Australia and I would be grateful to learn if this is so.

In view of the association's concern about the regrettable increase in the number of armed hold-ups in this State and throughout the remainder of Australia, can the Attorney be specific in stating when this legislation will be introduced?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I think this matter concerns my portfolio rather than that of the Attorney-General. Honourable members will know that a new Firearms Act was passed in 1977, and that Act has still to be proclaimed, because the very complicated process of drawing up the regulations is still in operation. Draft regulations have been prepared and distributed to a wide range of interested organisations, including the Bank Officials Association, to try to meet possible objections and to ensure that the regulations are as effective as possible. That stage has been completed and a new draft has been prepared on the basis of submissions made by a whole range of organisations. Those draft regulations are being considered before being sent to the Crown Solicitor. The whole operation of implementing the scheme will depend on a sophisticated computer system that has been designed to ensure that a proper tab is kept on all registrations.

The Act contains provision for banning imitation firearms that could be taken by people to be real firearms. Recently, miniguns were advertised in the *Advertiser*, and I thought the honourable member intended to refer to this matter when he asked his question. Those guns were alleged to fire blanks, but I got a report on the matter and found that the guns were about 4 centimetres long and I think they must fire caps rather than blanks, because they have a solid barrel. It seems from the question that in New South Wales it is considered necessary to ban the items that the honourable member has mentioned, and I would be surprised if they were not banned under our new legislation also. However, I will get a report for the honourable member.

BIRKENHEAD BRIDGE FIRE

Mr. WHITTEN: Will the Chief Secretary find out whether sufficient foam was available to fight adequately the fire on the Birkenhead bridge on Tuesday night? As most of the metropolitan and near country supplies of petrol pass over the Birkenhead bridge and through Port Adelaide, if sufficient supplies of foam are not on hand will he have the matter rectified? A report on the front page of yesterday's *Advertiser* about the fire that unfortunately occurred on the Birkenhead bridge states:

> Firemen from eight appliances with four support vehicles poured foam on to the blazing wreckage until 11.30 p.m. The foam ran knee deep in places into the gutters and the river. Extra supplies of foam had to be rushed to the area from Adelaide in fire trucks with police escort.

It seems that the report was to the effect that insufficient foam was available to fight the fire.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I have inquired about this matter and have been told that at no time in the fighting of the fire was there a shortage of foam. However, the matter was exacerbated because the fire took place on a slope on the bridge and the foam that was poured on to the blazing wreckage ran off quickly and into the river. This made it necessary to call for further supplies of foam which were supplied from headquarters, where a reserve is kept so that it can be made available wherever it may be needed in the metropolitan area. I understand that the foam arrived in good time to be used at the fire.

I shall get a further report for the honourable member but, as I understand the situation, adequate supplies of foam were kept to handle any normal operation, bearing in mind the usual practice that additional supplies are kept in reserve stocks at headquarters. The position is analogous to that relating to the use of other appliances. Although there is a risk of fire in the Port Adelaide area, because of the nature of the area and the wharves, it is never expected that sufficient fire appliances will be kept in Port Adelaide to handle any fire that could occur. This situation applies throughout the metropolitan area, and it is customary to bring appliances from other areas to deal with any serious fires that occur. I think the same position obtains in the case of foam as in the case of appliances.

BICYCLES ON FOOTPATHS

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Transport give a positive statement of the Government's attitude to cyclists using footpaths within the metropolitan area? A newspaper report in the *Advertiser* on 21 December 1976, under the heading, "Cyclists could use footpaths", quotes the Minister as saying that cyclists may soon be allowed to use footpaths on parts of Adelaide's main roads, and that they would be asked to leave the footpaths only where there was high pedestrian activity near shops. The Minister was reported to have said that he regarded the footpath proposal as only a stopgap remedy.

I have been approached by residents in my district, and also principals of schools and teachers, who are concerned about the prevailing situation and the hazards caused by schoolchildren riding bikes on footpaths. When confronted by principals and teachers, the children say that they are allowed to ride on footpaths, because of the report in the newspaper, under the direction of the Minister.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: All that goes to prove is how unreliable are newspaper reports or how unreliable is the interpretation of them. The operative word on which the honourable member did not lay great emphasis was "may". If he goes back to the explanation and the newspaper report he read to the House, the comment attributed to me was that at some stage cyclists may be allowed to ride on footpaths. The Road Traffic Act prohibits that, and the only way in which the situation can be changed is for the Act to be amended. That has not taken place.

When the proposition was placed before the Road Traffic Board for consideration, the board reported to me that it did not believe an amendment to the present legislation would be in the best interest of all concerned. I accepted that advice and made public comment on it. That situation stands. It is unlawful for anyone to ride a bicycle on a footpath. There are one or two exceptions—wheelchairs, for instance—but generally it is unlawful for a person to ride a bicycle on a footpath.

Mr. Mathwin: Why don't you make it public?

The SPEAKER: Order!

MINERAL RIGHTS

Mrs. ADAMSON: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether he supports the granting of unfettered mineral rights to Aborigines?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Cabinet policy, when it is announced on this matter, and when any legislation is introduced, will be the policy of the Government. As a member of the Cabinet, I will support it in full. The Labor Party's position on this matter has been to ensure adequate land rights for Aborigines and to ensure that there is appropriate consultation between anyone who wants to explore or indulge in mining activity in relation to Aboriginal lands. That position applies at present.

Any mining or oil company that wants to indulge in exploration in any Aboriginal reserve in South Australia must negotiate and consult with the Aboriginal people and, if agreement is not reached, the exploration does not go ahead. It is as simple as that. A couple of years ago I think Shell was negotiating in order to explore in the Officer Basin, but did not reach the stage of finalising an agreement with the Aborigines in the area, so did not proceed.

That indicates the Government's attitude all along towards exploration of this nature; if it is to take place on Aboriginal reserves, the local Aboriginal people cannot be ignored, and their agreement must be sought and obtained in relation to what is to happen. That may make it a bit more difficult, but it is something that has to be done. That is the policy that I have been administering.

At 3.6 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MUSEUM ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the South Australian Museum Act, 1976. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill proposes amendments to the South Australian Museum Act, 1976, which will allow for a more efficient method of enforcing regulations relating to parking offences on museum land and which will bring the principal Act into line with the provisions of the Art Gallery Act, 1939-1978.

Section 20 of the principal Act empowers the Governor, on the recommendation of the Museum Board, to make regulations for the control of parking. As the Act stands at present, however, the only remedy against an offender is prosecution in court. This is both costly and time consuming. The Bill provides for the expiation of an offence by payment of a prescribed expiation fee. This is a procedure commonly used by local councils for parking offences. The offender can pay the expiation fee or accept the risk of prosecution. Usually, the offence is expiated and the need to prosecute the offender is avoided.

The State Library, the Museum, and the Art Gallery face similar problems relating to unauthorised parking and driving on their land. One problem is that there are no clearly defined boundaries between the land controlled by each of them. It is therefore desirable that uniform legislative provisions and regulations apply to all three institutions. The Bill will make the principal Act uniform with the Art Gallery Act. A Bill to amend the Libraries and Institutes Act, 1939-1977, bringing that Act into line with the Art Gallery Act, will be introduced with this Bill.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 paragraph *(a)* adds power to regulate, restrict, or prohibit the driving of motor vehicles on land controlled by the board. This is in addition to the existing power to regulate the parking of motor vehicles, and brings the Act into line with the Art Gallery Act. Paragraph *(b)* adds to section 20 of the principal Act subsections (3) and (4). Subsection (3) is an evidentiary provision that will facilitate the proof of ownership and control of a vehicle the subject of a prosecution. Subsection (4) provides for expiation of an offence.

Mr. MATHWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Libraries and Institutes Act, 1939-1977. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill is designed to give to the Libraries Board power to borrow money for its purposes under the Act. It is envisaged that the new borrowing powers will be used to assist in the expansion of library services that is now taking place. The Bill will also enable the Governor to make regulations that regulate, restrict, or prohibit the driving or parking of motor vehicles on land under the control of the board and will, in addition, provide an efficient method of imposing penalties on offenders who contravene the regulations.

Regulations under the new provisions will be aimed principally at the land on North Terrace. Similar provisions already exist in the Art Gallery Act, 1939-1978, by virtue of amendments made earlier this year. It is intended to introduce into Parliament, with this Bill, a Bill that makes similar amendments to the South Australian Museum Act, 1976. The three Acts will then enable the making of uniform regulations on this subject for the North Terrace land of all three institutions. Uniformity is desirable, because there are no clearly defined boundaries between the land controlled by each board and because they face similar problems in the control of driving and parking on their land.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 removes the reference to moneys voted by Parliament in section 20 (5) of the Act. The reason for this is to allow the board to use both moneys voted by Parliament and money that it borrows for the purposes mentioned in the subsection. Clause 3 enacts the borrowing power as section 20a of the Act. The power is similar to that already given to statutory bodies such as the Art Gallery. Clause 4 removes the reference to moneys voted by Parliament for the reason given in the explanation to clause 2. I now deal with clause 5. Paragraph *(a)* adds a new paragraph to the regulation-making power that will allow the Governor, on the advice of the Libraries Board, to regulate the driving and parking of vehicles. Paragraph *(b)* increases the maximum penalty in a regulation to $500 to bring this provision into line with the Art Gallery Act. Paragraph *(c)* will add two subsections to section 149 of the principal Act. Subsection (2) is an evidentiary provision that will facilitate the proof of ownership and control of the vehicle in question. Subsection (3) provides for an efficient means of enforcement by way of expiation fee. This procedure obviates the expensive and time-consuming process of prosecuting every offender in court.

Mr. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMMUNITY WELFARE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Community Welfare Act, 1972-1976. Read a first time.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The principal object of this Bill is to effect amendments to the principal Act that are consequential upon the recently introduced Children's Protection and Young Offenders Bill. As the principal Act now stands, children may be placed under the "care and control" of the Minister in various circumstances. To all intents and purposes, a care and control order vests the Minister with all the powers of a guardian, and so it is proposed that the terminology of the principal Act be changed to the extent that such orders will be referred to as "guardianship orders". No major substantive amendments are proposed by this Bill, as the principal Act is now being subjected to a general review that probably will result in proposals for further legislative changes.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act on a day to be proclaimed. Clause 3 amends the arrangement of the principal Act. Clause 4 inserts a further transitional provision dealing with care and control orders made under the principal Act. These orders will be deemed to be guardianship orders as from the commencement of this amending Act. Clause 5 repeals definitions that are redundant, and amends other definitions to accord with the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act. The terms "neglected child" and "uncontrolled child" will no longer be used, as such children will be known as "children in need of care".

Clause 6 provides that the Minister and the department may provide supervision and counselling for children generally. Clause 7 amends a heading to a subdivision of the principal Act. Clause 8 provides that a guardian of a child who is in need of care may apply to the Minister for an order placing the child under the Minister's guardianship. The criteria for deciding whether a child is in need of care are substantially the same as those provided in Part III of the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act. It is made clear that a guardianship order under this section must be for a specified period, and may not extend beyond the time at which the child turns 18 years.

Clause 9 re-enacts section 40 of the principal Act in a clearer form, without making any change to the substance of the section. This section deals with temporary guardianship orders that may not exceed three months. An order may be made under this section in an emergency situation, whether or not the child is in need of care.

Clause 10 effects sundry consequential amendments. Clause 11 repeals a heading, thus amalgamating subdivisions 1 and 2 of this division. Sections 42 to 49 will now apply only to guardianship orders made under this Act, and not to orders made under the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act. Clause 12 deletes a reference to the "correction" of children, as young offenders will no longer be within the ambit of this division. Clause 13 effects a consequential amendment. Clause 14 gives the Director-General the same powers in relation to a child under guardianship under this Act as he has in relation to a child under guardianship pursuant to the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act.

Clause 15 replaces references to the "apprehension" of a child with the terminology used in the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act. Clause 16 removes inappropriate references to the "detention" of children under guardianship under this Act. Clause 17 effects consequential amendments. Clause 18 repeals a section that provided for the extension of guardianship beyond the age of 18 years. This is now seen to be unnecessary. If a child is incapable of managing his own affairs upon becoming an adult, then proceedings could be taken, if appropriate, under the Mental Health Act.

Clause 19 provides that either a guardian, or the child himself if he is of or over the age of 15 years, may apply to the Minister for an order discharging the child from his guardianship. As the principal Act now stands, a child cannot make such an application. Appeals from decisions of the Minister under this section will be dealt with by the Children's Court. Clause 20 is a consequential amendment. Clause 21 provides that the Director-General may constitute assessment panels. Clause 22 is a consequential amendment. Clause 23 enacts an interpretation section, with the effect that certain of the sections in this miscellaneous division will apply not only to children under the guardianship of the Minister pursuant to this Act, but also to children under the guardianship of the Minister pursuant to the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, and children detained in any place pursuant to that Act.

Clause 24 amends section 74 so that the section will apply to the categories of children referred to in the explanation of clause 23. Clause 25 re-enacts section 76 in a form that includes all necessary consequential amendments. It is now thought to be inappropriate to have an offence of absconding from a home, particularly in relation to children who are merely under the guardianship of the Minister. The Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act makes provision for children in detention who prove to be uncontrollable. Such a child may be transferred to a prison in certain circumstances. Clause 26 is consequential upon clause 25.

Clause 27 deletes the prohibition against persons who communicate with children in homes without first getting the approval of the Director-General. It is now seen to be quite sufficient merely to prohibit a person from communicating with such a child where the Director-General has expressly forbidden communication. Clauses 28 and 29 effect consequential amendments. Clause 30 repeals the section that deals with the transfer of children from homes to prison where they prove to be uncontrollable in the home. Such a provision is quite inappropriate in relation to children under guardianship. A similar provision appears in the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act in relation to children who are being detained in any place pursuant to that Act. Clauses 31, 32, 33 and 34 effect consequential amendments.

Clause 35 makes clear that the Minister and departmental officers are not liable in tort for the acts of any child under the guardianship of the Minister under any Act, or a child being detained in any place pursuant to the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, whether or not the child is actually on the premises in which he is being detained. Clause 36 strikes out a provision relating to proceedings against a child for an offence. This matter is now covered by the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act. Clause 37 effects a consequential amendment.

Clause 38 repeals a section that provides for the management of the estate of a child whom the Minister believes is incapable of properly managing his own affairs. The Mental Health Act now provides the proper machinery for dealing with such a situation. Clause 39 expands the regulation-making power to cover the treatment of children detained in any place pursuant to the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act. For the sake of convenience and simplicity, it is better to have in one place all the regulations dealing with homes under the

direction of the Director-General of Community Welfare.

Mr. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONTAINING, CONTROL AND REGISTRATION OF DOGS

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence. Report received.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I rise on a point of order regarding this report. I refer you, Sir, to Standing Order 395, which reads as follows:

> The evidence taken by any Select Committee of the House, and documents presented to such committee which have not been reported to the House, shall not be disclosed or published by any member of such committee, or by any other person.

I refer to the front page article of yesterday's *News*. Assuming that this article was accurate (I have not seen the report, but the article certainly purports to be an accurate one about what the report would contain), it seems that someone has breached that Standing Order and has given information to a newspaper, which, through publishing that information, has thereby breached the same Standing Order. I personally regard the Standing Order as absurd, and have asked my colleagues, the other Party leaders, to support me in having altered the arrangements of secrecy surrounding Select Committees. I was gratified to find that the Liberals will support that move, although the Government turned it down. However, while we have got the Standing Order—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Mitcham to keep to his point of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Very well, Sir. While we have the Standing Order, it should be enforced or some explanation sought for its breaching. Yesterday's article states:

> A Parliamentary Select Committee was set up to investigate the proposals, and its report will be tabled in the House of Assembly tomorrow.

Below that was printed, "New registration fees for dogs will be $5 a year", and so on. Some action should be taken to ascertain who breached the Standing Order and why, and why the *News* published this material a day early, presumably to jump the gun on the *Advertiser*. Be that as it may, there has been a breach of the Standing Order and, while we have that Standing Order (although I would like to see it altered), I think it should be enforced, and that is why I raise this point with you.

The SPEAKER: I have not read the article or the report to which the honourable member has referred. However, I will obtain copies, and give my ruling at a later date.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government) moved:

> That consideration of the report be made an Order of the Day for Tuesday 12 September.

Motion carried.

HARBORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 August. Page 518.)

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the Bill, which makes a number of disparate amendments to the Harbors Act. As the Minister said in his second reading explanation, some of the amendments are of rather more significance than others. I might say that the Minister's explanation was brief enough. He said that one of the most significant amendments increased the minimum size of vessels for which compulsory pilotage was required. A perusal of the Bill indicates that it is intended that the size of the vessel will be 200 tons in lieu of 100 tons, which is a fairly significant change in relation to vessels requiring pilotage.

I have made inquiries regarding this clause, and it transpires that the people most affected by this provision will be fishermen. However, that was not made at all clear in the Minister's second reading explanation. Further, it seems that few vessels other than fishing vessels would come within the 100 tons to 200 tons range. It seems fairly reasonable to me that fishing craft that ply to and fro frequently in South Australian waters should not be required to take on a pilot. So, there is no difficulty with that provision.

The Bill contains certain other amendments relating to definitions, to harbor lights, lighthouses, etc., to which no objection could be taken. I was interested in the provisions of the Bill dealing with compulsory acquisition of property and the power the Bill seeks to give to the Minister to dispose of foreshore property. I hope that the Minister will make clear (because it is not clear from reading the Bill or the parent Act) what will apply in relation to the acquisition of property. I take it, although it is not explicit in the explanation, that the Land Acquisition Act will apply to any property that the Minister seeks to acquire. At face value, the Bill gives the Minister wide powers indeed. Clause 10 provides:

> Subject to this Act, the Minister may deal with, or dispose of property acquired, or vested in him, under this Act as he thinks fit.

The sections to be deleted from the principal Act set down a fairly rigid code for the ways in which the Minister may deal with property that is acquired. Those sections will be deleted if the Bill is enacted, thus giving the Minister complete power to deal with or dispose of property acquired. Also, the mechanics for the acquisition of property are changed somewhat under the terms of the Bill. I want to know that the Land Acquisition Act, introduced in 1969 by my predecessors, applies to any land the Minister may acquire. I take it that the Land Acquisition Act overrides an Act such as the Harbors Act.

The only other matter I draw to members' attention is one that has been raised by my colleagues, most recently by the member for Light, in relation to the Ministerial power and authority. The Bill vests in the Minister the authority to dispose of foreshore property by proclamation and this means, in effect, that we have Executive Government; Parliament loses control over the situation completely if this is done by proclamation. On principle, we object to government by proclamation. We believe that as much as possible should come within the purview of Parliament. For that reason, I do not believe that we should pass the Bill unamended. In Committee, I will move amendments which may appear minor in their scope but which give effect to the Opposition's view that any envisaged changes should come under the review of Parliament. If changes are made by regulation, they come before Parliament, but if they are made by proclamation they are simply an act of Executive Government. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Repeal of s.6 of principal Act."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister assure the

Chamber that the Land Acquisition Act overrides any authority vested in the Minister in terms of this Act, as this is essential for the protection of the public?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Marine): If the Deputy Leader cares to examine the Bill he will note that new subsection (4) of section 8 of the Act provides that the Land Acquisition Act shall apply to the acquisition of land under this Act.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 to 11 passed.

Clause 12—"Care, control and management of foreshore, etc."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I move :

Page 4, line 12—Leave out "proclamation" and insert "regulation".

As the Parliamentary Counsel is otherwise occupied at a Select Committee hearing, I apologise to the Chamber for not having had drafted these fairly straightforward amendments. What I seek is to ensure that any changes to be made in the administration of the foreshore, as delineated in new section 44 (3), be made by regulation, and not by proclamation. I do not know whether any subsequent drafting is required. I simply wish to change "proclamation" in subsection (3) of new section 44 to "regulation".

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Couldn't we say "prescribed"?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is where I need the services of Parliamentary Counsel. My intent is clear. We on this side would prefer changes to be made by regulation rather than by proclamation because any changes would then come under the view of this Chamber. I apologise for the fact that my amendment is not in writing.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I would prefer that the Parliamentary Counsel examine the way in which the amendment should be drawn.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I would, too.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have no strong objection to the amendment, except that I would like the opportunity to check with the department to see whether there is any extraordinarily difficult administrative reason why the term should be "proclamation" rather than "regulation". What the honourable member is suggesting is a much more expensive procedure, but it enables members to peruse whatever is involved, object to it, and move for its disallowance if they disagree with it. I do not wish to take that advantage away from members, provided there is no difficulty of the kind to which I have referred. I undertake to have the matter examined. If I find that the amendment is reasonable, we will certainly move it in another place. If we find that the amendment is not reasonable, I will inform the honourable member, who can then take whatever steps he wishes to take. The procedure I have outlined is better than proceeding at this stage with an amendment that may be improperly drafted. I could ask that progress be reported, but I would prefer that the Bill proceed on the basis of the undertaking I have given to the honourable member.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I accept the Minister's undertaking, which satisfes everything we could wish for at this stage. The Minister said that the provision for regulations might be more expensive, but I do not think it would be grossly more expensive, although it may slow down the procedure somewhat. Because regulations come before the House after they are made by the Government, Parliament and the people have an opportunity to know what is going on. We do not get anything for nothing, but I do not think the additional cost will be great. I thank the Minister for his courtesy.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Whitten): I understand that the honourable Deputy Leader seeks leave to withdraw his amendment on the basis of the honourable Minister's assurance.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, Mr. Acting Chairman. I seek leave to withdraw my amendment, because the Minister has given an undertaking that he will examine it and, if the Government considers it to be feasible, the Government will move it in another place. If the Government decides not to accept my amendment, I understand that the Minister will inform me. I ask him to inform me in sufficient time if his decision is adverse, so that my colleagues in another place can consider whether they should pursue the matter further.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

Dr. EASTICK: Earlier this week the Opposition stated that it was more kindly disposed toward regulations than proclamations; it regarded regulations as the lesser of two evils, because the issuing of regulations allows members to seek their disallowance. The Parliamentary Library has indicated to me that the record of debates in the Legislative Council on 23 August 1950 (*Hansard*, pages 372-8) indicates that there is an opportunity for a proclamation to be challenged in the Parliamentary system; it requires an address to be passed by both Houses before the matter of the proclamation can be challenged. I appreciate that that makes it even more cumbersome, but I believe that that comment is pertinent to the other discussion that has taken place in this Chamber on two previous occasions this week. I know this will be one of the matters that the Deputy Premier will consider in connection with the undertaking he has given.

Clause passed.

Clauses 13 to 21 passed.

Clause 22—"Duty to take in pilot."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I would like the Minister to explain the reason for this clause. I have been told that vessels in this range are fishing vessels and that fishermen required this change in the law. I was told also that few other vessels would come within this 100-ton to 200-ton range. Is that correct, and will the Minister explain the change in the provision concerning compulsory pilotage? Further, why has the measurement not been changed to metric tonnes, when other provisions in the Bill make metric changes?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This measurement remains in tons, as that is the universal measurement in relation to shipping. An approach was made, I think about two years ago, to the Director of Marine and Harbors, and it eventually came through to me, about the increasing problem arising from changes in the type of fishing taking place, particularly prawn fishing, whereby every time a prawn trawler, for example, in excess of 100 tons went into or out of the port it was required under the Act to have a pilot on it. I gave an undertaking that during the previous session I would amend the Act, and this was overlooked.

Because I had given an undertaking and did not meet it, I waived the charges administratively. I think we put the pilot on board in order to comply with the Act, but we waived the charges for his services. True, the increase mainly concerned fishing vessels. I am not sure whether ketches such as those plying to Kangaroo Island came into this category. It is not sensible to expect people who constantly ply into and out of the port to require a pilot's services. The reason for the increase is that the tendency is for the fishing fleet to use larger vessels and it is possible that, with the exploitation of deep-sea fishing, vessels up to 200 tons will be fairly common in future.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (23 to 39) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier) moved:
That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. RUSSACK (Goyder): Last Saturday afternoon, when I attended a football match in the Mid-North, I had not been there long before a councillor from a district council and two other councillors who represented wards in two other district councils approached me because they were concerned about the condition of the roads in the area. One road passing through a certain area is being torn up, not by local traffic particularly but by many heavy transport vehicles.

This is a matter of concern to the three councils in the area, but it is of singular concern to councils throughout the State, especially this year. This year, there is a greater need for roadworks after the deluge we have had, the welcome rain which has transformed the countryside and which will be the means of producing primary products to assist the State and the Commonwealth with exports and also helping to improve the unemployment situation.

I should like to know why, over the years, there has been a gradual decline in the funds going from the State to local government for roadworks, especially funds coming from the Commonwealth Government. Why has the Government passed on less money this year than in previous years? The Minister of Transport has often said that the responsibility lies with the Federal Government . Perhaps it does in determining the overall sum of money for roadworks which comes to this State but, on 1 August, I asked the Minister a question about this year's allocation and the allocation to local government. The reply was as follows:

> Rural councils have already had an allocation of $3 895 000, to the Monarto Development Commission $5 000, and to urban local roads there will be an allocation of $2 200 000 which has not yet been allocated, making in total $6 100 000.

The following statement appeared in the Budget papers regarding roads:

> The Commonwealth provides grants to the States for expenditure on the construction and maintenance of roads, including roads which are the responsibility of local government authorities. Although the relevant Commonwealth legislation does not determine any particular amount which the States must provide to local government, in each State amounts determined by the State are passed on to local government authorities for expenditure on roads which are the responsibility of those authorities.

I repeat the significant words: in each State, amounts determined by the State are passed on. On 15 August, I asked the Minister a question, as follows:

> Does the Minister regard the 1978-79 Commonwealth Government grants of $43 207 000 for roadworks as being in the category of tied grants?

The answer was simply "Yes". If they are tied grants, then the priority must have been given by this State, because the document states that the State has the responsibility for allocating the money.

In fairness, I thought it would be appropriate to make a comparison with the situation in other States. The New South Wales Government allocates to local government 21 per cent of the money received from the Federal Government for roadworks. The figure in Victoria is 38 per cent, in Queensland 15 per cent, in Western Australia 34 per cent, in Tasmania 23 per cent, and in South Australia 15 per cent, equal to the percentage in Queensland; all the other States have a much higher percentage. I have taken the percentages in round figures. The South Australian allocation to local government is, with that in Queensland, the lowest of any State. This year, I could ask the Minister another question, as follows:

> Why has the Government passed on less money percentage-wise to local government this year than last, despite the fact that there has been a substantial increase percentage-wise in the amount received from the Federal Government?

I have also checked this by asking a question of the Minister. Last year South Australia was allocated $40 400 000; this year we were allocated $43 207 000. This is a 7 per cent increase. Admittedly, South Australia has given a little more to local government in money terms. Last year the amount given to local government by South Australia was $5 971 000. This year it is $6 100 000, but of the amount received from the Commonwealth last year South Australia gave to local government 14·8 per cent. This year it is giving only 14·1 per cent. Therefore, I ask the Minister to say why, as the Federal Government has given 7 per cent more to South Australia this year, the State has reduced the amount given to local government by ·7 per cent?

Dr. Eastick: See if you can run it at your own direction.

Mr. RUSSACK: That is exactly right, and I am sure than money received from the Federal Government is allocated in categories used by the Highways Department. We talk about unemployment: one way in which employment can be distributed throughout the country is through local government. There was a time when there was a scheme known as the debit order scheme, under which road work was carried out by local government in a most efficient manner, but this year there seems to be a different principle again. In most cases the money allocated by the Government must be spent on one particular road. I can name many councils that have been given an amount that will enable work to be done on about 1 kilometre of road, and it will take 15 to 20 years to complete that road. Applications and recommendations from the councils themselves have been ignored in the allocation of those grants.

I summarise by saying that South Australia is giving the lowest amount of any State in the Commonwealth to local government. In this State this year local government will receive less money than last year, despite the fact that 7 per cent more was received from the Federal Government. The Minister of Local Government has said on numerous occasions that local government should stand on its own two feet. That is true, yet the Government continues to keep knocking local government behind the knees so that it cannot stand on its own two feet.

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): In the short time at my disposal I want first to elaborate on the question I asked the Minister of Education earlier this afternoon in respect of curricula in high schools, particularly relating to future employment of young girls, if I can talk about employment in the current unemployment environment. There is an obvious need for change in those curricula. I want to talk first about the problems of employment of young girls in an environment of heavy industry.

I asked my question this afternoon, because I seriously believe that the current curricula at high schools are not necessarily helping people, particularly young girls, to obtain employment. Surely, employment is now hard enough to find without increasing that difficulty in relation to school curricula. I had the good fortune a week ago to attend a certain high school at Whyalla, at which I addressed a class that contained an abundance of young girls of Leaving standard. When I suggested to that class that young girls might have to accept a change in their

curricula to enable them to obtain work as apprentices in heavy industry, it seemed that they were appalled at the thought.

I point out that women generally have fought for equal rights. They do not believe, for example, in sex discrimination, but believe in equal pay and equal working conditions, and this is a fundamental matter that should be a right in our society. However, I believe that women must accept their changing role in the work force. In the heavy industry environment, only limited employment opportunities are available for shorthand-typists or private secretaries. The present inclination is to have a work force of women in industry that is subsidiary to heavy industry. I refer to such industries as the manufacture of work clothing and even to the production of electric light bulbs, the tourist trade (including hotels), and hospitals.

I remind members that the Further Education Department building in Whyalla offers enormous opportunities for training hairdressers, both men and women. There is also opportunity for young people to be shop assistants, and a need for processors and assemblers in heavy industry. If the matter is looked at in its proper perspective, I believe that the process worker in heavy industry involves the most important issue facing young girls who are attending school in that environment. I now refer to a report headed "Report calls for work equality" in the 24 February issue of the *Advertiser*, part of which states:

> An investigation commissioned by the Further Education Department has called on the department to commit itself to work equality for women. The report, "Women as Workers", was issued yesterday. It was compiled by Miss M. Corich, a D.F.E. lecturer at Strathmont College of Further Education.
>
> Miss Corich recommends that the commitment be a departmental priority endorsed by colleges and branches of the department. "The commitment should try to remove barriers to women taking part in departmental programmes", she says. These include a lack of child care facilities, prohibitive fees, insufficient financial support, inflexible time tables and a lack of bridging, re-entry and refresher courses to meet the needs of South Australian women.

That may be so, but I point out, with great respect to Miss Corich, that, if this report is correct, she should examine the real question of whether women support this type of report. I question whether they do, and whether, for example, young girls attending high school today even remotely think about doing courses different from those that they are doing.

In other words, they are too eager, in my opinion, to undertake shorthand or typing courses, thinking that they will all become private secretaries or stenographers. Common sense tells us that, on leaving school, there will be only a limited field for their qualifications. They ought to be looking at some more positive vocation.

I also question whether we should be examining the continuing unemployment figures and whether we should seriously look at the role of married women in the work force. Although I support the principle of single or married women working, I question whether, in the present unemployment environment caused by the Fraser Government, adult or young males will be able to obtain employment. Perhaps we should also take time to examine our current priorities. Whether or not men like it, in some cases the wife earns more than the so-called breadwinner. I also question, as I have done previously, whether married women should be given a greater priority in the work force than the young single girls attending high school who will leave school next year. The *Transcontinental* of 9 August, under the heading "It's a man's world, at least in employment", states:

> "Women in employment" was the theme of the address in Port Augusta last week by the new Commissioner of Equal Opportunities (Mrs. Joan Colley). Addressing a well-attended meeting of members of service clubs and their wives, Mrs. Colley revealed that today 40 per cent of the work force were women, with 64 per cent of those married.

I question whether we should not be examining the role of married women in the work force. We should also consider the courses being undertaken by the young girls at high school.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): During Question Time today, I raised the issue of the Frozen Food Factory. In particular, I quoted to the House certain costs of meals prepared by the factory, and compared those costs to what the Premier said were the average costs of meals produced in the factory during 1978-79.

There is another area about which I will grieve and which relates to the same project, namely, the capital costs of establishing the factory. Considerable concern exists in the community at the waste of taxpayers' funds by Governments generally. The Frozen Food Factory at Dudley Park is an example of how millions of dollars can be wasted through over-capitalisation. The facts reveal not only over-capitalisation, but also wastage. I believe that the Parliament is being grossly misled over the cost of the factory. In January 1974, the Parliamentary Public Works Committee approved the construction of the factory, and its report may be found in the library. The factory was to cost $4 225 000. Of the estimated cost, $125 000 was allocated for the purchase of the land. Therefore, the estimated cost, excluding the land, was to be $4 125 000. In March 1975, the cost of the factory had escalated to $5 200 000, and that is carefully recorded in *Hansard*.

The figure does not include the cost of land. Approval was not sought in Parliament (I have checked through *Hansard*) or justification given to Parliament for the $1 000 000 increase in this cost, or what was a 25 per cent increase in just on a year. The sum of $350 000 had been set aside in the original estimate in 1974 to allow for a 10 per cent increase in overall costs in the construction of the factory. When approval was given by the South Australian Government for the project to proceed, the cost was further escalated to $7 000 000. The new estimate contained an allowance for "the cost escalation up to date of completion". I am quoting the Minister of Health as reported in *Hansard*.

Parliament was not informed about this huge jump in costs. Again, I have checked through *Hansard* to make sure that is so. In January 1977 the estimate was further increased to $7 986 000. The new estimate included an additional allowance (this again from *Hansard*) of $400 000 for professional fees for the construction manager, Austin Anderson (Australia) Pty. Ltd., and an additional $116 000 for additional equipment to go inside the factory.

In March 1978 the cost of the factory (again as recorded in *Hansard*) had escalated by a further $625 000 to $8 616 000, despite the allowances made on two earlier occasions to cover cost escalations. I have referred to those two occasions. Apparently, further expenditure has occurred since March. I understand, from talking to one or two people, that the final cost could well be over $9 000 000. Professional fees for the construction of the factory were estimated in 1974 (according to the Public Works Committee report) at $430 000 but, by the completion of the project late last year, that fee allowance had increased to $1 100 000; in other words, an increase of more than 200 per cent. According to *Hansard*, the factory

started operations on 25 October 1977.

I believe that there should be a full investigation of the rises and the reason why those rises have occurred and why there is such a discrepancy between the original estimate presented by the Public Works Committee and the final costs, as revealed to this House, by an examination of *Hansard*. Such a rise, without an explanation to Parliament, is scandalous.

From 1974 to 1978 costs increased by 103 per cent. Certainly, there has been no justifiable explanation given to the House by the Government, particularly the Minister of Health, for that increase. Cost increases have far exceeded the general rise in construction costs for the period. The original cost estimates in 1974 had already been inflated by 10 per cent to allow for such cost increases. The price index for building materials, other than housing, which I got from the Australian Bureau of Statistics, increased by only 21 per cent during the two-year period during which the factory was being constructed. I have also checked the cost of building labour and the consumer price index, and they increased by only a small amount compared with the 103 per cent rise in the factory cost. I remind the House again that this 103 per cent rise is apparently not the final cost for the factory. Some estimates say that it could go over the $9 000 000 mark, which would increase that percentage increase even more.

The factory was initially designed to produce 25 000 meals a day, but apparently this capacity was increased, after approval had been given by the Public Works Committee. I have checked that figure in the Public Works Committee's report, which certainly states that approval was given for a factory with a capacity of 25 000 meals a day. Who made the decision to increase the factory's capacity; why was it made; and why was Parliament not informed? These are crucial questions, because at present the factory is producing well below its maximum capacity. I was told this morning that one estimate was that it was producing at just over 50 per cent of its capacity.

There is evidence suggesting that the Frozen Food Factory is grossly over-capitalised and under-utilised. The South Australian Government, and especially the Minister of Works and the Minister of Health, must bear full responsibility for this waste of taxpayers' funds. The factory can be likened to a similar Government bungle in connection with the construction of Samcor's southern meat works. More than $8 000 000 and possibly $9 000 000 of taxpayers' funds has been used to build the factory, but we have had no explanation as to why an additional $4 000 000 or $5 000 000 was necessary to construct that factory. Further, we have had no explanation as to why that factory has the capacity to produce far too many meals.

Obviously, millions of dollars of taxpayers' funds has been wasted. It is scandalous that Parliament has not been informed, first, as to the reason for the increased costs, secondly, as to the reason for the increased capacity and, thirdly, as to the reason for the capacity of the factory being under-utilised. Those fundamental questions need answering. Then we could see why the cost of a meal from this factory is well above the estimate given by the Premier. During Question Time today I said that the cost—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: —of a meal was $2·09.

The SPEAKER: Order! Several times the honourable member has continued in this vein, and I hope he ceases. It is not good enough for the honourable member not to resume his seat when the Speaker calls "Order!".

Motion carried.

At 4.9 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 12 September at 2 p.m.