

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 28 September 1978

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Administration of Acts Act Amendment,
Constitution Act Amendment (No. 2),
Evidence Act Amendment,
Soil Conservation Act Amendment,
State Transport Authority Act Amendment (No. 2).

PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

The Hon. G. T. **VIRGO** presented a petition signed by 35 electors of South Australia praying that the House would pass legislation to provide for Ministerial responsibility adequately to control pornographic material.

Mr. **KLUNDER** presented a similar petition signed by 176 electors of South Australia.

Mr. **TONKIN** presented a similar petition signed by 212 electors of South Australia.

Mr. **BECKER** presented a similar petition signed by 73 electors of South Australia.

Mr. **GUNN** presented a similar petition signed by 38 electors of South Australia.

Mr. **MILLHOUSE** presented a similar petition signed by 32 electors of South Australia.

Mr. **RUSSACK** presented a similar petition signed by 86 electors of South Australia.

Mr. **MATHWIN** presented a similar petition signed by 113 electors of South Australia.

Mr. **DRURY** presented a similar petition signed by 42 electors of South Australia.

Mrs. **ADAMSON** presented a similar petition signed by 348 electors of South Australia.

Mr. **ALLISON** presented a similar petition signed by 239 electors of South Australia.

Mr. **ARNOLD** presented a similar petition signed by 203 electors of South Australia.

Mr. **BLACKER** presented a similar petition signed by 94 electors of South Australia.

Mr. **RODDA** presented a similar petition signed by 59 electors of South Australia.

Mr. **WHITTEN** presented a similar petition signed by 92 electors of South Australia.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: VIOLENT OFFENCES

The Hon. J. D. **CORCORAN** presented a petition signed by 17 residents of South Australia praying that the House would support proposed amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to increase maximum penalties for violent offences.

The Hon. G. T. **VIRGO** presented a similar petition signed by 99 residents of South Australia.

Mr. **KENEALLY** presented a similar petition signed by 103 residents of South Australia.

Mr. **RODDA** presented a similar petition signed by 88 residents of South Australia.

Mr. **CHAPMAN** presented a similar petition signed by 280 residents of South Australia.

Mr. **ALLISON** presented a similar petition signed by 147 residents of South Australia.

Mr. **RUSSACK** presented a similar petition signed by 104 residents of South Australia.

Mr. **GUNN** presented a similar petition signed by 103 residents of South Australia.

Mr. **BLACKER** presented a similar petition signed by 944 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

PETITION: VOLUNTARY WORKERS

Mr. **TONKIN** presented a petition signed by 112 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.

PETITION: OLD CEDUNA SCHOOL HOUSE

Mr. **GUNN** presented a petition signed by 198 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to expedite the establishment of a National Trust museum at the old schoolhouse at Ceduna.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

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

LAND TAX

In reply to Mr. **GOLDSWORTHY** (13 July).

The Hon. D. A. **DUNSTAN**: Land tax is levied on the unimproved value of land as determined by the Valuer-General according to a five-year cyclical valuation programme covering all taxable land in South Australia. About one-fifth of the State or from 90 000 to 120 000 valuations are made each year. This means that the one-fifth of the State under general valuation in any year is always ahead of the other four-fifths. The level of unimproved value for the local government areas in the fifth of the State under general valuation each year is determined by reference to the most recent land sales which have occurred in those areas or from analyses of the most recent sales of improved properties. In general, land tax now applies only to urban land.

During the five-year period between general valuations in each area it is usual for land values to increase and, to preserve equity between taxpayers who have received a new general valuation and those who have not, equalisation factors are applied in the other areas not under general valuation to provide taxable values in those areas at the same level as the general valuation. As each local government area becomes further removed from its last five-yearly general valuation, the equalisation factors can be expected to vary appreciably from year to year until the next general valuation, depending on the current land prices that have occurred in the area. These variations will increase with rising markets and decrease when there are falling markets. The taxpayer therefore gets the benefit

annually of any rise or fall in the market taken into account in the calculation of the taxable value of the land.

The equalisation factor is determined by comparing the existing general valuation in an area not under general valuation with the latest sale prices in that area and then relating that difference to the level which the new general valuation bears to the latest sale prices in the area of general valuation. Reliance is then placed on the valuer responsible for each area to test that the equalisation factor so determined produces equitable taxable values in those areas.

Referring to those areas mentioned by the Deputy Leader in his question, it is pointed out that the Kensington and Norwood area was revalued as at 1 July 1977. The area is principally made up of residential zonings which permit the erection of units and flats and a larger than normal number of commercial properties. The level of assessment at 1 July 1977 was very close to the market values, and current sale prices during the ensuing year indicated an insufficient change in value to justify an equalisation factor greater than 1.00 for the 1978-79 year.

In the city of Burnside, which was last valued four years ago, current land prices showed that the equalisation factor of 2.02 produced reasonable taxable values at a valuation level equivalent to those in the Kensington and Norwood area. Similarly, in each of the other areas mentioned, the same comment can be made according to their position in the five-year valuation cycle. The equalisation scheme has eliminated most of the inequities in land tax payments as between taxpayers which previously existed before the scheme came into effect and has provided an equitable cushioning of those former very large five-yearly land tax increases that formerly occurred.

BIRKENHEAD BRIDGE FIRE

In reply to Mr. WHITTEN (24 August).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The limited quantities of foam compound on the fire pumpers attending the Birkenhead Bridge fire were adequate to commence operations with the foam guns carried. Back-up foam compound supplies from the reserves at Port Adelaide fire station arrived at the fire-ground within six minutes of the first pumper arrival. A shuttle service from this depot continued throughout fire-fighting operations with the Port Adelaide foam compound trailer.

Supplies were also dispatched from headquarters (13 minutes and 28 minutes after the first arrival). The movement of foam compound on to the fire-ground from the Port Adelaide and headquarters depot stocks was according to routine procedure. Seven hundred and ninety-eight gallons of foam compound (sufficient to make about 200 000 gallons of foam) was used at the fire-ground. However, there was 2 300 gallons still available at headquarters after the fire.

DRUGS

In reply to Mr. MILLHOUSE (12 September).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The report referred to by the honourable member was a research document prepared by the Commonwealth Health Department for consideration by State and Commonwealth Ministers involved with drug abuse. It was felt that the document needed to be updated to include more recent information, and the Ministers, both Commonwealth and State, therefore recommended that it be reviewed by the National Standing Control Committee on Drugs of

Dependence. It is not considered that this was an act of suppression.

INCENTIVE SCHEME

In reply to Mr. OLSON (21 September).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The scheme to which the honourable member refers is the Establishment Payments Scheme, which became operative from 1 September 1978. The scheme is designed to encourage capital investment and employment creation by firms establishing or expanding significantly in South Australia, where a significant portion of the additional income of the firm (resulting from the establishment or expansion) is derived outside the State (or region). For firms that satisfy the eligibility criteria, the scheme provides for the payment of a cash grant, or alternatively, at the option of the recipient company, a long-term interest-free loan. This payment is calculated with reference to three factors, namely:

- (a) Capital and Employment Component—a percentage of approved capital expenditure (5 per cent in growth centres, 4 per cent in major service centres and 3 per cent in Adelaide and the rest of the State), plus 20 per cent of the additional wages bill in the first three months of operation.
- (b) Relocation Cost Component—a payment of 75 per cent of relocation costs up to certain limits, plus an allowance of \$500 per key employee.
- (c) Regional Significance Component—up to \$50 000 depending on the assessed significance of the project to the region.

There is an upper limit for this payment, depending on the location involved. In the case of growth centres, the maximum payable is \$375 000; for major service centres, the maximum payable is \$325 000; and finally, in Adelaide and the rest of the State, the maximum payable is \$315 000. The payment is made three months after the establishment or expansion occurs.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: NEW MINISTER

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have to inform you, Mr. Speaker, and members of the House that this morning the member for Ross Smith was sworn in at Executive Council as Minister of Community Development and Minister Assisting the Minister of Ethnic Affairs.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: FISHING INDUSTRY

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Following a personal attack in this House yesterday by the member for Alexandra on a member of my staff, that member was telephoned this morning by Mr. Corigliani who said he was speaking on behalf of fishermen and said that they wanted Mrs. Chatterton to know that they disapproved of remarks made by the honourable member, that they had no prior knowledge that such remarks would be made, and that they supported Mrs. Chatterton and wanted her to know directly that they dissociated themselves from what was said in this House.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: INVESTMENTS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I draw honourable members' attention to the statement made by the Federal Minister for Industry and Commerce (Mr. Lynch) in adverting to matters of investment in the various States of Australia and quoting his department's figures as to how new investment is committed or contemplated State by State. It is true that the Minister made this statement in an attack on the New South Wales Government, but the figures he gave were interesting. According to those figures, compiled by his department, for the three major manufacturing States new investments committed or contemplated State by State amounted to \$322 a head in New South Wales, \$590 a head in Victoria, and \$818 a head in South Australia, and that does not seem to accord with some of the things which have been said by members opposite now for some time.

QUESTIONS**NEAPTR**

Mr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Transport say what were the major objections and alternative proposals contained in the report prepared by independent consultants, George Clarke and Peter Casey, on the NEAPTR tramway route for the Adelaide City Council, and presented to the Government recently? In what way has the plan, as announced today, taken into account the findings of this report and will the report be made public?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Which report?

Mr. TONKIN: Because of the concern expressed by the Adelaide City Council and others about the effects of the NEAPTR proposals on the park lands, the city, and particularly on King William Street and Road, an independent study by recognised experts in the field has been commissioned by the City Council and presented to the Government. The adverse effects of the scheme on the city and its surroundings, as expressed by the council, will have been emphasised, but there is no evidence in today's report that any consideration has been given to the council's concern. Representations have been made to me that the Clarke-Casey report must be made available for public discussion if all the factors are to be considered. The concern that is now being expressed is that the Government has spent thousands of dollars promoting and selling a scheme that it had already decided on well before the period of so-called public participation began.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The uppermost thought in my mind when the Leader started his question was about the press release that he issued (I think when he was in Holland, maybe when he returned or both), that what the north-east area needed was a light rapid transit system similar to the type that he had seen in Holland. I am delighted that the Leader is now acknowledging that that is right. If we are to run something into the city, as Adelaide is surrounded by park lands, I would be delighted if the Leader would tell me and others how one could get into the city without going through the park lands.

The question about the Clarke-Casey report, to which the Leader refers, should rightly be directed to the Adelaide City Council. On Tuesday, the Premier and I met with the Rt. Hon. Lord Mayor and members of his

council and discussed this matter. Whether or not the Clarke-Casey report will be released is a decision that the City Council must make: it commissioned the report, and it will decide whether it is released or not. Whatever comments the Government has on it are comments between the Premier and me and the City Council. Certainly, we do not have a right to release those comments, unless the Clarke-Casey report is released. That agreement was reached at that meeting, and I would not be party to breaching it, as the Leader suggests we should do.

Mr. Tonkin: Was it favourable or not?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Whether it was favourable or unfavourable, it was a report to the City Council; whether the Leader has seen it or not, I do not know, and I do not really care.

Mr. Tonkin: No, I haven't.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: One thing is abundantly clear: it is a report that was commissioned by the City Council. It is its property and it has to decide whether or not to release the report. It is not the province of the Leader or anyone else to suggest that we should take action to have it released or to comment on it, unless it is released.

Mr. Tonkin: Did you take any notice of it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We are required (and indeed we gave a public undertaking) to compile and release for public discussion an environmental impact statement. We have complied with that undertaking: it has been released. It is being made available presently to all parties concerned, including the members for the district. I am sure that the Leader, in his capacity as Leader, will be the recipient of a copy of the e.i.s.

Mr. Tonkin: You've taken no notice—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader has interjected three or four times, yet honourable members still complain about replies being too long.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Leader shows a lamentable lack of knowledge when he makes the statements he makes, because the draft e.i.s. must deal with the work that has been done to this stage. Its release for public consumption, criticism, and comment is the next phase. Those comments and criticisms, and whatever else there may be, will be analysed and incorporated in the final e.i.s. that is produced. The Leader should know that. I am sure the member for Glenelg knows it, because of his very shady record with his activities in the Morphettville area, where he tried to stir up trouble about the Morphettville Bus Depot, and fell flat on his puss. If the Leader has any comment to make, constructive or otherwise, on the e.i.s., I suggest that he act in accordance with the requirements and submit those views so that they can be analysed and included in the final e.i.s. that will be presented.

MATRICULATION EXAMINATION

Mr. KLUNDER: Has the Minister of Education read, on page 14 of today's *Advertiser*, the report on the South Australian Matriculation examination results, and will he comment on the trend in the results mentioned in the report?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I have seen the report; in fact, I have a copy of it in front of me. It is gratifying to know that the 1977 pass rate for the Matriculation examination is up about 7.5 per cent on the 1973 results. One cannot always guarantee absolute consistency in marking, over a period of years, but I think this is an

encouraging sign in view of the garbage that has gone on in the past two or three years about the decline of standards in schools. This information has been bruited about by people who had a vested interest in a reduction of the commitment of public funds to education, in the absence of any objective evidence to support their claims.

I have maintained that any objective evidence that has existed—and I am the first to admit that there is precious little—has tended to support an indication in the opposite direction. Although we should not draw too strong a conclusion from the results of the past few years in public examinations, it is good to know that they give absolutely no comfort to the knockers.

NEAPTR

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Transport say how much money is to be spent this year on the light rapid transit system to Modbury; where provision has been made for this expenditure; and what is the estimated all-up cost of the scheme, including rolling stock, acquisition of property, provision of environmental protection measures, such as noise baffles, and so on, and making good construction damage surrounding the track? The Minister has said in his public statement that it is expected that work will begin on the project this year. I understand that the Government's five-year programme for urban public transport is now before the Federal Government, and that no reference to this proposal was in that submission.

The Hon G. T. VIRGO: Nothing can be spent this year until the Government takes a decision. The honourable member should know (and I wonder whether he does; certainly his Leader does not) that a final decision cannot be taken until the process of the environmental impact statement has been gone through. I would imagine that his colleague, the member for Murray, would inform him of that process.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He doesn't know it, either.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There is not much that the honourable member does know, unfortunately, and it is lamentable. What I hope will be the position is that the Government will take an affirmative decision. I hope that the e.i.s. will come out in such a fashion in the final analysis that we will take an affirmative decision. I am on public record as having said that Adelaide cannot afford not to put in an l.r.t. system. I think that the same statement has been made by the Premier and by the Minister for Planning, who made an announcement whilst I was away, and that position still maintains today.

Mr. Millhouse: That begs the question of where you'll get the money from.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I sincerely hope that, before the end of 1978, the e.i.s. will have been finally evaluated and the Government decision taken. Much work then needs to be done in the preliminary stages of design and planning, as I think that the Deputy Leader would understand. Detailed designs take a lot of time and will occupy the resources of the Government for the greater part of this financial year, without incurring any undue additional costs. Regarding the total costs, in round figures it is estimated that we are involving ourselves in about \$70 000 000 (at 1978 prices), but, as it is a 5½-year programme, I would not like to guess what it might cost, because I do not have the means of knowing how badly the present Federal Government is going in the handling of our economy.

SCHOOL BUILDING PROJECTS

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Education give details of the new financial scheme that enables schools to undertake major building projects? In addition, can he say what types of project may be funded under the proposed scheme, and how the scheme will assist school councils in our less affluent areas, such as Port Adelaide, now that the Commonwealth Government has reduced funds to the State for education purposes?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The projects covered by the new scheme are those that were covered by what we used to call the major capital works subsidy scheme. I think that I can best put the matter in context by answering in the following way: Soon after we came to Government in 1970, my predecessor changed the system that had previously obtained whereby, if schools raised money for certain purposes, they got a \$1 for \$1 subsidy; instead, we introduced a direct grant for schools that reflected basically the enrolment of the school and certain other aspects of it as well. This seemed to be far more equitable, particularly for schools in areas where people largely had limited incomes. A couple of areas of subsidy have remained, including the major capital works subsidy.

There have been problems with this system because, first, it is contingent on schools having a reasonable sum in the bank; secondly, it never works out to be a \$1 for \$1 subsidy, because once the commitment has been made, typically the department has had to pick up the whole of the escalation of the cost; the effect of this is, thirdly, to distort the general budgeting procedures of the department in relation to the expenditures from loan works. Added to this are the present financial stringencies, particularly regarding Loan funds. Therefore, what we have decided to do is in line with the policy the Government has adopted in other matters, that is, to expand borrowing capacity outside of the normal Loan Council arrangements.

This can be done by allowing school councils to borrow on a more expanded basis than has occurred previously. They will be able to borrow up to 90 per cent of the total cost of a project, with the servicing of the project being in the hands of the Education Department. This should cost the department in a particular year less than the old major subsidy capital project.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Not all the interest on the borrowing will be funded by the Education Department.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: True, but most of it would certainly occur in that way. It will certainly mean a lesser cost to our loan programmes but, at the same time, it will make sports halls and things like that more practicable to schools which in the past could not generate them from the cash they could raise or even on a \$1 for \$1 subsidy they received from us. It has taken us some time to work out the scheme. The member for Mount Gambier and the member for Mallee expressed an interest in this matter when we were still working out the process, which has now been published. My advice to a specific school that wishes to come into the scheme would be to approach its Regional Director, because it will be done on a regional basis.

NEAPTR

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the Government is in conflict with Adelaide City Council or the council's commissioned e.i.s. Clarke-Casey

report with respect to the inner portion of the NEAPTR proposal? Whilst acknowledging the concept of l.r.t. travel, the Opposition has been denied a copy of the George Clarke report by the Adelaide City Council. We understand from reports that, unless the council has recently changed its mind, it shares the Opposition's view that there should be no above-ground rail tracks along King William Street, that there would be no real benefit in trying to connect the NEAPTR link with the Glenelg terminus at Victoria Square, and that the impact of the proposal on Adelaide's adjacent park lands is both unacceptable and could be avoided if Adelaide Railway Station was adopted as the terminus for the NEAPTR project.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not quite sure why the honourable member has told me that the Opposition has been denied a copy of the Clarke report by the Adelaide City Council.

Mr. Chapman interjecting:

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

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I should have thought that the question would and should properly be directed to Adelaide City Council. Certainly, I would not presume to influence the council in its decision to provide or not to provide the Opposition with anything at all: that is a decision that the council can and will make. To suggest, as the honourable member has suggested, that the l.r.t. to Tea Tree Gully should not connect with the existing Glenelg tram is, to me, a statement that I find absolutely impossible to accept. I do not know what the honourable member and the Opposition really have in mind but I am clear, however, that the Leader has stated publicly for a considerable time that he believes there should be an l.r.t. system serving Tea Tree Gully. The shadow Minister agrees with that. I would remind the honourable member that, in his question, he said that it should not come into the city.

Mr. Chapman: No rails in King William Street.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Alexandra to order. He has asked his question. I have called him to order once before and I hope he will not continue to interject.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Is the honourable member suggesting that the system should be installed at a cost of about \$70 000 000 and should then stop at Walkerville, leaving people to walk into the city? Is that the sort of thinking that the Opposition has on public transport?

Mr. Wotton: You're misrepresenting the question, and you know it.

Mr. Mathwin: You do that for the tourists—

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

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It must be obvious to everyone, other than those who are trying to play politics, that if an l.r.t. system is to service the Tea Tree Gully area it has to go into the city of Adelaide. Surely that ought to be an elementary fact that does not need to be debated. The proposal in the environmental impact statement is that the system should enter the city via King William Road and King William Street, pass around the perimeter of the Victoria Square complex, and link up with the existing Glenelg tram service, with the obvious bonus of upgrading of the Glenelg tram system so that we have a fast modern l.r.t. system operating between Glenelg and Tea Tree Gully. I do not understand how members of the Opposition, least of all the shadow Minister of Transport, are going to put in something different that will stop the service in the inner suburbs. All I can say is that, if that is

the thinking of the Opposition in relation to public transport, I hope to hell, for the sake of South Australia, it never assumes the Treasury benches.

CAR POOLS

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Will the Minister of Transport say what he thinks of the recent suggestion that the Government should encourage car pooling? A report in today's *Australian* states that an advisory committee to a group of State Ministers has suggested that, in the light of future problems associated with fuel, Governments should actively encourage people to pool their cars so as to conserve fuel. I imagine that a useful side effect of such a scheme would be fewer cars on our roads.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Australian Transport Advisory Council has had before it for some time the problem of the diminishing stocks of fuel used for private transport. It is a source of concern to us, as indeed it is to other Ministries, not the least being that of my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy. Consultations have been taking place between officers of the two departments, and I understand from the press report that a report has been submitted, but unfortunately I have not yet seen it. Certainly the suggestion has been put forward several times that many benefits could be obtained from the car pooling system. Not long ago the Director-General of Transport (Dr. Scrafton) put forward a proposition that was supported by channel 7 that there ought to be a pool system operating. From memory, I believe that channel 7 suggested that it would provide some form of computer pairing up to try to help the situation. Unfortunately, that suggestion did not receive the support of the public.

Mr. Allison: The Ministerial car—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Much more attention needs to be given to this problem. I know that the member for Mount Gambier is so disinterested in this subject that he just goes on yapping like a twopenny book.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In the future much attention will have to be given to this question because in Australia we are burning up a tremendous amount of energy in private cars. In most cases, the average is only a little over one person per car, so we are certainly not getting benefit from that.

NEAPTR

Mr. WILSON: In view of the refusal of the Minister of Transport to discuss the general recommendations of the Adelaide City Council's Clarke-Casey report into the NEAPTR proposals, will he at least say whether that report contains a cost-benefit comparison between the announced Modbury corridor route and the other alternative routes, and whether that cost benefit comparison was favourable to the present proposals? I was informed about a week ago that this cost-benefit comparison was included in the report and that, in fact, the comparison was unfavourable to the Government's announced l.r.t. route.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I never fail to marvel at some of the questions asked by members opposite. The honourable member is asking me to breach a confidence. I have been provided with a copy of an internal report to the Adelaide City Council, which is confidential to the council, and the honourable member has the gall to ask me

if I will divulge that information to the House. The answer is certainly "No".

Mr. WOTTON: Can the Minister for the Environment say what guidelines were provided by the Environment Department to the Transport Department concerning the preparation of the e.i.s. on the NEAPTR proposals? Has this e.i.s. been assessed by the Environment Department and will the Minister assure the House that the Environment Department will make its assessment public and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

In answering my earlier claim that the Environment Department had been made to look foolish because the Government had obviously decided on the corridor route prior to any proper e.i.s. being carried out by the department the Minister stated:

There has been consultation between my department and the Transport Department, and guidelines have been given by the Environment Department concerning the preparation of the environmental impact statement.

He went on to say that the Environment Department would make its assessment on the e.i.s. as this was its real responsibility in this matter.

The Minister should be aware of the public concern in regard to the effect of this scheme on both the park lands and general environment within the city itself and also in relation to the Torrens River. The people of South Australia will be looking to the Environment Department to make public its assessment on this proposal.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know whether the honourable member has a copy of the e.i.s. that has been issued.

Mr. Wotton: I have asked for one.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the honourable member waits until he gets it he will see the guidelines that were given by the Environment Department to the Transport Department for the drawing up of that e.i.s. I am pleased that he has asked this question because it gives me an opportunity to outline the correct procedures relating to an e.i.s. If the honourable member cares to wait for his copy of the draft e.i.s. he will see in appendix 1 the guidelines laid down by the Environment Department to the Transport Department in order to assist it with the drawing up of the draft statement. I noticed, I think in the *News* today, that the shadow Minister of Transport (the member for Alexandra) said that it was deplorable to think that the Environment Department had been written down, since it was not required to prepare the e.i.s. I want to explain to the honourable member that, if he did say that—

Mr. Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is not a matter of facts; I saw that report just before coming into the House. In relation to environmental impact statements being always drawn up by the proponents, I point out that it would be ludicrous if the Environment Department had to draw up the e.i.s. and then assess it. I want to explain to the honourable member that the proponent in this case is the Transport Department, which has drawn up the e.i.s. draft that has been submitted to the Environment Department for assessment.

Mr. Mathwin: Only about 50 yards away.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have spoken to the member for Glenelg about interjecting, but he has interjected twice since.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The assessment of the Environment Department will be presented to the Government. It is not my decision whether or not that will be made public; it is the Government's decision. If the honourable member reasoned at all about the matter he would find that there would be great difficulty for the

Government not to release that assessment. But I and the department are fully aware of the objections and praise that have been given to this scheme, and I assure the honourable member that the assessment will be objective; it will take into account comments made by the public over the six weeks that the document will be made available.

NEAPTR

Mr. ALLISON: Will the Minister of Transport say, if a decision is imminent on the commencement of the l.r.t. system, what portion of the \$70 000 000 estimate the State Government expects the Federal Government to fund and why the l.r.t. system was not included in South Australia's five-year submission on urban public transport proposals submitted to the Federal Government for approval and funding?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I would like to be able to tell the honourable member that the Federal Government would provide two-thirds of the \$70 000 000, which is the formula in accordance with the public transport legislation. However, I think even the honourable member would suggest that I was being a super optimist (even though it is his own Party) if I were to make such an assumption. Indeed, I suggest that it would be absurd to do so.

Mr. Allison: Why don't you answer the question?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mount Gambier has asked his question. I call him to order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We now have, thanks to the Whitlam Government, a system by which urban public transport is subsidised on a two-for-one basis. The Liberal Government, prior to 1972, steadfastly refused to provide financial assistance for urban public transport. The Whitlam Government introduced it, and the present Government has not the guts to cut it out. But to suggest that the present Government would meet its full cost would be rather optimistic.

The second question the honourable member asked was why it was not included in the present programme. I would have thought that that would be fairly obvious, even to the member for Mount Gambier. One cannot include things in the programme that are not yet approved. No decision has yet been taken. Surely, it would be ludicrous if we were to include, in the financial programme put forward, support for a project that was still subject to the provisions of the e.i.s. and the like. Until that happens, obviously it cannot be included in the programme.

FOSTER CARE

Mr. MATHWIN: My question, which is directed to the Minister of Community Welfare, has nothing to do with the hot wiring of cars. Will he now admit that children have been released from Brookway Park into foster homes during the phasing out of that institution? A spokesman for the Foster Parents' Association (Mrs. Ey) said in Monday's *Advertiser*, in a report headed "Foster mothers in Government rip-off":

... the department should pay foster mothers who cared for unruly boys more than the present rate of just over \$3 a day.

The Government is prepared to pay \$15 a day plus for youths released from institutions.

She is quoted as saying that she knew of two Brookway

Park Training Centre boys who had been placed with foster parents since it was decided that Brookway Park would be closed. She suspected that the Government was getting the situation on the cheap, before the Minister suggested that the Intensive Neighbourhood Care system had started.

On the following day, 27 September, under the heading "Fostering Cover Up", in a report in the *Advertiser* the Minister denied that young inmates had been transferred from Brookway Park. The report states:

Mr. Payne said on Monday that, with the exception of two cases, no boys had been fostered out from Brookway Park Training Centre since its recent closure.

Perhaps he meant from 1 September; that is a technical point. The report continues:

The speaker at the meeting said that he felt Mr. Payne had not been told what was going on from his own department as far as fostering was concerned.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It is becoming a custom, when questions are asked of me, that they are getting longer and longer and less able to be understood, not only by the person of whom they are asked but by anyone else in the House. The member for Glenelg has outdone himself on this occasion. He is trying to suggest that there is some diabolical scheme in the Community Welfare Department, presumably organised by me surreptitiously to place children so that they will not have to be placed at a later time at what he argues is a greater cost.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

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

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Placements for children are made by the Community Welfare Department with the best possible motives. The officers concerned are strictly enjoined under the Act to keep the interests of the child paramount, and I have no doubt that this is always to the fore in the minds of the officers concerned.

Mr. Mathwin: Answer the question.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The answer to the question is "No". It could just be possible—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Glenelg. This is the third time I have spoken to him. I hope he will cease interjecting, but he must accept the consequences if he continues in this way.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: In explanations made by the honourable member, sometimes attributed to anonymous spokesmen by way of press report, and on other occasions presumably free and *gratis* from him, he has referred to payments which apply. I should like to bring to the attention of the House the rates paid for ordinary foster care in South Australia. The honourable member made some reference to an amount of \$3 a day, and I think he was implying that it was a paltry sum.

For comparison, and so that members can understand and quickly relate the amounts between the States, I invite them to consider the rates applying for foster children 12 years to 4 years old, placed in normal foster care. The basic foster payment in South Australia is \$23.20 a week, automatically adjusted four times a year on the consumer price index. In Victoria, the amount is \$20 a week, in Queensland \$24.50, in Western Australia \$22, in Tasmania \$20 (including a pocket money component), and in New South Wales \$20. On that line alone it can be seen that South Australia, on a straight cash basis, is second only to one other State.

Turning to the other not inconsiderable benefits that apply in South Australia, the basic wear and tear clothing allowance in this State is \$4.50 a week. There is no such

allowance in Victoria, Queensland, Western Australia, Tasmania, or New South Wales. We are continually being asked, in relation to pocket money, how well motivated people who wish to assist disadvantaged children and who are prepared to be foster parents cope in this direction.

It has been constantly suggested by a limited number of people in the community that in some way they are not getting fair treatment. Regarding pocket money, in South Australia children 12 to 14 years of age receive \$2.10 weekly. In Victoria, Queensland, and Tasmania they receive nothing. In Western Australia, they receive \$2. In New South Wales, they receive \$1.25. So, the children, on a direct basis of having some minor independence and having a pocket money allowance, are well taken care of in South Australia. In the case of a placement, the initial clothing allowance made to parents in that position in South Australia is \$250 for children between those ages. In Victoria, it is \$150. In Queensland, Western Australia, Tasmania and New South Wales, no cash sum is made available. An initial clothing outfit is supplied and, in some cases, school uniforms are also supplied.

Across the board in every State the foster parents also have available for use by the family the family allowance payable in that case. That is an additional sum going into the household concerned. In addition, in South Australia my department pays the necessary educational, dental, chemist, medical and hospital expenses, which I suggest amount to a minimum of \$100 a year for each child and which would be considerably higher if special treatment was required. In addition, as I have pointed out to the honourable member on more than one occasion, if special circumstances arise, the department is always ready to discuss and negotiate with the family concerned (as is only right), because the law of this State requires the department to put the interest of the child paramount. I am certain that my officers do that to the best of their ability.

The question was also raised of a meeting at which certain things were said. The public meeting of foster parents, the organised association, was attended by about 20 persons, and I point out that there are presently 800 foster parents caring for more than 1 000 children in South Australia. I suggest that at least members would now be prepared to put some kind of weighting on the kind of question that has been served up to me. That does not suggest to me that what was raised should be dismissed because it came from only a small number of persons. I am always ready to listen to any proposition put up to me, as the Minister, or to my department, and any matter of substance will be looked at to see whether anything can be done.

The question I was asked was whether children were placed in the circumstances connected with Brookway, as the allegation suggested. I could also provide any detail, if the honourable member wishes it, but I do not want to take up the time of the House any further in answering the question. If he is prepared to see me, I will give to him the circumstances, which are obviously being misrepresented in the press and which caused him to raise the matter.

LOAN COUNCIL

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say when it is intended that a meeting of Loan Council or Loan Council officers will take place to consider further the case of the Redcliff petro-chemical establishment?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The report of the officers has been completed; it is being typed this week, and it is

expected to be available next Monday. The Prime Minister has undertaken to me that he will call a meeting of Loan Council 10 days to a fortnight from receipt of the report.

NEAPTR

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask a question of the Premier, and it is supplementary to a number of questions that have been asked today about the north-east area transport business.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows that he must ask his question. He can then seek leave of the House, and I hope that he will do that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir. I was just giving him warning.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Is the Government really serious in asserting that it can find the money to pay for the light rail transit service between Adelaide and Tea Tree Gully? As I foreshadowed a moment ago, I have listened with great interest to the questions that have been asked by the member for Kavel and others about the financial aspects of the scheme which, of course, are crucial. Unless we have the money to pay for the scheme, all this talk is pie in the sky. The replies given by the Minister of Transport were quite vague and indefinite. However, we did ascertain from him that the cost was nearer \$70 000 000 on today's estimate and not the \$54 000 000 that got into this morning's paper and that he does not know and, of course, no-one knows what will be the final cost.

Before I came into the House today I searched through the financial statements to see whether mention was made of this scheme. There was none, as was confirmed in the explanations to some of the questions that were given. We have further ascertained from the Minister this afternoon that he is hoping that two-thirds of the funds for the scheme will come from the Federal Government. My shrewd suspicion is that it will not be forthcoming.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He didn't say that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes he did; he hoped it would come from that source.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable member will not debate the question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I won't.

The SPEAKER: Otherwise I will take away his leave.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My suspicion is that he is getting ready to say that the Federal Government has pulled out the plug from the scheme and that it will therefore not go ahead.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have just warned the honourable member about debating the question, but he has continued to do so.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Previously, the Premier has said that, even if no money were forthcoming from the Federal Government, the State would finance the scheme from its own resources. However, that was before the Federal Budget and the financial stringency about which he has complained were brought down. It is for those reasons that I ask the question, otherwise there will be needless debate, upset and worry by many people in the community over a project that cannot possibly succeed or go ahead until we have the funds.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. EVANS: I ask the Minister of Transport whether any agreement or understanding exists between any Minister of the South Australian Government and the Adelaide City Council that would preclude the council from releasing immediately the contents of the Clarke-

Casey Report?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No.

HOUSING COSTS

Mrs. ADAMSON: My question relates to the report of the committee studying housing costs in Australia, and I ask the Minister for Planning whether he agrees with the committee's conclusion that one of the factors contributing to the high cost of housing is Government regulations and, if he does, can he say what action, if any, he intends to take to reduce costs by assessing regulations with a view to diminishing their impact on costs?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A large number of recommendations and conclusions are contained in that report. The report is now under study. Certainly, I think that it is agreed that actions by the Government and local government may have an impact on the cost of housing and may be one of the sources of difficulty for the building industry. In any assessment of that question it is vital to consider precisely what any form of Government regulation is designed to achieve and precisely how effective it is in meeting the objectives of ensuring reasonable design standards and degrees of protection for the home buyer, and so on. No doubt, in our consideration of the report and in the consideration of it by the housing Ministers' conference and the Ministers who are involved with Building Act regulations, that will be a factor that must be taken into account.

I found it interesting in the report, however, to note that the committee of inquiry made it clear that the house-land package was much dearer in the Eastern States, and Sydney and Melbourne particularly, than it was in Adelaide, and also that the cost of finance was the main source of increase in costs affecting the individual purchaser. The rise in interest rates that has taken place in recent years probably explains over half of the extra payments that the individual house purchaser has to make on a weekly basis in order to finance the purchase of a house. That does not mean that the question of whether or not Government regulations are excessive is an issue. It is, but it is one of the issues among many other issues. The report itself is comprehensive, and much careful consideration by everyone concerned will be required before appropriate policies can be developed as a consequence of it.

RAILWAYS

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Transport or officers of his department attended to all correspondence and communication from the Federal Minister for Transport or his officers associated with the proposed closure of, or the desire to keep open, the non-metropolitan railways of this State? It has come to my notice from people who were in the presence of the Federal Minister last week in Canberra that the Federal Minister has said that he cannot get any communication from the State Minister. I therefore ask whether all correspondence has been attended to by the Minister or his officers.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is a novel complaint. I have never heard that one before. What I have heard persistently from the Federal Minister is that if Virgo did not exist he would have only half the correspondence he now gets. He has complained persistently that I write to him too often, so I really just do not know the basis of the

furphy the honourable member has just raised. I hope the honourable member is not being flippant about the future of the railways of South Australia, because the matter is serious.

I am delighted that bit by bit the Federal Minister appears to be back-tracking. First, after I revealed his insidious plan to dismantle the non-metropolitan railways, he immediately assured the Country Party member for the Northern Territory that there was no intention of closing the Ghan service. That was the first proposed closure to be taken off the programme that he called a "corporate plan" (I do not know what that meant). Now aided and abetted by the little boy in the South-East, a fellow called Porter (I think he would make a good porter, probably in the railways or airways), the Federal Minister has acknowledged that no railway will be closed down before harvest time. The honourable member ought to know, because it involves part of his district and the district of the member for Eyre, that the Federal Minister wrote a demanding letter to me two months ago saying that the Gladstone-Wilmington-Peterborough-Quorn line should be closed not after the harvest but forthwith.

Peter Nixon is finding that he does not have the support he thinks he has, and that is good for South Australia. In his insular place in Canberra he is not completely divorced from public thinking, and he is having to back off from one thing after another. I hope he will back off completely, and I will give him every support to do so. I will commend him publicly when he backs right off and takes away that threat of the closure of the non-metropolitan railways in South Australia. I ask the honourable member, as a political colleague of Peter Nixon, to urge him to support the State Government in ensuring that the non-metropolitan railways continue to operate in South Australia.

QUORN HIGHWAY

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister of Transport state whether the Highways Department has decided on the method of overcoming the flooding on the Port Augusta to Quorn highway at Saltia Creek and, if so, what will be the timetable involved? I understand the Highways Department is looking at a number of solutions to this problem. It is a problem because the road is continually out of commission, and that prevents many people who live in Quorn and work in Port Augusta from attending work each day, apart from inconveniencing the numerous tourists and other commuters who wish to use the road. The Flinders Range has had a wet season, so even a small shower now floods the road and it is out of commission. I understand the Highways Department is concerned about it and is planning to overcome the flooding.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will consult with the Commissioner of Highways on this point and bring down an up-to-date answer for the honourable member.

HOSPITALS FUND

Mr. BECKER: My question is to the Deputy Premier, but I would not object if the Minister of Mines and Energy answered it. Does the Government intend to demolish the Hospital Fund Account? On page 46 of the Auditor-General's report we are informed that the Hospitals Fund receives contributions from the following sources:

(a) Racing Act—Statutory deductions and unclaimed

dividends in respect of off-course S.A. Totalizator Agency Board operations, excess amounts transferred by the Treasurer from the Dividends Adjustment Account and dividends unclaimed from racing clubs authorised to conduct on-course totalizators.

(b) State Lotteries Act—Surpluses from Lotteries Commission of S.A. operations and unclaimed prize moneys.

(c) Stamp Duties Act—Stamp duty on insurance policies relating to motor vehicles.

At the beginning of the 1977-78 financial year the fund had a balance of \$3 900 000 and it received \$15 000 000 during the year. The total amount available was \$19 000 000, of which \$15 000 000 was transferred to Consolidated Revenue as a contribution towards public hospital costs.

Many people in the community purchase lottery tickets in the belief that the proceeds of the lotteries go to the hospitals in South Australia when in actual fact the proceeds from the lotteries go to an account called the Hospital Fund Account and the money is paid straight into Consolidated Revenue. I see no purpose in maintaining such a fund. If the money is to go to general revenue, why not pay the whole proceeds into general revenue and be honest with the people of South Australia?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think that if the honourable member examines the legislation he will see that the transaction to which he has referred is made strictly in accordance with the legislation. There is no intention, nor has there ever been any suggestion to my knowledge, that the Government intends to abandon the contribution made from the Lotteries Commission and the other sources of revenue mentioned by the honourable member. The only thing I wish is that the income from this source would meet more of the costs involved in hospitals than they currently do. There is no intention of changing the situation.

CATTLE

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the Government will increase the maximum compensation of \$200 payable under the regulations made under the Cattle Compensation Act to reflect more realistically the replacement cost of cattle slaughtered as a result of brucellosis and other nominated diseases?

Several dairy farmers have found that cattle that they are losing, as a result of blood testing proving positive one of the nominated diseases under the Cattle Compensation Act, cost between \$300 and \$350 to replace, but that the maximum compensation provided in the regulations is only \$200. Will the Minister examine the situation with a view to increasing the compensation payable under that Act?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to take up this matter with the Minister of Agriculture and bring down a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PREMIER'S STAFF

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. CHAPMAN: This afternoon I was cited in the Premier's Ministerial statement. There seems to have been some error or doctoring of facts somewhere along the line in conveying a message from one officer to another within the Premier's Department. If this is so, I would appreciate

it if, at the appropriate time, the Premier will correct the situation.

The Premier claimed that I had made a serious allegation or series of allegations in this Parliament about a member of his staff. I am aware of remarks that have been made about the Premier's staff adviser in question and the subsequent *Advertiser* and *Stock Journal* press coverage that those remarks attracted. My name has not been connected with those press announcements. To further explain the situation, yesterday in this House—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have spoken to the honourable member before about this matter. This is a personal explanation, not a debate. The honourable member has been debating the matter. I hope he does not continue to do that. If he does so, I will withdraw leave because he will not be complying with Standing Orders.

Mr. CHAPMAN: To explain the situation I am placed in as the result of the Premier's remarks today, I want to say that I referred to the particular industry, about which that person is an adviser, twice in this place yesterday, once in some five columns of the *Hansard* record where I spoke about the fishing industry, particularly prawn fishing licence fees. Not once in any of those five columns did I use the name of the staff member involved.

During Question Time yesterday, immediately before the debate to which I have just referred, I did refer by name to the staff member involved, when explaining to the House about a meeting held between members of the fishing industry, the Premier, the Minister and others. I listed those present as "senior officers of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department", the Premier, the Hon. Mr. Chatterton and, of course, his wife, Mrs. Chatterton. That, members will recall, drew considerable reaction from the Government side. That was the end of my comments on that subject at that point. Further on, during the explanation of my question (and this is the only other time that that person's name has been mentioned by me in this place for the whole of this session of Parliament), I referred to "the attitude of the Minister of Fisheries in the general application of his job and, of course, the reported and consistent presence of Mrs. Chatterton wherever primary industry is discontented". Other than in those two cases, I have not used the name of that staff member anywhere in this Parliamentary record for the whole of this session of Parliament. On that—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has made his personal explanation clearly, and he is now debating the matter. I do not intend to permit him to continue.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Aren't you going to apologise?

The SPEAKER: Message—

Mr. Chapman: No way!

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Alexandra. I am standing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader and the Minister to order. I have not finished yet. I do not need any help from the Deputy Leader.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I didn't say a word.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member did say something; I heard him. I call the honourable member for Davenport to order.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I did not open my mouth.

The SPEAKER: Order! I heard the honourable member speak.

Members interjecting:

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

SIR JOHN BARNARD'S ACT (EXCLUSION OF APPLICATION) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Classification of Publications Act, 1973-1974. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill has two main objects. First, it seeks to ensure that films classified as restricted publications under the principal Act are not screened in premises where they are available for sale. Secondly, it introduces a concept of vicarious liability in relation to offences against the Act. Recent decisions of the Full Court have made it clear that under the present law it is possible for the establishments generally known as "sex shops" to show screenings of restricted films on their premises, regardless of whether these films have received a classification pursuant to the Film Classification Act. The provisions of that Act would normally prevent the screening of any film unclassified by the Minister in premises which can be regarded as a theatre, and that expression is defined in terms which are possibly wide enough to cover a booth in a sex shop.

However, section 20 of the Classification of Publications Act provides, in effect, that sex shops are permitted to display certain restricted articles, and it has become apparent that this licence extends to the screening of films, notwithstanding the provisions of the Film Classification Act.

The Government regards the exhibition of films that have been classified as restricted publications in sex shops as an undesirable development. The amendments proposed in this Bill are designed to prevent such activities by making it an offence to screen restricted films in sex shops. In order to facilitate the enforcement of the proposed provision and other existing provisions in the principal Act, the Bill also introduces two new sections to the Act which create vicarious liability for certain offences. Under the first of these, a person in charge of a sex shop, for example, is to be liable for any offence in relation to a restricted publication which is committed by another member of staff.

The second provides that, where a body corporate commits an offence against the principal Act, every member of its governing body, its manager and its secretary shall be guilty of a corresponding offence and punishable accordingly. In addition, proceedings for offences against the principal Act may be prosecuted within two years, rather than six months, as at present.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 inserts a definition of "film" in section 4 of the principal Act. The terms of this definition include slides, video-tapes and any other form of optical or electronic record from which a visual image can be

produced. A minor consequential amendment deletes the now superfluous reference to slides in the definition of "publication". Clause 3 amends section 18 of the principal Act, which sets out various offences, by adding a new subsection making it an offence to exhibit images from a restricted film in premises in which restricted publications are offered for sale.

Clause 4 enacts new sections 18a and 18b to the principal Act. Section 18a provides that where an offence is committed under the Act in relation to a restricted publication, the person in control of the premises in which the offence was committed shall be guilty of an offence and liable to the same penalty as that prescribed for the principal offence. It is a defence to a charge under this section for the defendant to establish that he could not have prevented the commission of the principal offence by the exercise of reasonable precautions. Section 18b provides that where a body corporate is guilty of any offence against the principal Act, every member of its governing body, its manager and its secretary shall be guilty of an offence and each liable to the same penalty as that prescribed for the principal offence. Here, again, it is a defence to show that reasonable diligence on the part of a defendant could not have prevented the commission of the principal offence.

Clause 5 repeals section 21 of the principal Act which sets out the procedure for dealing with offences. A new section is enacted, expressly extending the period during which proceedings may be commenced to two years from the date on which the offence was allegedly committed.

Mr. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

FILM CLASSIFICATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Film Classification Act, 1971-1977. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The principal object of this short amending Bill is to bring video-tapes within the ambit of the Film Classification Act. As the legislation stands, video-tapes are not subject to the Act. The Government takes the view that this is undesirable, and, with increased use of the medium, could seriously subvert the intended operation of the principal Act. The Bill also modifies terminology in the principal Act relating to the apparatus employed to show moving pictures, so that a form of expression better suited to either film or video-tape is achieved.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section three of the principal Act, which defines expressions used in the Act. The existing definition of "film" is deleted, and a new definition substituted which makes it clear that conventional films, video-tapes and, indeed, any optical or electronic record from which moving pictures may be produced are subject to the Act. The clause also deletes the definition of "cinematograph" and replaces it with a wider definition based upon the more modern expression "projector". The new definition extends to any apparatus used to show video-tapes. The term "projector" is

substituted for "cinematograph" in the definition of "exhibitor", and clause 3 provides for an identical consequential substitution in section 6 of the principal Act.

Mr. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to prohibit the making of pornography involving children and for that purpose to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1935-1978. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The object of this Bill is to provide, in specific terms, that it shall be a criminal offence to take pornographic photographs of children under the age of 16 years. The Government takes the view that behaviour of this kind is already proscribed for practical purposes by paragraphs (b) and (c) of subsection (1) of section 58 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, which together provide that any person who incites, procures, attempts to procure or is otherwise a party to the commission of a grossly indecent act by a child under the age of 16 commits an offence. It is extremely difficult to envisage how a pornographer could be in a position to take indecent photographs of people in the relevant age group without first breaching one or the other of these provisions.

Nonetheless, the Government believes that it is desirable, as a matter of principle (and, indeed, this was recommended by Judge Mitchell, who took the same view of the law as the Government does, but nevertheless recommended that an amendment be made in order that the matter be made clear), that there should be a rider to the central provisions of section 58, stating specifically that the operation of the section extends to the taking of pornographic photographs. For the purposes of this amendment, "photograph" is to include a conventional film, a video-tape, and any other optical or electronic record from which a visual image can be produced.

The Bill also amends the penalties for a breach of section 58, from a maximum of two years to three years imprisonment in the case of a first offence and three years to five years in the case of a subsequent offence.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 58 of the principal Act, which refers to acts of gross indecency involving persons under the age of 16 years. The penalties set out in subsection (1) are amended. Two new subsections numbered (3) and (4) are inserted, the first of which provides that any person who photographs or attempts to photograph an act of gross indecency committed by, or in the presence of, another person under the age of 16, is himself a party to that indecent act. The provisions of the proposed subsection extend to the photographing of persons adopting poses calculated to give indecent prominence to sexual or excretory organs; that is, it makes clear that an act of gross indecency is committed in respect of a photograph where merely poses are concerned which are obviously intended to be indecent and does not merely relate to cases where specific sexual acts are being committed. This is to apply whether the indecent act is committed alone or with the participation of others. Subsection (4) defines the term "photograph" in the manner indicated above.

Mr. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

**POLICE OFFENCES ACT
AMENDMENT BILL**

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Police Offences Act, 1953-1978. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The object of this short Bill is to ensure that the provisions of the Police Offences Act prohibiting the publication of indecent matter extend in their operation to material depicting sexually orientated acts of violence. At present, section 33 of the Act defines indecent matter to include representations of an indecent, immoral or obscene nature, but it would appear that sadistic or masochistic material may elude the Act if it does not involve exposure of genital areas. The Government seeks to remedy this unsatisfactory position by incorporating specific reference to sadistic and masochistic representations in section 33.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 33 of the principal Act by inserting the words "sadistic" and "masochistic" in the definition of indecent material.

Mr. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

**UNAUTHORISED DOCUMENTS ACT AMENDMENT
BILL**

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Unauthorised Documents Act, 1916. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The object of this Bill is to prevent unauthorised use of the State badge and other official emblems of the State. For many years the magpie or piping shrike, has been a familiar emblem of this State. It is displayed prominently on the State flag and on Government letterheads. However, there appears to be some doubt regarding the emblem's legal standing. The earliest official reference to it seems to occur in a proclamation dating from 1904. But this does not actually establish the State badge; it simply presupposes its existence.

The Bill seeks to remedy this unsatisfactory situation. A new provision in the principal Act will empower the Governor to declare, by regulation, that an emblem be a State badge, or other official emblem of the State. Not only will this ensure the standing of the piping shrike but it will, in addition, make it possible to give official recognition to the State's flora and fauna emblems, should this ever be considered desirable.

Honourable members may be aware that each State has three emblems—a bird, an animal, and a flower. In our case, the animal, as the honourable member for Eyre would undoubtedly know, is the hairy-nosed wombat, and the flower, as he would undoubtedly know, is the Sturt pea.

Mr. Gunn: They are both common in my area.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Exactly; it is very appropriate. The Government feels that it is of some considerable importance that the State badge be protected from unauthorised display or commercial use. In recent times there have been various examples of actual or proposed misuse, including reproduction for souvenirs and other ornaments, business promotion, and representation on pamphlets printed by private organisations. Quite obviously, confusion could arise if it were to appear to people that something bearing the State badge was in fact an official publication, when it was certainly not.

This Bill will provide that it shall be an offence to

reproduce the State badge, or any other official emblem, for commercial purposes or in such a manner as to suggest official significance, without Ministerial approval. The Bill also raises the maximum monetary penalty imposed in respect of offences against the principal Act from \$50 to \$500. In this regard, honourable members should note that the penalty has not been modified at all since the principal Act became law in 1916.

The remainder of the explanation is formal and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal; clause 2 enacts a new section in the principal Act, numbered 3a. This provides that any person who, without the permission of the Minister, prints, publishes, manufactures or causes to be printed, published or manufactured, any document, material or object incorporating a prescribed emblem, either for a commercial purpose, or in a manner which suggests that the document, material or object has an official significance, commits an offence.

Subsection (2) of the proposed new section empowers the Governor to declare by regulation, that an emblem be a State badge or other official emblem of the State. The central provisions of the new section extend to any emblem which is so similar to a declared emblem as to be readily mistaken for it.

Clause 3 amends the penalty provisions of section 8 of the principal Act by raising the maximum monetary penalty from £50 to \$500.

Mr. GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

LEVI PARK ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

In Committee.

(Continued from 27 September. Page 1241.)

Schedule.

Economic Development, \$1 343 000.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): In relation to the amount of \$20 000 proposed to be allocated for overseas visits of officers, can the Premier say who travelled overseas last year; for what purposes did they travel; who is expected to travel overseas in the coming year; and for what purpose? The amount of \$105 000 proposed for publicity and information for industrial promotion shows a considerable increase over the amount voted and the amount actually spent last year. On what is it proposed to spend this increased sum?

For the benefit of the Premier, I repeat what I said yesterday. We have, in this time of financial stringency, to analyse our cost-benefit situation very carefully, and the Government has a heavy responsibility in setting priorities for spending. Spending on some matters perhaps could be cut back and the money could be better applied in stimulating growth and employment in the private sector, or even, if the Government is specifically set in its attitude against that sort of assistance for private enterprise, it may help to stimulate and encourage unemployment relief

schemes.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I shall have to get a specific list for the honourable member as to who travelled overseas last year. There are, from time to time, requirements for officers to go overseas. Mr. O'Connell at present is on a journey to Algeria concerned with the Ksar Chellala project. I cannot give the list offhand, but I shall get it for the honourable member, and information as to estimates of calls on the line for this financial year.

Regarding the amount proposed for publicity and information for industrial promotion, the expenditure allows for publicity of the new establishment grants scheme, for further increases in printing and publishing costs, particularly costs of the development booklets in South Australia, and for further promotion, both interstate and overseas. We have requests for promotional material from overseas trade officers and from the Commonwealth, and it is necessary for us, if we are to continue to attract investment to South Australia, to make the necessary approaches in order to do it. To do that, some money must be spent. This is not a large vote.

Mr. TONKIN: This additional sum is a significant increase on the expenditure from last year, which in turn was a significant increase on the expenditure voted for that year. If it is to be spent on promotion of the establishment grants scheme, I believe the money could be better spent on other matters. The scheme will be of tremendous benefit to very few companies—to those wishing to come to South Australia and establish operations. I understand that the Government is to consider the impact of such establishments on existing industries in South Australia or on industries which hope to expand. In this State at present, many firms are in danger of going out of business and are desperately struggling to stay afloat, let alone expand. The importation of more firms in competition with companies currently going out of business is not in the best interests of the overall economy or the overall industrial development position. The matter could be exacerbated by the establishment of the Government Clothing Factory. I understand that one private clothing factory is likely to be put out of business, probably two.

Mr. Dean Brown: One has closed already.

Mr. TONKIN: That is so, and others are in difficulties because of the Government's action in setting up in competition. The establishment grants scheme, although promoted with much blowing of trumpets and fanfare, is not basically a particularly effective scheme in helping existing industry in South Australia. It is singularly inappropriate that the Government should be spending this money to publicise and promote a scheme which will help very few people and which is likely to disadvantage existing firms in this State, at the same time doing virtually nothing to help struggling firms.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Premier say whether the salaries for those who work in the South Australian Development Corporation are paid from the line relating to the Statutory Corporations Division? If so, I should like to ask a number of questions. They must be paid either from that amount or from the sum proposed under the Treasury line for the Industries Development Committee.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall have to check that. The information is not here in detail as to whether this line actually covers Mr. Pridham and the office staff of the South Australian Development Corporation.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If the Premier will allow discussion of the South Australian Development Corporation under the Treasury line in connection with money allocated for the Industries Development Act, that will resolve the situation, and I shall not ask the questions at

the moment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not object to the honourable member's raising the question of the payment of the staff of the South Australian Development Corporation under that line.

Mr. GUNN: Has the Economic Development Department been asked to investigate the long-term effects of the Government's decision to let tenders for the equipment for the new northern power station, rather than letting those tenders to the locally-based Whyalla firm, Reyrolle Parsons, which I understand was set up some years ago to supply equipment to the South Australian Electricity Trust? This week, the Premier announced that a small contract had been let to that firm. On my way to Adelaide last Tuesday, I heard on the car radio that the Premier had allocated the contract to that firm. However, in the same announcement the manager indicated that many people would be put off at Christmas time. During last weekend, which I spent in Whyalla, great concern was expressed to me about the long-term future of that industrial enterprise, which is of great benefit to the city and which will remain so if it can continue to operate, even at less than full capacity. Has the Development Division or the Economics Division examined the tendering and the effects flowing from decisions to let tenders outside of South Australia? Can the Premier indicate that preference in future will be given to locally-based firms tendering for South Australian Government contracts?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member should know that the tenders that have been let outside South Australia could not have been fulfilled inside South Australia. It is not possible to let the whole tender for the powerhouse equipment within South Australia. Certainly, the firm of Reyrolle Parsons, in England, tendered for the work, but that work would have had to be done in England. Its tender was way above those of its competitors. What we sought to ensure was that everything that could be fabricated in South Australia be subcontracted for here by the major successful tenderer, Mitsubishi. We do not make in South Australia the equipment that Mitsubishi is making. The pre-heaters and condensers and fabrication of parts can be done here in South Australia. So, tenders were called in Australia for subcontract work on that contract. At great expense to the Government (the putting into the Electricity Trust of \$600 000), the tender was let to Reyrolle Parsons, which was the highest of the three tenderers, in order to keep the work in Whyalla. State preference is given in South Australia, and this is a singular example of it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: What is the strategy of the Economic Development Department to promote industrial development in South Australia? In particular, what type of promotion is the department planning to undertake to attract new industry to the State? Has the department's new study been completed, and when will it be applied to attract new industry to the State?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The studies have not been completed. There is a whole series of studies, which are looking at existing resources or exploitable resources in South Australia, either in skills or in the development of raw materials here. A large series of studies is being undertaken by officers of the department, and some of those studies involve members of the Agriculture Department as well. When those studies have reached the stage where it appears that we have a conceivably viable proposition, it may be necessary to commission specific consultancies in relation to those industries from people who have expertise in those industry areas. Those studies are proceeding and, as soon as they have been completed (and I am pressing the department to proceed with them;

officers of the department have been working long hours in relation to them), they will be made public. It will be the aim of the department then to interest particular commercial, manufacturing or industrial groups in the areas where they appear to have proven-up a viable proposition. They will be informed of the incentives the State offers for the establishment of an undertaking. If we are unable to attract someone particularly in that area, we would aim to set up the organisations ourselves and go on the market for the capital through the S.A.D.C. We will carry out the effects of the studies ourselves if we are unable to bring particular groups to take them up.

Mr. Dean Brown: What areas do they cover?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They cover an extremely wide range; some of them are the development of agrobased industrial processes.

Mr. TONKIN: I think that this line relates to the Research and Planning Division, so this may be the appropriate occasion on which to raise this matter, although it might better be raised under the line relating to the Public Service Board Department. Can the Premier tell the Committee what research has been done into the long-term effects of the superannuation fund as it currently stands? There has been a considerable degree of concern—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That has nothing to do with this department.

The CHAIRMAN: I would have to rule the honourable Leader out of order, because the matter he raises does not appear under this line. If there is a more appropriate line under which he could raise the matter, he should do that.

Mr. TONKIN: I will explain, Mr. Chairman, and then perhaps you can give a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN: As long as the honourable Leader does not debate the point.

Mr. TONKIN: The Economic Development Department is concerned particularly with looking not only at the present but more particularly at the future of South Australia's economy—not only from the industrial development point of view but as regards how much money will be available and what our income will be and what we are likely to be doing in the next few years. I have a great regard and respect for the work being done by the department, particularly by the Director-General and his staff. It is absolutely essential that we have such a department, but the degree to which it will be able to conduct its activities and to which the State will be able to conduct its activities within the next, say, five or 10 years (and that is the time span the department is currently looking at) will be influenced considerably by our financial commitments in that time.

One factor is the question of the increased Government contribution and responsibility for meeting superannuation payments. Therefore, I ask whether the staff of the Economic Development Department has been conducting any studies into the long-term effects of the superannuation fund, which is one item that I believe will bear heavily on the State's ability to finance projects within the next 10 years.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, the department has not.

Dr. EASTICK: I seek information from the Premier in relation to the announcement of economic assistance for establishing organisations. My query relates to the agricultural situation. The farming community has been assisted by drought relief.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out to the Committee that there has been a tendency for honourable members to use the Economic Development Department to associate

it with a wide range of activities throughout South Australia. It is a tenuous thread, and I want honourable members to be more specific as regards the lines. If the honourable member can relate his query to a specific line, it would make the decision of the Chair much easier.

Dr. EASTICK: I find it difficult so to do. We are looking at the administrative activities of the Economic Development Department. The department has distributed literature today, setting out the guidelines for the assistance available in the Adelaide area, in certain growth centre areas, and elsewhere in this State. Many establishments in many areas of this State were unable to gain drought relief assistance, but they provide a real service to the community.

I am referring to agricultural equipment organisations, welding groups, various emporiums and the various stock firms and drug houses that have not had any drought relief assistance. They do not seem to qualify for the assistance that is now available from the Economic Development Department through the new incentives programme which was announced first by the Deputy Premier and which was then highlighted today in documentation from the department to members. A question asked by the member for Semaphore was replied to today by the Premier in relation to that matter. I ask whether the Government has considered or will consider, through the close liaison between the Economic Development Department and the Small Business Bureau, the plight of the many rural service organisations that are finding themselves in financial difficulty so that they can at least make use in the shorter term, until general agricultural returns improve (which we hope they will do by the middle of next year), of assistance to maintain their services for the community which otherwise might be denied to the community unless immediate assistance is not received.

Last week the member for Goyder indicated a problem that exists in his area. His area is not alone on this matter. An operator in his district has been in touch with the Economic Development Department, and I assisted in arranging the interview. That man was able to demonstrate to the department that various finance organisations have now written to a number of such people in the rural community, saying:

Unfortunately, I wish to advise that our current company policies do not allow us to lend outside the metropolitan area.

It is a real problem, of which the Director-General of the department was unaware when this man made his first approach. I have quoted only one of several letters that have come from finance organisations indicating that they cannot (even though they have done so in the past) make funds available in rural communities.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Does that include Beneficial Finance?

Dr. EASTICK: Beneficial Finance is not one of the companies from which I have received correspondence on the matter. Beneficial Finance is only one organisation and would have a limitation on the funds that it has available. I want an indication whether the department has considered extending assistance to this vital area between now and the time rural funds begin to flow.

During the second reading debate on this measure I introduced figures that were supplied by the Bureau of Statistics relating to the down-turn in rural returns. Those statistics show a marked depression in returns between 1973-74 and now. That reduction is reflected in the ability of the farming community to meet debts owing to a number of organisations which are a vital part of the rural community and which, if permitted to go to the wall or to wind down operations, will mean not only the loss of that

service but also of job opportunities for several people. The Premier would know of a similar situation which applies in Kadina and which has been referred to by the member for Rocky River. Provision does not seem to have been made in statements so far to accommodate the organisations and people to whom I have referred in the vital interim period.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has been referring to schemes operated by the department in industrial incentives, that is, for the establishment of new and additional employment. Those schemes cannot encompass schemes that try to provide a better financing arrangement to existing establishments during a difficult period. We have numbers of schemes that help people who are in existing difficulties.

Dr. Eastick: No-one in the department has been able to identify them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Let me outline the basis on which we give assistance. It is given through the Small Business Bureau, which at times gives advice and consultancy. Regarding finance, a number of rural co-operatives have obtained funds through the loans to producers arrangements, which are extremely generous. In addition, the State Bank of South Australia widely services the rural community. Again through the State Bank we have a part interest in Beneficial Finance, which has also been giving considerable service to the rural community, so that hire purchase and finance company operations are extended through the agencies of the State banking system in rural areas.

Those are the traditional means of assisting people in difficulty through a limited period when they are faced with an economic down-turn. Moreover, the South Australian Development Corporation can, in certain circumstances, give assistance for the purpose of restructuring an industry. Several industries have been assisted in this way. It is on those bases that we assist now. I have not had drawn to my attention by the Director-General a particular difficulty in this area, but I undertake to discuss the matter with him to see if there is something further we should do.

The CHAIRMAN: I am concerned about the scope of the debate that eventuates on some of the lines. I do not want unnecessarily to limit that scope of debate but, without reflecting on any member, there is an unintentional tendency on some of the lines to take too much advantage of the tolerance of the Chair. To make the work of the Chair easier so that I can understand more clearly the information that members are seeking and so that I can determine whether or not what they are asking is in order, I would appreciate it if they could refer to a specific line, where it is relevant to do so. I appreciate that there are times when that is not so easy.

Dr. EASTICK: I accept the offer that has been made by the Premier but so far discussions in that area have not solved the problem that exists. That was highlighted by the member for Goyder last week when he indicated that the Small Business Bureau and the department said to the person concerned that he was doing everything he should be doing and he had an exemplary business record and undertaking. However, no suggestion was made whence assistance might come. It would be wrong, whilst we provide initiatives to get new businesses under way (and I fully appreciate the situation and believe that it is necessary and desirable), to let that situation proceed and, at the same time, by default, let a number of organisations wind down or go to the wall.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I refer to the provision for the Research and Planning Division. Does this division carry out a survey of companies to determine what are the

specific policies that companies would like adopted by the State Government to help their rather parlous financial position at the present time, particularly in relation to employment? I receive many letters from companies requesting specific types of assistance from the State Government. I sometimes wonder whether the State Government, through this division, surveys companies in an attempt to determine the main problems faced by companies in South Australia.

I know many of the component manufacturers in the motor vehicle industry face particular problems, especially now that four major manufacturers operate in Victoria. These companies are now finding it increasingly difficult to ensure that they can compete against component manufacturers in Melbourne or Sydney. General Motors- Holden's have placed their supply division in Victoria, although originally part of that supply division was in South Australia. This means that companies which wish to supply G.M.H. must send their engineers to Victoria to consult on quality control, etc., and they must travel to Victoria to tender. These fundamental problems are not obvious when looking at figures but they need to be ascertained if we are to protect the employment base in this State. I know the Government is concerned about what we can call the erosion of our manufacturing base of employment and the Opposition is certainly concerned. I sometimes wonder whether the Government departments appreciate the problems faced by individual industries, and, if such surveys are not carried out, could the Government departments ensure they are carried out in future?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Surveys are carried out by the department, which endeavours to keep closely in touch with all areas of industry. I think there is no area of industry that it knows better than the car and component-manufacturing industry. A South Australian Government submission was successful in showing the previous Federal Government that the I.A.C. proposals for the car industry were hopelessly badly based and the model was wrong, because they had not taken into account the component-manufacturing industry in this State. We had detailed material prepared.

The head of the Economic Intelligence Unit in the department, Mr. Smith, was previously the senior economist at Chryslers. He knows the car industry and the component-manufacturing industry extremely well. He and Mr. Owens keep in close touch with the industry. I believe they and Mr. Bakewell have a close knowledge of the problems facing the component industry as well as the major manufacturers.

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say how many motor vehicles will be purchased this year and to whom they will be offered? How many motor vehicles are in the department, and what is the reason for the short-fall in the purchase of motor vehicles last financial year when \$38 900 was allocated and actual payments totalled only \$18 224?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Last year the estimate included provision for four additional vehicles. The purchase of these has been deferred; that was why there was a short-fall. The 1978-79 proposed expenditure allows for the replacement of two vehicles and the purchase of one of those which was deferred. We are still providing for very much less than the establishment which we originally proposed and which we had thought necessary for the establishment of the department, given the contacts which the department must make with business in South Australia.

Line passed.

Public Service Board, \$3 767 000.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: A few weeks ago I asked a Question on Notice regarding the payment of telephone accounts of public servants. It was not a very expertly drafted question, because it contained an ambiguity in that I asked "in whole or in part". I got the staggering answer that 1 340 public servants have their telephone accounts paid in whole or in part, including 10 officers of the department of the Public Service Board.

I then put a series of Questions on Notice designed to elicit who had the lot paid, who had rental only paid, and who had calls paid, in whole or in part. I was not altogether surprised, but still disappointed, when the Government avoided answering that question last Tuesday, when the raw information must have been there to answer the first question. How can the Premier justify 10 officers in this department having assistance with their private telephone accounts?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Because they are required to do work which involves telephone calls to their homes. It is as simple as that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That may be a simple way of answering the question but it is an absurd thing to say. Is the Premier suggesting that these officers would not provide telephones for themselves or that they should, because they have incoming calls, have some assistance with their telephone accounts? I suspect, from the way in which the question was answered, that this is, as I have said publicly, and as many people have said when agreeing with me, merely a perk which has got out of hand. It must be a very long time since any scrutiny was given to what is going on.

I would have thought that the officers in this department would be those who are responsible for checking on this, but, as I see it, they are amongst the offenders in this way, and I can only say that I am by no means satisfied with the glib answer the Premier gave, as, to all intents and purposes, it begs the question.

Mr. BECKER: Has the Government, through the board, sought an assessment of the value of flexitime within the State Public Service? I refer to the following report in today's *News*:

Federal public servants may lose flexitime privileges because the man who introduced it, former A.L.P. Minister for Labor, Mr. Clyde Cameron, had detected apparent abuses of the system. Mr. Cameron told Federal Parliament he had recently attempted to ring three Government departments—including the Public Service Board itself—but could get no answer.

I am concerned about the methods of using flexitime in some Government departments. My experience has been that although telephones have always been answered in departments, in some departments I find difficulty in getting certain officers between 11.30 a.m. and 3.00 p.m. My secretary has said that it is a waste of time telephoning these departments at those times. That may be a little unfair, but there is a problem there.

I have received complaints from several constituents who have telephoned Government departments. I received a complaint from a businessman in Melbourne recently who was seeking assistance through the Economic Development Department. He was trying to ascertain whether a factory was available in the Hindmarsh area, but he could not contact a particular person when he telephoned. The nature of the position of the person he was ringing is such that that person is in and out of the office. Flexitime makes it difficult to contact some officers unless the person trying to contact them knows their movements. Some departments do not have the depth of assistance available, and I wonder whether the Government has assessed the benefits of flexitime and the

inconvenience it causes to the public. Because of flexitime, issues that sometimes could be handled within 30 minutes or an hour have to be deferred for 24 hours. This has happened to me on several occasions. If no assessment has been made, would the Government undertake to review the situation because of those statements made by Mr. Clyde Cameron, for whom I have much respect?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report from the Chairman of the board for the honourable member.

Mr. TONKIN: I notice that for "Advertising vacant position in press and expenses of applicants for positions and new appointees" there has been a considerable increase from \$203 575 to \$240 000. I know that the Premier and members of the Government have announced a freeze on appointments to the Public Service, so I wondered why that freeze is not more accurately reflected in the amount set aside this year. Am I to assume that there is a freeze on the establishment but that this does not necessarily mean that the Public Service will run down, but that people will be advertised for in the usual way?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The provision has occurred because there are increased advertising and career publicity material rates. It is expected that some interview expenses will include air fares, and that we will have to have additional provision for them. Also, some relocation expenses will have to be met.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Line 1050 indicates that the Public Service Board is being provided with computing services in some way. There has been no previous vote for this, but there is an amount of \$100 000 voted this year. What is entailed in that amount and what functions will computers perform for the Public Service Board? I assume that this is a vote for the use of a computer situated in another Government department to provide information to the board. Why does that line appear for the first time this year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Amounts have previously been spent in this area. This is a contingent amount provided to enable feasibility studies to be conducted for the purchase of additional computer hardware and software. We have previously been involved in the A.D.P. centre.

Mr. BECKER: Has the Government reviewed its policy in relation to advertising in the *Australian* newspaper, particularly the *Weekend Australian*? I often read that paper and have not seen any State Government advertisements in it for the Public Service. I wondered whether the Government has a policy of not advertising in that paper. If so, will the Government reconsider it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government does advertise from time to time in the *Australian*; I can assure the honourable member of that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Premier wrote me a letter about this matter a few weeks ago, because I asked him the same question, suspecting that the Government had something against Mr. Rupert Murdoch and that for that reason the advertisements had been withdrawn. I received a much fuller reply than the honourable member got from the Premier.

Mr. Becker: I would appreciate a copy of that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will see whether the resources of my office will stretch as far as giving the honourable member a copy of the letter. The answer I got was that as was appropriate these advertisements were inserted, but that the *Australian* frequently was not the appropriate paper in which to place advertisements because likely applicants were unlikely to see them. The Premier did not canvass the reason why the number of advertisements had decreased rather markedly. He is pretty good at avoiding a

difficult point simply by ignoring it.

I return to the matter I raised with the Premier before about the payment of telephone accounts. How long is it since this matter was scrutinised by the Public Service Board, which I imagine would be responsible for this matter? If the Premier does not know, will he find out, and, in any case, will he give an undertaking that the whole matter of the payment of telephone accounts of public servants will be examined with a view to reducing the colossal number who now get this perk?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not consider this a "perk". I know the honourable member is looking for anything he can use in a perjorative way in the hope that some reporter will be waiting to hear these deathless words fall from his lips. There have been a number of reports to the Government since 1970 concerning this and other matters relating to particular facilities provided for public servants. The Government has reviewed them from time to time. I will endeavour to get the honourable member the date of the last review.

Referring to the matter of advertisements in the *Australian*, the Government, on investigation, found that, when advertising positions interstate, if it advertised in both the *Financial Review* and the *National Times* it would be getting to the same professional group to whom it intended to get by advertising in the *Australian*, at a very much lower cost. In those circumstances, I, as Treasurer, did what I thought members opposite would want me to do and said that we would do the thing as effectively and, also, as cheaply as we could. This does not mean that there are not appropriate occasions for a particular advertisement to be inserted in the *Australian*, also.

Line passed.

Art Gallery, \$904 000.

Mr. EVANS: What historical items were purchased for the Art Gallery, and where were they purchased from? Earlier this year I asked the Premier whether items were bought from the Jam Factory for the museum. In a reply I was told that that was so, and that there were \$4 500-worth. Subsequently, I received a letter from the Premier's Department pointing out that an error had been made and that the items had been bought not for the museum but for the Art Gallery.

In my question I asked whether the items purchased from the Jam Factory could be isolated individually, and the price given for each item. I have heard that one item, a piece of silverware (a teapot), was bought from the Jam Factory for \$2 500. I cannot prove that. The only way I can find out if that is correct is to ask the Premier for full details of the items bought for the Art Gallery, including items that may not be historical. Can I have details of all the items bought (including purchases of works of art), amounting to \$130 000, for the Art Gallery last year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will ask the board to provide this information.

Mrs. ADAMSON: There has been an increase of \$7 000 for purchases of works of art. I ask for information relating to the Government's priorities in this area. I am well aware that the function of the Jam Factory is quite separate and distinct from that of the Art Gallery, but it seems somewhat extraordinary that there was an excess of expenditure over income at the Jam Factory of \$479 000 in the current year, and \$391 000 in the previous year.

The Government appears to be very willing to pour vast sums of taxpayers' money in this direction. When it comes to purchases of works of art which retain and increase their value and which are for the use and enjoyment of the people of South Australia, a mere additional \$7 000 can be found for that, whereas hundreds of thousands of dollars is put into other areas, many of which are administrative.

One gets the impression that the tail is wagging the dog and that actual art works themselves are receiving far less money than is the "administration" of the arts. Will the Premier explain why there is comparatively little for the purchase of the works of art for the State collection, but such vast sums are spent on items in relation to the Jam Factory?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In relation to the Art Gallery Department, the provision was made for that department on the basis of the general provision for Government departments; that is, they followed the same line in the general amounts which could be made available from revenue for that purpose. As to the amounts which we are spending on purchase of works of art, I should like it to be more, but I am rather surprised that the member for Mitcham has not been on his feet drawing the attention of the Committee to the fact that, when this Government came to office and succeeded his, the annual line for purchase of works of art for the Art Gallery was \$5 000. It has only been under this Government that the amounts have been increased to figures of these proportions. It does show what our relative priorities have been.

In relation to the Jam Factory, that of course is a completely different operation. It is part of the upgrading of the crafts in South Australia generally. It was shown clearly to us that, if we were to upgrade the crafts, we must have master craftsmen's workshops setting a standard to which the general craft climate of South Australia could get, and that meant that we had to import master craftsmen here. That is a view that I am sure all members of the Art Gallery Board would accept.

Mrs. ADAMSON: Nevertheless, is the Premier satisfied that the Government's priorities are correct in allowing so much money to be spent at the Jam Factory, compared with the smaller sums that are spent at the Art Gallery? Does he consider that it is a correct priority to allow nearly \$500 000 to be expended at the Jam Factory in terms of a deficit, yet only increase the line for the purchases of works of art for the Art Gallery of South Australia by \$7 000?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I do. I believe that the priorities are correct. The work of the Jam Factory will have very wide implications in South Australia; it already has had. It will make a considerable difference over a very wide area. The collection which we have at the Art Gallery is a good one. The purchasing policy has been a good one, and in Australian national terms it is the second collection in this nation.

Mr. Millhouse: What's the first?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Melbourne one, but of the State galleries ours is the next, quite clearly.

Mr. Evans: Some of it was achieved under previous Governments.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Some of it was achieved under previous—

Mr. Evans: Most of it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Some of the earlier policies were sensible with the very little money that was then provided, but the major purchases that have been made since our Government came to office (and we increased the amount by which purchases of works of art could occur 500 per cent in the first year of our office) meant that certain parts of the collection are now the best collections in the world. I believe that we have followed a sensible course in this.

Mr. Millhouse: Could you tell us which parts they are?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Thai Ceramics are by far the major collection in the world.

Mr. ALLISON: Is the present allocation of funds

sufficient to maintain the existing Art Gallery collection itself in a good state of repair, bearing in mind that a considerable proportion of the collection is stored away? I also ask whether the stored collection might be split up into specialised collections for circulation to the up and coming regional cultural centres?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We do have mobile exhibitions provided by the gallery. They are used quite extensively in country areas. With the establishment of the Naracoorte Gallery and of the art gallery that will be part of the regional cultural centre in the honourable member's own city, it will be possible for the Art Gallery Board, which now has, effectively, responsibility for art galleries for the whole of South Australia, to provide exhibitions and collections on loan to the gallery in Mount Gambier.

I point out to the honourable member, as to storage and care, that the Government is currently spending some millions at the Art Gallery. Apparently, that is something that the member for Coles is not aware of either, but it will come up in the Loan Estimates. It is spending some millions at the Art Gallery, for upgrading the Art Gallery, and air-conditioning it to make certain that there is no deterioration of the works of art in the area.

Eventually, I hope we will be able to make some alterations in the buildings on North Terrace, with some alterations, proposed in the museums area, to enlarge the exhibition area for the Art Gallery. It is intended as soon as possible to hand over the old police barracks building, which is occupied by some technical officers of the Museums Department, to the Art Gallery for additional space for its historical collection, and to restore that very vital historic building so that it is a suitable place for that purpose.

Mr. WILSON: I refer to the sum to be allocated for the purchase of historical items, and to the notebooks, film, and tapes of the Aranda people now in the possession of Professor Strehlow. I believe we are facing a serious situation, whereby this priceless information may well be lost to us unless some research assistance can be given to the Strehlow Foundation to have these notebooks translated during the professor's lifetime. I understand that an approach has been made to the Premier and to the Government on this matter. The position is complicated, but I believe it is important that these priceless things should not be lost. Can the Premier give any information on the matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is some time since I saw the correspondence in relation to the Strehlow proposals. I received some material from Mrs. Strehlow, which was written in terms which were not exactly conducive to objective evaluation of the proposals. The Government has tried to help in this area where it can. If Strehlow materials are to be purchased by the Government, they would appropriately be in the museum area, where we have the best collection of Australiana and ethnic material anywhere. It would not be appropriate for the Art Gallery Department in the same way. I shall undertake to have another look at the situation. Negotiations have taken place over a considerable period between the Strehlows and the Federal authorities.

Mr. BECKER: The amount proposed for the Deputy Director and for administrative, clerical and general staff is \$522 754. Will that be sufficient, because of the situation of restraint within Government policy? The Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1978, at page 67, states:

Collection Stock Checks:

As reported last year, several collections had not been physically checked in accordance with stocktaking policy. Of these, oil paintings, water colours, and pastels remain

unchecked, and two other collections, prints, and non-gold coins and medals require cataloguing before a check can be undertaken.

The Auditor-General's Report for the year 30 June 1977, at page 63, states:

Collection Stock Checks:

During the year it was necessary to refer to the board the fact that several collections had not been physically checked in accordance with the stocktaking policy. In addition, non-gold coins and medals have yet to be catalogued.

Because of the necessity for strict stocktaking, and the stocktaking policy of the department, can the Premier say when this will be done and what assistance can be given to the department to expedite it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall get a report from the Director. Provisions for this year are adequate to cover the staff, as no new positions are to be created this year in the Art Gallery Department.

Dr. EASTICK: What now is the policy of the Art Gallery in relation to the use of collection items in Government departments and in electoral offices? Earlier, the system was that paintings from the Art Gallery were made available to members who wished to hang them in their electoral offices. They were replaced on a rotational basis, making use of an art exhibit that otherwise would be gathering dust or not available to the public.

Mr. Millhouse: A waste of time—

Dr. EASTICK: It becomes a matter of personal decision as to whether it is a waste of time or whether it is allowing the public access to something that is their right and their property. The major issues previously have been problems of security and insurance. As I believe that the Art Gallery Board was to examine the matter overall, has the Premier any further information on this matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The opinion of the Art Gallery Board was that the collection that had been made by the Art Gallery was not a large collection for dispersal purposes, but a carefully made selection to be as representative as possible of various styles and works of art, particularly those of South Australian artists. There were problems in insurance and security, and in being able to retrieve certain works for exhibition purposes, if they were dispersed widely in public buildings in South Australia.

It was proposed to draw back into the Art Gallery all those works of art belonging to the gallery that were out in other public buildings. One immediate problem about that was that, from some of the earlier policies of the Art Gallery Board, there are some works of art that it would be fairly unlikely that the Art Gallery would want, with its exhibition space, to exhibit with any sort of frequency.

Mr. Millhouse: Some of those in this place that have been here for 20 years now.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Some of those. The Art Gallery has, however, retrieved some works of art that were hung in this building and has exhibited them, but there have been numbers that it has seen fit to leave here. Looking at them, I do not find that surprising. The opinion was that the Art Gallery should draw in that collection, and that a policy should be developed by the Government of purchase of South Australian works of art that would not be purchased for the gallery, although they were excellent works of art.

Nevertheless, since the gallery had sufficient representative works of a particular painter, it would not go on buying endlessly works of a good painter or other kind of artist in South Australia if it considered that that artist was sufficiently represented in the collection, but that we should put on a special line for purchase of works of arts for public buildings, and should then steadily replace the

works that the gallery had out in public buildings.

The Government views that as a sensible proposition. It would be of assistance to South Australian artists, and it would be a reasonable proposal. However, we do not believe that we can afford it at the moment. Therefore, I have made no provision for it in these Estimates. Perhaps in the future we may be able to agree to the gallery's proposal, but at this stage I do not think that we can.

Mr. EVANS: Will the Premier obtain for me details of the number of items held in the gallery's new warehouse, together with its capacity? Can he also tell me who gave permission for the new burglar alarm system to be installed in the Art Gallery that was found to be unsatisfactory immediately it was installed? According to the Premier's reply to me on 12 September, the installation cost \$13 000. The removal costs were included in the contract cost of the new system, \$14 000, which I believe is satisfactory. Such an error should never have been made, as this means money down the drain.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

Mr. BECKER: I am disappointed that no provision is made this year for the purchase of works of art for public places, whereas \$15 000 was allocated and spent last financial year. Will the Premier ask the board to investigate the possibility and the desirability of placing a statue of Queen Adelaide somewhere in the city? The board might even consider establishing a public fund for such a statue.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This is a matter to some extent of artistic taste, and that is inevitably somewhat subjective. The honourable member's proposition does not thrill me. I would be astounded, putting it mildly, if I were able to find extra money for the Art Gallery Board under the item "Purchase of works of art for public places", if it chose to spend it on a statue of Queen Adelaide. I believe it would be unlike the members of the board to make any such proposition. If the honourable member believes that there should be a public fund, perhaps he would be prepared to sponsor it publicly and provide the organisation. Possibly, the Adelaide City Council would be prepared to accept it, as long as it were on a basis other than the basis on which the statue of John McDouall Stuart was erected. I do not know whether the honourable member has seen the inscription on the bottom of the statue, but it states, "Erected by public subscription and donated to the city by the Caledonian Society".

Line passed.

Premier, Miscellaneous, \$12 290 000.

Mrs. ADAMSON: I seek information from the Premier regarding the Ethnic Festivals Grants Advisory Committee, ethnic festivals, ethnic organisations, and Italian Village Incorporated. Who are the members of the Ethnic Festivals Grants Advisory Committee, who appoints them, and for what purpose is the \$1 000 allocation to be used?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain a list of the members for the honourable member. The members are appointed by the Government. The allocation is for members' fees and operating costs for a full financial year.

Mrs. ADAMSON: Regarding the \$40 000 allocation for ethnic festivals, how are the sums allocated between the different ethnic communities; which communities received grants during the past year; and what specific purposes are in mind for the increased grants in the forthcoming year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot give the honourable member a list of the specific allocations as between communities. The grants are made not on a proportionate community basis but on an examination of

the merits of the applications made by festival organisations. Guidelines are set down for the Ethnic Festivals Grants Advisory Committee in allocating that money, namely, the criteria it is to consider in deciding on applications for grants. It has to be careful, because we have noted a tendency for certain public activities and festivities of various kinds to decide that they might get some of this money by suddenly declaring themselves ethnic and having a few people dressed in would-be European costume dancing around at some part of their carry-on.

Naturally enough, we do not find that as being an ethnic festival. The ethnic festivals are to be proper shows and celebrations of the culture of a certain ethnic group in South Australia and the sharing of that cultural tradition with the population of the State. The reason that we established grants in this area was that these festivals, which are important in the development of our multi-cultural society, were tending to fall between two stools in the Government grants area. They were found in many cases not to have a particular tourist attraction of sufficient note to get priority as against other areas of tourist grants. They did not get in under tourist grants and, at the same time, many of them did not rate highly as having a specific arts content.

The Italian Festival got an arts grant for those particular festival activities that could come within the normal arts grants provisions, such as the provision of Italian opera, and the like. The business of having, say, the Sagra and other public activities that were sharing the Italian tradition with the rest of the community nevertheless did not qualify for arts grants. We believe that it was proper to give a small sum to encourage people in this area of activity.

Last year we put \$40 000 on the line. That sum was not spent because it was late last year before the Ethnic Festivals Advisory Committee was appointed and, consequently, the whole allocation could not be spent during last year, given the applications that were made. We have kept the allocation the same as last year's, but we expect that applications will considerably exceed that amount this year. However, we believe \$40 000 was a reasonable provision.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask for your guidance, Mr. Acting Chairman, as I intend to move to reduce one of the lines in this vote by \$100. Should I do it now? It is on page 20 of the details of the Estimates of Expenditure.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You can do it Tuesday week if you want to.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not believe that it is for the Premier to make that decision—not formally, anyway. Maybe he is the one who gives the nod to the Chairman, but it is the Chairman who makes the decision. I propose to move to reduce the line "Royal Commission—Non-medical Use of Drugs". Should I do it now?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Whitten): The honourable member can move it at any time, but I feel that the Committee should have the opportunity to ask questions on other lines first.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: All right. I certainly do not want to cut anyone else out. In fact, there are several questions I want to ask on earlier lines. I take it that I have an assurance that, when other queries and so on are exhausted, I will get a chance to move in that way.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The honourable member can move it at the appropriate time.

Mrs. ADAMSON: Regarding the line "Ethnic Organisations", I seek information from the Premier whether the allocation for this line is related to a grant for cultural purposes, or to a grant for commercial or social welfare

purposes? Why was it considered necessary to establish a new and separate line for "Ethnic Organisations", for what purpose will these grants be made, and to whom?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It provides for grants to approved ethnic organisations established to give advice and assistance to various ethnic groups within the community. It is to encourage a self-help programme within the ethnic groupings.

Mrs. ADAMSON: Regarding the line "Italian Village Inc.", for what purpose was the sum of \$15 000 made available, why was it a once-only grant, and why is no further assistance to be given to the Italian Village Committee, which has bought land at Athelstone for the purpose of erecting a village for retired Italians?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Italian Village Incorporated is to provide an old folks home for Italian people. Its normal application for assistance would have been to the Commonwealth, which provides a subsidy for the erection of such homes. The organisation could not provide enough funds for the home itself, and it sought the Commonwealth's assistance. It was told that, if it could get an undertaking from the Federal Government about when a specific sum would be paid to subsidise the programme, the South Australian Government would provide bridging finance for the interim period that would be repaid from the Commonwealth allocation in due season. The organisation has not been able to get that undertaking from the Commonwealth.

Mrs. Adamson: It has; it is awaiting zoning approval.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In that case it has not made an application to me since then. It was told clearly what the position was at the time. In addition, because of the provisions that have faced ethnic communities, the Government said that, unlike the case of other old folks homes in the rest of the community but because of the specific difficulties of ethnic communities, it would make a \$15 000 grant towards the establishment of such a place. The Government made that promise and carried it out. If the honourable member is suggesting that I have been parsimonious with the Italian community, frankly, she is biting the hand that has fed people in her own district.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier): In the *News* of 14 September, in one of his regular contributions to that newspaper entitled "View from the back bench", the member for Torrens, under the heading "A revealing first year as an MP"—

Mr. Wilson: Do you read it, too?

Mr. HEMMINGS: You will hear what I am going to say about it. In that article, the honourable member wrote the following:

The most disappointing aspect of Parliamentary life is to be on the receiving end of the low esteem in which MPs are held by the public. . . . Nevertheless, we have earned a bad reputation in the past and we must set about showing the public that we do the very best we can for the people of this State, to the limit of our individual abilities.

I have no argument with the honourable member on that aspect; I agree with him that members of Parliament as a whole have bad reputations. It has also been a revealing year for me as a member of Parliament, revealing in as much as I have ascertained just how low certain members

opposite can sink in their personal, vicious attacks on members of the Government. Not only do they attack members but they also include members' families. I refer to the despicable, cowardly outburst made against Mrs. Chatterton by the member for Eyre on Tuesday evening.

Sheltering in the safety of this House, he abandoned long-standing traditions of decency and propriety by denigrating the Minister's wife, knowing full well that had he made those charges outside the House he would have been subject to legal action. True to form, the *Advertiser* gave the charges he made against Mrs. Chatterton full prominence on page 1, as follows:

Blast for wife of Minister: The wife of the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Chatterton, was the subject of a bitter attack in Parliament last night.

Mr. Gunn (Liberal, Eyre) said in a grievance debate in the Assembly that Mrs. Chatterton, a research assistant (agriculture) in the Premier's office, was not only despised but wherever she went there was criticism of her. Mr. Gunn said people regarded Mrs. Chatterton as the one who made the decisions because of her interfering attitude. "She is a busybody," he said. Mrs. Chatterton was the "force behind the throne."

Mr. Gunn asked: "Why is this particular person sitting in on meetings?" He asked why Mrs. Chatterton was making comments to fishermen around the State. "That is not her role; it is the role of the Minister", Mr. Gunn said. "It is quite improper for the Premier to employ a Minister's wife in his office, particularly advising him on matters which are under her husband's control."

Mr. Gunn said the interfering and the incompetence of the present Minister could not be tolerated any longer. The Premier ought to sack the Minister and his wife.

I read that so that people reading *Hansard* will understand the member for Eyre's cowardly stand. It was interesting to hear the Premier today in a Ministerial statement inform this House that the prawn fishermen completely dissociated themselves from that criticism of Mrs. Chatterton, because of the remarks of the member for Eyre and the remarks of the member for Alexandra, who was also trying to get into the act of slandering Mrs. Chatterton by using the safety of this House.

It was interesting, after the Minister of Mines and Energy asked the member for Alexandra and the member for Eyre to apologise, to hear them say, "No way." That is the low standard of members opposite. I am sure my colleagues will agree with me that the member for Eyre, that small-time country boy, who obviously has no standards of decency, is a gutless coward. I am sure there are members opposite, although if I counted them I do not think there would be very many, who are ashamed of the slanderous attack made by the member for Eyre against Mrs. Chatterton. They will not say so publicly but perhaps the member for Torrens, who wrote that frank article in the *News*, is slightly ashamed of his colleague. Any member who is not ashamed of what the member for Eyre said stands condemned also.

Unfortunately, the same day the member for Eyre made his cowardly attack, another member opposite chose also to sink to an all-time low. In her vicious diatribe against the Attorney-General, the member for Coles said that it would be interesting to see who on this side would defend the Attorney-General. I am not on my feet to defend the Attorney-General; I am on my feet to expose the member for Coles for exactly what she is. At all times the member for Coles has presented herself to this House, especially when dealing with rape and pornography, as espousing the views of Christian persons.

A dictionary defines "Christian" as follows: believing or professing to believe in the religion of Christ; following the

precepts and examples of Christ; being humane, being civilised, being decent, and being respectable. The dictionary definition of "humane" is civil, courteous, obliging, kind and benevolent. After that outburst against the Attorney-General by the members for Coles, can anyone say that the member for Coles is a Christian, civil, courteous or tolerant? I very much doubt it. When the member for Coles was elected she went on record as saying as the new member for Coles she would give the Attorney-General a hard time. It seems to me that a hard time can only be identified with a deep personal dislike of the Attorney-General, as is shown in the vicious attacks made by the member for Coles upon his integrity.

At a public meeting, which was organised in my district but which turned out to be a private meeting of the Liberal Party, with the public being excluded, the Liberal Party used for political gain a concern being shown by some members of the Elizabeth North parish of the Catholic Church, and they played on this concern to the full with a cynical disregard for that parish's reputations and feelings. I doubt very much whether members of the Liberal Party in this House or in my District of Napier will apologise to the people of the Elizabeth North parish church.

I apologise to them for the contempt in which they have been held by the Liberal Party, and when I write to Archbishop Gleeson to explain the role of the Liberal Party in my district in this whole business, I can only hope the Archbishop can show the same forgiveness to the Christian members of the Liberal Party. It seems to me, and it seems from the opinions of my colleagues on this side, that Christianity belongs to the Liberal Party.

If their concept of Christianity is in accordance with what they have done in connection with the public meeting and the debates conducted by members opposite on pornography and rape, I am proud not to be called a Christian.

Mr. WOTTON (Murray): This afternoon, in reply to the member for Glenelg, the Minister of Community Welfare once again attempted to suggest that South Australia was leading Australia in matters relating to fostering of children. We have often been bombarded with this fact that South Australia is supposed to be leading the other States in so many things; today, it was community welfare, particularly the fostering of children. The Minister has continually implied that there is no problem with regard to the care of children in this State. If the Minister persists in this attitude, Opposition members will have to make him realise that this Government's policies and attitudes are creating very grave problems associated with the fostering and the care of children generally.

Many reports have been brought to the Opposition's notice expressing deep concern by foster parents and people closely associated with the care of children. The Minister of Community Welfare has continually suggested that people who come out into the open and discuss these matters have no idea of what they are talking about. After the Minister had replied to the member for Glenelg, a glaring example of the Government's attitude was evident, when the member for Florey referred to the matter raised as a "load of rubbish".

Mr. Mathwin: He wouldn't know.

Mr. WOTTON: There are very few members on that side of the House who would know. The Minister has shown that he is not prepared to accept any form of criticism in regard to the policies and the objectives laid down by this Government regarding the care of children, particularly the fostering of children. That is a sad and serious situation.

Mr. Mathwin: The Minister is isolated from the

problem.

Mr. WOTTON: The Minister does not understand either his department or the problem; that is a serious situation. The Minister has referred to statements reported to have been made by Mrs. Ey through the media as being nonsense. Actually he referred to these as something else but, fortunately for the Minister, that was not printed in the *Advertiser* this morning. Other people who, like Mrs. Ey, have spoken up on this same subject have received the same treatment from the Minister.

It is not simply a matter of one or two people coming out into the open and talking in this manner. Opposition members have received representations from a wide cross-section of this State's population. The growing amount of evidence has shown quite clearly many of the issues causing concern to foster parents and to the community generally. I intend to deal with some of the evidence that has been brought forward. Much concern has been expressed to me about the failure of this Government to meet its obligations in regard to financial assistance.

The Minister quoted figures today relating to financial assistance to foster parents and children in South Australia compared to assistance given in other States. Anything can be done with figures. There are cases where adequate assistance is provided but there are also many cases where it is not. The only case that I have time to bring to the notice of the House today arose recently when a foster mother was made to feel very degraded, when she was subjected to a means test, after requesting financial assistance to purchase special shoes for a foster child. I have not time to mention all the examples I should like to provide, but in some cases the status of children has been reduced from care and control to that of guardianship. This is applying even to children who have no living parents. One could ask the Minister whether this was a general policy of the Government, because there are growing reports of it.

Mr. Mathwin: It's in the new Bill.

Mr. WOTTON: Yes. Among other things, that has meant that the initial clothing allowance has been reduced in these cases and in other cases no regular clothing allowance exists and there are no maintenance upkeep payments. I have spoken with people who are receiving no payment other than pocket money for the children: this is all the allowance these people are receiving for carrying out this duty to the community. My colleague, the member for Glenelg, referred in his question today to the placement of Brookway Park boys. The Minister either is not interested or does not want to know, and I suggest that it is the latter. Boys have been fostered out from Brookway Park into ordinary foster homes.

Mr. Mathwin: Of course they have been, and the Minister knows it well.

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

Mr. WOTTON: He has chosen not to recognise it, though. This has been evident since it has been common knowledge that the plans for the introduction of the I.N.C. scheme were well under way, and it has occurred since the closure of Brookway Park home was imminent and, indeed, since the home was actually closed. I know this because I have spoken to at least one person who is personally involved in this situation.

Particular concern has been expressed to me by foster parents in regard to the Government's policy relating to children with serious problems of disruptive behaviour. Many cases brought to my notice recently suggest that it is imperative that foster parents of children with such behavioural problems should be covered by insurance and receive compensation. I raised this matter in the House

recently in a question to the Minister and, in his usual style, he chose to fob it off. An insurance cover for foster mothers should be provided when, as in so many cases, foster parents are completely unaware of the risks they are taking with some children, and this would particularly apply to youths transferred from homes such as Brookway Park to ordinary foster homes.

I have been told of one case where a foster mother received injuries as a result of the action of an unruly foster daughter. The same child injured a cottage mother who apparently is still receiving compensation. The foster mother was refused compensation. There are also problems when foster mothers have traumatic experiences with children who have grown up to have serious behavioural problems that are detected mainly as the child matures. I believe they are not receiving adequate attention from the Community Welfare Department.

This is not the fault of the officers of the department but it arises because their hands are tied by the policies of this Government. It seems that the department has no programme to provide any strength in assisting foster parents in distress situations. Most of the concern that I have referred to today devolves upon this Government's refusal to accept the fact that there is a real need to lay down a set of standards. I believe that this is a very real factor that must be seriously considered when looking for solutions to many problems associated with community welfare.

The Minister has repeatedly suggested that punishment and restitution are the responsibilities of the court and not the department. I also stress the need for treatment to include emphasis upon behavioural change based on reasonable and generally accepted community standards. Unfortunately, it seems that the Government is unwilling to accept this suggestion.

The *laissez faire* attitude to discipline makes the work of foster parents 10 times harder. That job is almost impossible, and possibly ruins the lives of children in later years. It is to be presumed that, if the Minister continues to ignore the concerns of so many genuine people who are willing to open their hearts and homes to assist—

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

Mrs. BYRNE (Todd): I am pleased that the present Government recognises that some children require special education or education appropriate to their needs. The general policy assumes that most individual differences of children can, and should, be managed in regular classes by regular classroom teachers. There are many children with physical difficulties, or with less severe learning problems, who are adequately dealt with without special education resources being required in their support.

The latest available comparative data (1976) shows that 96.1 per cent of children receiving special educational assistance in South Australia obtain it in departmental schools. The following figures apply in other States: Tasmania, 100 per cent; New South Wales, 93 per cent; Western Australia, 90.6 per cent; Queensland, 89.4 per cent; and Victoria, 79.3 per cent. Some States have private organisations or other departments providing educational services for many moderately and severely handicapped youngsters who, if they were in South Australia, would be attending regular or special schools.

Therefore, South Australia compares favourably with other States, and is accepting its responsibility for providing for a more substantial part of the child population than are most other States. The Education Department works on the premise that meeting the wide variety of needs of handicapped children requires a wide

variety of services, flexibly organised. A general summary of these services includes: first, the provision of facilities within special schools that are of specific value to groups of children and adults within the community to attract the general population into settings that would otherwise be exclusively for the handicapped; secondly, the provision of special school resources, wherever possible, on the same site as regular schools, the combining of special classes, students and teachers, with regular classes in a single unit; thirdly, the provision of an additional teacher within an open-space unit, which includes a group of handicapped children; fourthly, the provision of support teachers in regular schools with small numbers of handicapped children; and, fifthly, the setting up of full-time special classes, and special classes to which children are withdrawn for limited periods.

The Education Department accepts all children, except the small number of totally dependent children, no matter what their level of handicap. For example, the department provides a school within the Strathmont Centre for any child who can take any self-initiated action whatever—a level of acceptance that is rare elsewhere. Secondly, physically handicapped and mentally retarded children are accepted within the school at the Woodville Spastic Centre. Thirdly, totally blind or totally deaf students are accepted into appropriate special schools or centres, and hearing-impaired children, for example, are educated in special units attached to regular primary or secondary schools, or in regular classes supported by visiting special teachers.

The school for visually-impaired children (Townsend House) provides on-site education for about 50 blind and partially-sighted children and, in addition, supports almost twice that number in regular schools by advice, counselling, and the provision of specialist materials.

Even at Ru Rua Hospital, where totally dependent children are provided with medical, nursing, and basic training care, departmental teachers, have an advisory and co-ordinating role. Referring to the children in this category, many parents continue to try to care for these children at home, as formerly they had little choice, because no really satisfactory alternatives were possible.

Keeping them at home must sooner or later impose enormous stresses on the family, because the presence of such a handicapped person makes normal family life impossible. Many marriages break up, some mothers suffer from depression, siblings frequently suffer because the handicapped person requires a disproportionate amount of attention, and normal outings are hard to arrange. As I recently visited Ru Rua Hospital, I pay a tribute to the staff for their devotion to the persons in their care. Of course, I also include in that the other staff members who are involved in this type of work.

Special schools have been set up in some country towns where hostels are provided by organisations, such as the Mentally Retarded Children's Society, to permit children in more isolated settings to board in order to attend school. Some peripatetic support services are available to help teachers to retain more handicapped children within their neighbourhood schools. If teachers or parents wish to avail themselves of it, access to the advisory service given by psychologists in the Guidance and Special Services Branch is available. When the last figures on this branch were given, it employed 63 psychologists (known as guidance officers), including senior officers, 11 social workers, and 11 speech therapists, in support of teachers, parents of students, and handicapped children in departmental schools. Not all officers work on a full-time basis.

The department's special education section is respons-

ible for slightly fewer than 500 teachers, including principals and deputies, in one form or another, of special education throughout the State. Of that number, rather less than half are employed in special schools with some degree of separation from regular schools, although often on a common campus or co-operating across a range of activities.

The remainder are employed in regular primary and secondary schools as teachers of full-time special classes, withdrawal classes, special centres, or as support teachers within single schools or groups of schools. In addition to teachers employed in these areas of work, nearly 150 school assistants or teachers' aides are employed in support of handicapped children in our schools.

Parents are encouraged to be involved in the process of education, and a number of parents' organisations communicate with the department and its officers on matters concerning their particular interests, be they hearing-impaired children, mentally retarded children, hyperactive children, autistic children, and so on. I could add to that list, but it is obvious that in this field the Government has an excellent policy based on common sense and humanitarian values.

This level of services has been made available in South Australia despite the fact that the Handicapped Persons Assistance Act, operated by the Australian Social Security Department, provides staff (50 per cent of salaries) and capital on a four-to-one subsidy to private organisations providing special educational services for handicapped children, but not to Governments doing likewise. The effect of the legislation is that States like South Australia, which have accepted greater responsibility for the education of handicapped children, receive proportionately less Commonwealth support because of that acceptance.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): During the course of his remarks, the member for Napier, the person who did not have the courage or the guts as Mayor of Elizabeth to back his own

Town Clerk but allowed the Town Clerk to carry the can for his incompetence, decided to launch a personal attack on me, because I stood up in the House and drew to members' attention the comments that had been made for at least 12 months about the Minister of Agriculture and his wife. I make no apology for launching criticism on that occasion.

The Hon. D. J. Hoggood: You can give it, but you can't take it.

Mr. GUNN: I can give it, and I make no apology about that. I do not mind taking it, if it is well based or if it can be substantiated, but the member for Napier did not substantiate his charges. He threw accusations in all directions, but none of them could be justified. What is the situation in relation to the criticism I levelled? I challenge him and members of the Government to talk to members of industry, agriculture and fisheries to find out the sort of comments that have been made. Let him come into this House and deny that concern has been expressed about the involvement of the Minister's wife.

It is a completely ridiculous situation when the Premier appoints to his staff the wife of the Minister of Agriculture to advise him on agricultural matters. Last weekend, at a show I attended with the member for Rocky River, one of the leading figures in agriculture in this State, expressed great concern—

The Hon. D. J. Hoggood: Name him!

Mr. GUNN: I will name him next week. He is away on holidays at the moment. I was telephoned yesterday by one of the leading persons involved in negotiations for the prawn industry who commended me for my remarks. I was also congratulated, while in this building, by a Government employee about the comments I made.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 10 October at 2 p.m.