

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Tuesday 10 October 1978

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

**QUESTIONS**

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: all questions except Nos. 514, 550, 575, 591, 592, 594, 603, 620, 624, 637, 640, 643-49, 653 and 654.

**DENTAL DEPARTMENT**

505. **Mr. TONKIN** (on notice): What was the average cost of each outpatient to the Royal Adelaide Hospital Dental Department for the past three financial years including 1977-78?

The **Hon. R. G. PAYNE**: 1975-76, \$22.08; 1976-77, \$25.46; 1977-78, \$26.82.

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

1. How many full-time dentists are exclusively employed at the Royal Adelaide Hospital Dental Department dealing with denture patients?

2. How many dental technicians are employed in the Royal Adelaide Hospital Dental Department making dentures?

3. Has consideration been given to a voucher system to enable pensioners needing dentures to obtain them from private dental practitioners, and, if so, what has been the outcome and if not, why not?

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

1. One.

2. Seventeen.

3. Yes; however, it has never been accepted that the provision of free dental services for pensioners is a State responsibility, as it is considered that all social security obligations, including pensioner health care, are the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government.

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

1. How far back does the waiting list of the Royal Adelaide Hospital Dental Department extend?

2. What was the total number of people on the waiting lists for dental treatment at the Royal Adelaide Hospital Dental Department at the end of each month of the financial year, 1977-78?

3. What was the total number of treatments commenced and how many were completed for:

(a) dentures;

(b) fillings; and

(c) orthodontics,

in each month of the financial year, 1977-78?

4. How many patients were treated from the waiting list for:

(a) dentures;

(b) fillings; and

(c) orthodontics,

in each month of the financial year 1977-78?

5. How many patients were, as a result of treatment, or for other reasons, removed from the waiting list for each month of the financial year, 1977-78?

6. How many names were added to the waiting lists for each month of the financial year, 1977-78, for:

(a) dentures;

(b) fillings; and

(c) orthodontics?

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

1. 1975.

2. July 1977 .....	5 956
August .....	6 328
September .....	6 709
October .....	7 087
November .....	7 420
December .....	7 793
January 1978 .....	8 089
February .....	8 420
March .....	8 101
April .....	8 440
May .....	8 845
June .....	9 337

3. Treatments commenced financial year 1977-78.

Month	Dentures	Fillings	Orthodontics
July 1977 .....	570	1 666	28
August .....	762	1 378	21
September .....	773	1 639	26
October .....	759	1 710	30
November .....	646	845	20
December .....	486	456	14
January 1978 .....	382	569	33
February .....	492	717	115
March .....	492	1 157	62
April .....	577	1 317	41
May .....	563	994	31
June .....	590	1 133	73

Treatments completed financial year 1977-78.

Month	Dentures	Fillings	Orthodontics
July 1977 .....	639	1 666	
August .....	715	1 378	
September .....	724	1 639	
October .....	761	1 710	
November .....	645	845	Not readily available
December .....	536	456	
January 1978 .....	371	569	
February .....	449	717	
March .....	518	1 157	
April .....	543	1 317	
May .....	579	994	
June .....	573	1 133	

4. This information is not available without substantial research.

5. Monthly details not readily available; total for the year: 1 873.

6. Month	Dentures	Fillings	Orthodontics
July 1977 .....	199	155	18
August .....	200	168	13
September .....	177	183	18
October .....	165	150	18
November .....	189	171	13
December .....	166	129	1
January 1978 .....	247	273	29
February .....	191	272	60
March .....	239	267	91
April .....	179	213	56
May .....	143	264	81
June .....	198	261	57

**ADVERTISEMENTS**

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

1. Was the paid advertisement screened on Channel 7 at about 10.15 p.m. on Thursday 31 August 1978, which featured the Premier in a scathing attack on the Federal

Government, paid for from State Government funds and, if so, who authorised the expenditure, what criteria was used to accept such advertisement as the "genuine business of the State" and therefore the financial responsibility of the State, what was the cost of the particular screening, and from which account is the cost to be met?

2. Was the paid advertisement aired on Station 5AA mid-afternoon on Friday 1 September 1978, which featured the Premier in a scathing attack on the Federal Government, paid for from State Government funds and, if so, who authorised the expenditure, what criteria was used to accept such advertisement as the "genuine business of the State" and therefore the financial responsibility of the State, what was the cost of the particular airing, and from which account is the cost to be met?

3. What has been, or is to be, the total media programme for attack upon the Federal Government's Budget and what are the details as to times of presentation, avenues of presentation, cost of production, and payment to individual media outlets?

4. What, if any, precedent exists for the expenditure of taxpayers' funds in this manner?

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

1. No.
2. No.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.

**BRUKUNGA MINES**

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

1. When did AMDEL commence their investigation on the pollution associated with the water from the old Brukungu pyrites mines?

2. When is the report of these investigations due to be released?

3. What levels of mercury and cadmium pollution, if any, have the AMDEL tests revealed and are these levels regarded as dangerous?

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

1. 1973.
2. AMDEL has not produced a comprehensive report covering all aspects of their investigations, but have prepared for the Department of Mines and Energy several progress reports covering results of the various phases of the study.

3. Mercury levels are less than detectable limits (less than 0.1 parts per billion) and thus mercury is not a hazard. Cadmium has shown to be present in Dawesly Creek waters at the mine site at levels of up to 0.11 milligrams/litre. The standard level recommended by the U.S. Department of Interior for watering of stock is less than 0.01 milligrams/litre and thus the water is considered unsafe for this purpose. However, cadmium levels in the Bremer River below its junction with Mt. Barker Creek, which includes the Dawesly Creek waters, is between 0.005 and 0.01 milligrams/litre and is safe for stock watering purposes. The recommended level for irrigation purposes is 0.05 milligrams/litre and thus the Bremer River waters could be used in the Langhorne Creek irrigation area.

**MONARTO**

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

1. What is the total money used in the development of

Monarto by way of:

- (a) grants;
- (b) loans;
- (c) State general revenue; and
- (d) interest repayments?

2. Are any moneys invested by the Monarto Development Commission and, if so:

- (a) with what body;
- (b) for what term; and
- (c) at what interest rate?

3. What will be the total cost of Monarto when all debts incurred on that project have been settled and in what year will the payment for the debt be completed?

4. Has consideration been given to selling all or some of the Monarto land and, if so, what is the result of those considerations?

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

1. As at 30 June 1978—

- (a) Grants—\$2 176 000.
- (b) Loans—\$18 841 000.
- (c) Contributions from Consolidated Revenue—\$94 000.
- (d) Interest payments owing:

	\$
State Government accrued interest . . . . .	1 047 000
Commonwealth Government accrued interest . . . . .	3 407 000
Total . . . . .	\$4 454 000

2. As at 15 September 1978:

Commonwealth Bank—\$200 000 until 10/10/78 at 9.7 per cent.

A.N.Z. Bank—\$200 000 until 27/10/78 at 9.7 per cent.

Bank of N.S.W.—\$150 000 until 14/11/78 at 9.7 per cent.

Aust. Savings Bonds—\$100 000 (1 months notice) at 10.5 per cent.

Elders Investment & Finance Co.—\$130 000 at call at 9.5 per cent.

3. The cost of Monarto to 30 June 1978 is as follows:

	\$
Land and improvements . . . . .	10 397 000
Planning and investigation . . . . .	1 486 000
Design . . . . .	1 233 000
Site development . . . . .	2 201 000
Capitalised expenses . . . . .	9 867 000
	\$25 184 000

Present debts will have all fallen due for payment by 2006.

4. No.

**DRUGS ROYAL COMMISSION**

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

1. What are the financial arrangements made between the Government and Mr. Dennis Muirhead for his services in connection with the Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs?

2. What is the estimated total payment likely to be made to Mr. Muirhead?

3. When is it expected that the Royal Commission will make a final report?

4. What is the estimated total cost of the Royal Commission?

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

1. The financial arrangements made between the Government and Mr. Dennis Muirhead at the time the commission was established, took into account the current level of fees in South Australia for counsel. Given the fact that work for the commission was continuous over a considerable period of time, a fee of \$262.50 a day plus an allowance for keep of \$37.50 was considered to be a reasonable figure. The Government was advised that, in view of the disruption to Mr. Muirhead's London practice, a high figure on brief of \$10 000 should be set and that it would be appropriate as compensation for the whole of the disruption plus an initial briefing fee.

In addition, because of the considerable period of time over which the commission would extend, the Government allowed four first-class return fares to London for Mr. Muirhead to attend to business of his London practice. For his wife and family the Government would meet one economy return trip per year. In fact, his family have only made use of one of these trips, although the commission is in its second year. Since the setting of Mr. Muirhead's fees, there have been three increases in counsel fees, and the Public Service Board has made increases to the allowance for keep. The Government has increased Mr. Muirhead's fees to \$300 a day, plus \$41.90 a day expenses as from 1 March 1978. A reading fee of \$60 an hour was set for when Mr. Muirhead was outside Australia but has not been charged.

2. \$177 254.39.

3. The commission anticipates that the final report will be available in March 1979.

4. \$813 690.00.

#### CUMULATIVE IMPRISONMENT

539. **Mrs. ADAMSON** (on notice): Will the Attorney-General introduce legislation to provide the power for the courts to impose more than two cumulative terms of imprisonment when sentencing criminals who have committed a series of offences, as recommended by the Acting Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Hogarth, and Mr. Justice Wells when sitting as a Court of Criminal Appeal in August this year and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The matter is currently receiving consideration.

#### ACCOUNTANCY PROFESSION

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

1. What is the reason for the delay in the presentation of the Report of Committee of Inquiry into the Accountancy Profession, established in August 1977 and originally expected to report early in 1978?

2. When will the report be presented?

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

1. There has been no delay.

2. Before the end of the year.

#### MR. DENNIS MUIRHEAD

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

1. What are the details of the payment of \$106 594.39 made to Mr. Dennis Muirhead up to 31 August 1978 under the heading "Muirhead—Fees and Expenses" in connec-

tion with the Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs?

2. Do such payments include air fares for trips between here and the United Kingdom for:

(a) himself;

(b) his wife; and

(c) other members of his family;

and, if so, for how many such trips for each and on what dates?

3. What is the justification for such payment?

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

1. The details of payments since 1976 are:

	Amount \$
1. Travel for Mr. D. Muirhead, wife and members of his family . . . . .	18 128.27
2. Fees and allowances paid to Mr. D. Muirhead . . . . .	88 262.50
3. Sundry expenses incurred by the Commission credited to Mr. D. Muirhead on behalf of the Royal Commission . . . . .	203.62
	\$106 594.39

2. (a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) Yes—Mr. Muirhead's three children.

Name	Number of Trips	Dates
Mr. D. Muirhead (U.K. Aust./U.K.)	5 return trips	1. Left U.K.—28/2/77 Returned U.K. 25/3/77
		2. Left U.K. 3/5/77 Returned U.K. 5/7/77
		3. Left U.K. 23/7/77 Returned U.K. 7/11/77
		4. Left U.K. 8/12/77 Returned U.K. 6/5/78
		5. Left U.K. 29/5/78 Returned U.K. 13/8/78
Mrs. D. Muirhead	1 single (U.K. Aust.)	Mid-May 1977
	1 single (Aust.-U.K.)	Not yet taken
Mr. D. Muirhead's three children	1 single (U.K.-Aust.)	Mid-May 1977
	1 single (Aust.-U.K.)	Not yet taken

3. The justification for the payment is that it was in accordance with the Government's agreement with Mr. Muirhead for the engagement of his services.

#### DRUGS ROYAL COMMISSION

544. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): In connection with the Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs, how are the following items of expenditure to 31 August 1978 made up:

(a) research projects—\$76 993.83;

(b) legal fees—\$9 234.40; and

(c) travelling and accommodation—\$27 793.38?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** To provide an accurate account of the total costs of research projects, the payments in the way of salaries have been aligned from the

salaries ledger with the respective projects (see question 546). This accounts for the increase in research project breakdown from \$76 993.83 as quoted in the reply of 19/9/78 to \$114 298.74 provided in the table below. Actual

costs of projects include payments to individuals and institutions (see question 572 response to Mr. Brown), and the Royal Commission considers the table below to be a more realistic account of actual project costs.

RESEARCH PROJECTS - SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURE

	1976-77	1977-78	July-Aug	Total
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Health and welfare study .....		1 200.00		1 200.00
Sentencing of drug offenders in S.A. ....		1 078.00		1 078.00
Study of criminal statistics in South Australia .....	11 124.00			11 124.00
Effects of cannabis .....		3 625.00		3 625.00
Extent of drug use literature review .....		2 210.00		2 210.00
Trends in psychotropic drug dispensing .....		2 162.00	138.00	2 300.00
British and U.S. systems of treatment .....		1 700.42		1 700.42
Legal regulation of drugs .....	4 500.00	1 600.00		6 100.00
Pharmacology of drugs .....	7 200.00	2 423.00		9 623.00
Drugs and the media .....		1 400.00		1 400.00
Drug dispensing in hospitals .....		2 102.23		2 102.23
Patterns of drug use in S.A. ....		900.00		900.00
Social history of laws of drugs .....		1 660.00		1 660.00
Summary of literature .....	308.00			308.00
Review of literature/transcripts-Michael O'Neil .....		400.00		400.00
<i>Internal projects</i>				
Extent of drug use survey	\$			
W. Heine, Manager of Survey, also involved in other projects .....	14 000.00			
Computer charges .....	4 115.32			
Printing costs .....	3 198.42			
Interviewer's wages and delivery of notices .....	30 752.53			
Mileage and other expenses .....	7 539.32	59 605.59		59 605.59
<i>Other internal projects:</i>				
Narcotic files and Prevalence of heroin use				
Sue Carr .....		4 675.00		4 675.00
David Rimmington .....		4 287.50		4 287.50
Miss Carr and Mr. Rimmington assisted with internal projects and the study of criminal statistics project.				
	\$23 132.00	\$91 028.74	\$138.00	\$114 298.74

TRAVEL AND ACCOMMODATION

	1976-77	1977-78	July-Aug 1978	Total
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Professor Sackville— Accommodation Adelaide .....	362.15	1 616.92	249.44	2 228.51
Professor Sackville— Interstate travel .....	1 499.80	6 642.10	1 028.40	9 170.30
Professor Sackville— Overseas travel .....		1 635.00	892.63	2 527.63
Country meetings travel and accommodation .....		2 180.29		2 180.29
Other travel—other Commissioners, counsel, staff travel, interstate hearings, witnesses, court reporters .....	1 872.43	8 270.02	427.45	10 569.90
Previous Commission in error .....	727.91			727.91
	\$4 462.29	\$20 344.33	\$2 597.92	\$27 404.54

Error in coding caused an incorrect entry being debited to this ledger line instead of the miscellaneous ledger. This accounts for the discrepancy with the previous figure \$27 793.38.

Legal Fees

		\$
22/6/77 .....	Johnston Layton Withers & Co. ....	7 340.00
30/6/77 .....	Johnston Layton Withers & Co. ....	1 894.40
		\$9 234.40

545. Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is Mr. Dennis Muirhead, counsel assisting the Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs, at present out of the State and, if so, how long has he been out of it, where is he, and when is he expected to return, and, if not, when was he last out of the State and for how long was he out of it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As agreed under the terms of his engagement, Mr. Muirhead returned to his London practice on 13 August 1978 and returned to Adelaide on 16 September 1978. For part of his 5 weeks Mr. Muirhead accompanied the Chairman of the Royal Commission, Professor Sackville, on an inspection tour of U.K. drug

centres to gain information on the most recent developments for inclusion in the Commission's final report.

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

1. To whom have salaries, amounting to \$209 045.06 to 31 August 1978 been paid in connection with the Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs?

2. In the case of each such person:

(a) how much has been paid; and

(b) what duties has he or she carried out and over what period?

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

1. and 2. The salaries ledger, for the purpose of internal accounting, and the particular request of individuals who wanted taxation deductions taken out of their payments, included some members fees and persons who worked on particular research projects. To provide an accurate picture of actual salaries paid to persons employed for the Commission, members fees have been transferred more appropriately to the members ledger (see table attached) and research costs have been transferred to the research ledger (see response to question 544 (a)). The salaries ledger then becomes (the difference between \$209 045.06 and \$119 260.51 being accounted for in the appropriate members fee and research ledgers)—

#### STAFF SALARIES

	1976-77	1977-78	July-Aug. 1978	Total	Period of Employment	Duties
	\$	\$	\$	\$		
D. Abbott		13 605.18	2 228.40	15 833.58	6.7.77 to date	Secretary
L. Hannemann		459.60		459.60	Oct.-Nov. 77	Temporary typist
Dr. A. Mant		20 207.40	3 252.80	23 460.20	11.7.77 to date	Director of research
D. O'Brien		8 949.49	2 034.19	10 983.68	17.10.77 to date	Editor
C. Reynolds	1 611.50	12 013.12	1 908.72	15 533.34	May 77 to date	Legal research officer
G. Spier		4 799.51	1 265.00	6 064.51	21.11.77 to date	Shorthand typist
B. Thomas	2 438.26	14 273.44	2 194.80	18 906.50	30.5.77 to date	Research officer
P. Thompson	1 987.20	1 747.62		3 734.82	11.3.77-9.9.77	Shorthand typist
G. Dodd			918.00	918.00	17.7.78 to date	Shorthand typist
J. Wilcox		7 878.63	362.00	8 240.63	29.8.77-14.7.78	Shorthand typist
L. Bordon	132.00			132.00	July 1977	Temp. clerical assist.
W. Heine			2 250.00	2 250.00	July-Aug. 1978	Research officer
M. Kennedy		320.00		320.00	December 1977	Temp. library assist.
University of New South Wales payment of part salary of Prof. Sackville's Secretary	1 200.00	3 000.00		4 200.00	January to date	Sec. to Chairman
Payroll tax	451.85	6 830.02	941.78	8 223.65		
	\$7 820.81	\$94 084.01	\$17 355.69	\$119 260.51		

#### MEMBERS FEES AND REIMBURSEMENT OF MEMBERS SALARIES

	1976-77	1977-78	July-Aug. 1978	Total	Duties
	\$	\$	\$	\$	
Professor R. Sackville	3 000.00	11 932.50	4 667.50	19 600.00	Chairman
IMVS reimbursement of Dr. E. Hackett's salary	8 630.90	34 280.30		42 911.20	Commissioner
South Australian Institute of Technology—Dr. Nies		3 500.00		3 500.00	Commissioner
University of New South Wales reimbursement of half Professor Sackville's salary, superannuation, long service payments, etc.			20 809.12	20 809.12	
	\$11 630.90	\$70 521.92	\$4 667.50	\$86 820.32	

Dr. Hackett is paid his normal salary by the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science and the Commission has reimbursed the institute since 7 March 1977.

Professor Sackville has been since 1 July 1977 working half-time with the Commission and the Commission reimburses half of his salary to the University of New South Wales.

#### RAILWAYS INSTITUTE

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

1. What promises have been made to the Railways Institute by the State Government or the Minister regarding the establishment of another headquarters for that body, since their old headquarters were proposed to be demolished in 1970?

2. What arrangements were made regarding the establishment of headquarters for the Railways Institute when the Commonwealth took over the responsibility for South Australian country services?

3. Why is the area of the Adelaide railway station previously used by the Motor Registration Branch now not to be developed for the Railways Institute headquarters?

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

1. Prior to the transfer of the non-metropolitan railways to the Australian National Railways Commission, the

State Government had approved of the accommodation in the Railways Building, previously occupied by the Motor Registration Division, being made available for the permanent headquarters of the South Australian Railways Institute. As a result of the transfer and in terms of the transfer agreement, the responsibility for the establishment of permanent headquarters passed to the A.N.R.C.

2. See above.

3. The reasons why A.N.R.C. has not developed the above accommodation for the Railways Institute headquarters are not known.

#### WATER QUALITY

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

1. How is the quality of Murray River water and Adelaide's reservoir water, respectively, assessed?

2. What is the concentration of total dissolved salts and also of phosphorous, nitrogen, particulate matter and heavy metals, in summer and winter, respectively, in—

(a) Murray River water; and

(b) Adelaide's reservoir water—

(i) before Murray River water enters; and

(ii) after Murray River water enters?

3. What percentage of Adelaide's water supply is treated by the new treatment plant at Hope Valley?

4. How have the costs involved in building this plant affected the real cost of water produced by the plant and how does this cost compare with that of the water provided to the consumer from the other reservoirs which have no filtration plants as yet?

5. Is it intended that future filtration plants planned to treat Adelaide's water supply should be sited in such a way that the water is treated before it enters Adelaide's reservoirs, rather than after it passes through them and if not, why not?

6. If the filtration plants are so sited near Mannum, Murray Bridge, Morgan, and the Swan Reach-Stockwell pipeline intake point, how would this affect the cost of the resultant water, as compared with the estimated cost of water which will be produced by filtration plants sited between the reservoirs and the consumers?

7. How many such filtration plants will ultimately be required under the existing plan, and what is the estimated cost per kilolitre of water produced from such plants?

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

1. Assessment of the quality of water in the River Murray and the metropolitan reservoir system is achieved by a programme of sampling followed by examination of samples for bacteriological, biological, chemical and physical characteristics.

2. There are no distinct seasonal patterns of water quality. The quality of water from the Murray at any particular time is dependent upon a wide range of varying factors producing differing effects in the quality of water in storage.

3. 16.6 per cent.

4. The average cost of water from reservoirs which have no filtration plant is 24.2 cents per kilolitre. The additional cost to have water treated at Hope Valley is 8.2c per kilolitre.

5. No. It is not good practice to store water in large unlined open reservoirs after treatment. Colour, turbidity and bacteriological quality of the water will deteriorate significantly due to natural run-off and algal growths.

6. The operating costs for siting filtration plants at the intake points to the pipe-lines would be approximately the same per kilolitre of treated water. However, in this case, water entering the reservoir system from natural catchment would not be treated. The annual quantity of water recovered from natural catchment is generally greater than the quantity pumped from the River Murray to the Adelaide Statistical Division area. Treatment at the pipeline source only would not allow control of the quality of water entering the distribution system. Treatment between the reservoirs and the consumers would still be necessary so that the total cost of water treatment for Adelaide would rise as some water would be treated twice and additional water filtration plants would be required.

7. 6c to 9c per kilolitre (1978 costs) depending on the capacity of the plant.

#### CONSERVATION PARKS

551. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Have officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service been looking for

alternative areas to replace the North West Conservation Park and, if so, which officers were involved, what parts of the State have they been investigating, and what are the reasons?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** No. Officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service have not been looking for alternative areas to replace the North-West Conservation Park. However, officers of the former National Parks Commission did undertake a survey in February 1972 in the western areas of the State to investigate alternative sites to the North-West Reserve.

#### OUTBACK AREAS TRUST

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

1. Has the fifth position on the Outback Areas Community Development Trust been filled and, if not, what is the delay and when does the Government intend filling this position?

2. Has the trust provided funds to any organisations or group in the area served by the trust and if so, how much and to what groups?

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

1. No, but the matter is at present under consideration.

2. The following organisations have been provided with funds:

Yunta Hall Committee—\$45 000 for the reconstruction of the Community Hall, and Blinman Progress Association—\$3 813 for construction of medical clinic to be used by the Royal Flying Doctor, upgrading of tennis courts and painting of community hall. In addition, the trust has agreed to fund the upgrading of the Coober Pedy and Marree airstrip, pending acceptance of the trust by the Commonwealth Government and the local ownership plan. The trust's contribution can be assessed only in the light of the reply from the Commonwealth.

#### PARINGA PARK SCHOOL

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

1. Why was Paringa Park Primary School redevelopment proceeded with, contrary to the recommendation of the Public Works Committee?

2. Have further stages of the project been considered and, if so:

(a) how many; and

(b) what is the estimated cost for each stage?

3. Will the project be proceeded with?

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** The replies are as follows:

1. See page xliii of Parliamentary Paper 18 of 1978.

2. and 3. A further stage of development was considered, but will not be implemented. The modifications to the original plan, together with falling enrolments and the joint development of the Bowker Street Reserve between the Brighton City Council and the Education Department, have negated the necessity for further major redevelopment of the Paringa Park Primary School.

#### PUPIL COST

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

1. What is the estimated cost a pupil for the financial year ended 30 June 1978 for:

- (a) primary school education;
- (b) secondary school education; and
- (c) special school education?

2. Why were these figures again not available for this year's Auditor-General's Report?

3. Could this information be readily available by the use of a computer programme?

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** The replies are as follows:

1. Costs are anticipated to be in the order of—

- (a) Primary—\$900
- (b) Secondary—\$1 600
- (c) Special—\$3 950

2. Extracting these costs requires restructuring of the department's accounting information into a completely separate presentation of financial statistics, according to an Australia-wide agreement designed to provide comparable State-to-State figures. These statistics are published in the Director-General's annual reports.

Because of the manpower resources required for the translation there is little likelihood of actual figures for the preceding year being available in time for the Auditor-General's Annual Report. Publication of premature estimations can only mislead.

3. Readily—no. A very extensive and costly computer programme would be necessary accompanied still, by considerable additional manual work. This possibility has already been examined by the Education Department.

#### ACCOMMODATION

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

1. When arranging to lease accommodation, cannot agreement be made for:

- (a) exclusive use of Public Buildings Department officers for all design and consultancy in respect of the area leased in terms of guidelines mutually agreed with the property owners; and
- (b) rental to commence at time of occupation or installation of furnishings and fittings?

2. Is greater co-operation now being insisted upon by all Ministers to ensure there are no delays in providing the Public Buildings Department with requirements for office fittings, furniture and layouts and, if not, why not?

3. Have there been instances in the past of numerous changes to original plans by Ministers or departments when new or additional accommodation is required?

4. Why are new furniture and fittings installed in new or renovated accommodation?

5. Is renovated or additional furniture to be used now or in future and, if not, why not?

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

1. (a) Yes. However, such arrangement may not always be the most practical, expeditious, or economical. Existing procedures allow flexibility and are considered the most appropriate having regard to the variable situations applying to each project.

(b) The date from which rental is paid on leased accommodation is dictated by the availability of good class office accommodation and the extent of the demand. In the present economic climate, with the present "no growth" policy for the Public Service and the increased availability of accommodation, it is anticipated that lesser periods will be involved than have previously been experienced between the commencement of payment of rental and the date of occupation.

2. Yes.

3. Yes—in isolated cases.

4. Where there is new or renovated accommodation it does not necessarily follow that new furniture and fittings will be installed. New and reconditioned furniture and fittings are installed only after an assessment has been made of the condition of existing furniture, etc., in relation to its suitability for the new environment.

5. Yes—as in the past; where practical.

#### RAILWAYS TRANSFER

565. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice): Where is the money under the Railways transfer agreement shown in Budget documents and how much will the State receive this financial year?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The money from the Railways transfer agreement is included in South Australia's estimated tax-sharing entitlement of \$557 400 000. As indicated in answer to Question on Notice No. 362, it is estimated that the State will receive \$45 800 000 in 1978-79 as a result of the transfer arrangements.

#### FINANCIAL STATEMENT

566. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice): Why is it necessary to duplicate Appendix 3 in the Financial Statement of the Premier and Treasurer when such information is contained in the Auditor-General's Report?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Whilst the first four columns of Appendix 3 may be regarded as a summary of Statement A of the Treasurer's Statements and Accounts, the remaining four columns enable members to compare payments in the year immediately past with payments by the same department in the next preceding year. That information could be obtained otherwise only by using two of the Auditor-General's Reports. The form and content of the statements and appendices are under review.

#### PREMIER'S OVERSEAS VISIT

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

1. Have all accounts now been presented and paid for the Premier's overseas visit in April/May 1978 and:

- (a) what is the final costing of accommodation for each individual member of the party and respective daily rate at respective hotels;
- (b) what was the air fare for each individual member;
- (c) when was reimbursement for air fares for Mrs. Inns and Mrs. Davies paid;
- (d) what travelling expenses, including number of days and rate, were claimed by each individual member of the touring party and how was this amount paid;
- (e) which credit cards were used and for what purposes;
- (f) what accounts have not been presented and what are their respective totals;
- (g) what is the break-up of individual expenses for meals, laundry, telephone, telex, car hire and gifts; and

(h) how many business seminars were held in the U.S.A., and what is the individual break-down of cost for such seminars?

2. What is the reason for the excess of total expenditure of this tour compared to original estimates?

3. Were all air fares booked through the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau and, if not, why not?

4. Were air travel arrangements altered during the visit and, if so, by whom and to what extent?

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

1. Yes.

(a) It is not possible to extract this information in the detail requested as some accounts were billed for the party as a whole and would consume an unwarranted amount of time to extract. The basic information is contained in question No. 38 previously given.

(b) \$3 280 for each member of the official party.

(c) The question of reimbursement does not arise as Mrs. Inns and Mrs. Davies paid their own air fares in advance direct to the airlines concerned.

(d) Travelling expenses were not paid to individual members of the party. All expenses were controlled by the Director-General, Premier's Department, and the Director-General for Trade and Development, and authorised on the basis of expenditure actually and necessarily incurred.

(e) Diners Club and American Express; for the payment of accommodation and meals on occasions when it was impractical to settle accounts in cash.

(f) None.

(g) This information in total form was provided in answer to question 38, and further breakdown is not warranted as it would consume an unwarranted amount of time to extract.

(h) Three—New York—\$2 821.55  
Chicago—\$2 389.38  
San Francisco—\$1 681.42

Additional costs were incurred which are not divisible between the three seminar centres and include cost of preparation of the audio visual presentation (not a direct cost against the overseas visit as it has a continuing use), printing of brochures, air freight and businessmen's expenses.

2. When announcing the overseas visit in February 1978, I said that the estimated cost would be \$40 000 and that there would be additional costs associated with the holding of the three trade and business seminars in the United States. The cost of the visit excluding the seminars was \$42 376.39. The small variation is due to the fact that it is impossible to precisely assess international hotel costs and budget for every contingency.

3. Yes.

4. No, not to any significant extent.

#### DRUGS ROYAL COMMISSION

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

1. What overseas travel by Mr. Muirhead has been paid for by the Government in relation to the Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs, what are the details of each trip, was he accompanied by other

persons and, if so whom, and what places were visited by Mr. Muirhead during this travel?

2. Where does Mr. Muirhead normally reside?

3. What are the academic and other qualifications of Mr. Muirhead?

4. What persons have carried out research projects for the Royal Commission, what fees were paid to each person and what research was carried out by each person?

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

1. (a) The following overseas travel by Mr. Muirhead has been paid for by the Government:

Date	Particulars
1. Left U.K.—27/2/77 Return U.K.—25/3/77	Air travel—London/Sydney, Adelaide/New York, Washington/London
2. Left U.K.—3/5/77 Return U.K.—5/7/77	Air travel—London/San Francisco/Salem/San Francisco/Sydney/Adelaide/London
3. Left U.K.—23/7/77 Return U.K.—7/11/77	Air travel—London/Adelaide/London
4. Left U.K.—8/12/77 Returned U.K. 6/5/78	Air travel—London/London
5. Left U.K.—29/5/78 Returned U.K.—13/8/78	Air travel—London/Adelaide/London

6. In addition, Mr. Muirhead returned to Adelaide.  
Left U.K.—7/9/78 Air travel—London/Adelaide (not yet charged to Premier's Department account)

(b) No other persons accompanied Mr. Muirhead. His wife and family travelled separately.

2. London, England.

3. Final certificate in law from the University of Adelaide (1964)  
Barrister and solicitor of the Supreme Court of South Australia (1965)  
Solicitor of the Supreme Court of Judicature in England and Wales (1971)  
Partner in the firms of Simons, Muirhead and Allan, London, which specialises in drug law.  
Attended the National Drug Abuse Conference, and California Bar Association Drug Conference, San Francisco, 1977.  
Member of the London Criminal Courts Solicitors Association.

Member and Immediate Past Chairman of the Management Committee of the Fulham Legal Advice Centre, London and Hammersmith Community Law Centre, Steering Group.

Solicitor to and member of the Management Committee, City Roads (Drug Crisis Intervention House), London.

Member of Justice, London, and Co-author of "Unrepresented Defendants in Magistrates Courts," published by Justice.

Panel selector of Release, London, drug legal and welfare organisation.

Invited to attend Informal Symposium "Prevention of Drug Related Harm" held by Institute for the Study of Drug Dependence, London, May 1978.

Member of the National Council for Civil Liberties, London.

Member of the British Academy of Forensic Sciences.

Member of the Law Society, England and Wales.

Member of the Law Society, South Australia.

Member of Legal Action Group, London.



## RESEARCH PROJECTS

Grantee Organisation or Researcher	Researcher	Project	Cost of Project	
			\$	\$
S.A. Institute of Technology—Social Planning Unit	Mr. W. Heine and Mr. D. Rimmington Ms. M. Mune S. Cole	Study of Criminal Statistics Health Welfare Feasibility Study Sentencing of Drug Offenders in S.A.		11 124-00 1 200-00 1 078-00
Flinders University—Dept. Clinical Pharmacology	Prof. D. Birkett	Pharmacology of Drugs		9 623-00
Mr. K. Windschuttle	Mr. K. Windschuttle	Drugs and the Media		1 400-00
Research Consultants	Mr. S. Haselton Mr. T. Sowerbutts	Extent of Drug Use—Literature Review		2 210-00
University of Adelaide	Mr. M. Goode	Legal Regulation of Drugs in S.A.	4 500-00	
Mr. M. Goode	Mr. M. Goode	Legal Regulation of Drugs in S.A.	1 600-00	6 100-00
Prof. R. Kalucy		British and U.S. Systems of Treatment	1 250-00	
Flinders University—Dept. of Psychiatry	Prof. R. Kalucy	Typing Expenses	450-42	1 700-42
Mrs. G. Bishop	Mrs. G. Bishop	Trends in Psychotropic Drug Dispensing	450-00	
Intercontinental Medical Statistics (Aust.) Pty. Ltd.	Mrs. G. Bishop	Trends in Psychotropic Drug Dispensing	1 850-00	2 300-00
University of Sydney—Dept. of Phar- macology	Dr. G. Chesher	Effects of Cannabis	1 500-00	
Dr. G. Chesher	Dr. G. Chesher	Effects of Cannabis	2 125-00	3 625-00
J. N. Hudson	J. N. Hudson	Drug Dispensing in Hospitals	1 440-00	
		Travel and Expenses	450-00	
Mrs. N. Kennedy	Mrs. N. Kennedy	Patterns of Drug Use in S.A.	312-23	2 102-23
H. Silins	H. Silins	Patterns of Drug Use in S.A.	600-00	
G. Wright	G. Wright	Patterns of Drug Use in S.A.	200-00	
A. Jakobowicz	A Jakobowicz	Review of Literature	100-00	900-00
J. Lonie	J. Lonie	Social History of Laws of Drugs		308-00 1 660-00

The Commission has also carried out some internal projects within the office of the Commission under the supervision of the Director of Research, Dr. A. Mant. The major project in this category is the Extent of Drug Use survey and details of the expenditure are set out in answer to a question No. 544 from Mr. Millhouse.

## RAILWAYS INSTITUTE

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

1. Why have arrangements for permanent housing for the South Australian Railways Institute not been completed, in the sense of providing actual occupancy, and what are the reasons for the delay?

2. When does the Government expect to provide a permanent home for the institute and what will be the financial consideration?

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

1. The permanent housing for the South Australian Railways Institute is the responsibility of the Australian National Railways Commission. The State Government has made available to the commission the accommodation in the Railways Building, which was previously occupied by the Motor Registration Division. The commission has not taken up this offer and the reasons as to why this offer was rejected are not known.

2. See above.

## TELEPHONE COSTS

576. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Further to the answer to question on notice 477, how many public servants are entitled to have their private telephone accounts paid in whole by the Government, in which departments are they, what positions in their respective departments do they hold, and what is the justification, in the case of each for such payment?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The work involved in answering question No. 477 was considerable, and it is not proposed to ask staff to go back over the same ground in far greater detail to answer questions 576 and 585 to 588. Such extra detail would be considerably more arduous to extract.

## VEHICLE WEIGHTS

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

1. What is the permitted tolerance allowed to graingrowers on the gross vehicle weight or gross vehicle combination for this harvest?

2. Is it intended to reduce the tolerance again next year, and if so, why and on whose recommendations?

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

1. As from 1 March 1978 and up until 28 February 1979, vehicles carrying primary produce will have an allowable "all up" mass of the gross vehicle and gross combination mass limits plus 30 per cent.

2. As from 1 March 1979 the limit will be reduced to 20 per cent in line with the existing legislation. This policy of progressively reducing the limit to 20 per cent was first made in October 1975 and has since been twice deferred. The purpose of the progressive reduction was to allow primary producers to obtain suitable vehicles for the loads they wished to carry. The Road Traffic Board feels that it would be unfair to keep deferring this policy as many producers have changed vehicles so that they would conform.

## PETERBOROUGH

579. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Does the Minister intend to allow the shops at Peterborough to open on Christmas Eve, as has been the case over the last few years, instead of the Thursday, as has been decided by the Government?

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I have been approached by representatives of some country shopping districts (including Peterborough) requesting that shops in those shopping districts be permitted to remain open on the Friday night instead of Thursday night in the week before Christmas.

Cabinet has decided that if an application is made by or on behalf of the majority of shop keepers in any shopping district for permission to trade on the Friday night, instead of the Thursday night, in the week preceding Christmas, approval will be given to such application. All shopping districts have been advised of that decision by letter.

### BEE-LINE SERVICE

580. **Mr. VENNING** (on notice):

1. What was the total cost of the Bee-line bus service for the financial year ended 30 June, 1978?
2. What has been the total cost of the Bee-line bus service since its inception?

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

1. \$146 300. This does not include capital charges on the buses used which were already owned by the authority.
2. \$560 000. This does not include capital charges on the buses used which were already owned by the authority.

### McNALLY INCIDENT

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

1. Has the victim of the assault on 14 September at the McNally Training Centre laid charges against the inmates responsible?
2. Has he laid any charges against the Minister and/or his department?
3. What has been the outcome of any of those charges?
4. How many inmates were involved?
5. What injuries were sustained by the victim?
6. Was the victim employed by the Education Department as a teacher?
7. Has the victim been absent from his duties because of those injuries and, if so, how long is he expected to be off work?
8. How many inmates were in the class at the time of the incident?
9. How many R.C.W's were on duty in the class at that time and what sex were they?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:**

The replies are as follows:

1. Yes: the inmate was charged with assault on 20 September 1978.
2. No.
3. Regarding 1—the youth was committed to McNally Centre on an ancillary order.
4. One.
5. The injuries sustained were bruises to the back and shoulder.
6. Yes.
7. No, except for medical treatment at the time.
8. Six.
9. One male R.C.W. on duty at the time in the class.

### ECOLOGICAL SURVEY

583. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Has a feasibility study for an ecological survey of South Australia been done by a division of the Environment Department, using landsat imagery during the last 2 years and, if so:

- (a) has this study been successful;
- (b) what use will the department make of valuable information thus obtained;
- (c) how will this type of information be used to determine land-use planning in South Australia;

- (d) will pressures upon the land such as over-grazing, land-clearing, and mining exploration be identified by the use of this technique; and
- (e) will this feasibility study, with associated maps and diagrams, be published and, if so, when?

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

- (a) Yes.
- (b) A natural resources inventory is being prepared.
- (c) Landsat is being used to delineate various types of land-use in the State so that a more complete and timely information system will be available to land-use planners.
- (d) Yes.
- (e) The original feasibility study was funded by the Federal Government, and once completed the document was presented to the Federal Department of Environment, Housing and Community Development.

### TELEPHONES

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

1. Further to question on notice 477, how many public servants are entitled to have a proportion, and what proportion, of the rental on their private telephones paid by the Government?
2. In which departments are they and what positions in their respective departments do they hold?
3. What is the justification in the case of each such public servant for such payment?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The work involved in answering question 477 was considerable and it is not proposed to ask staff to go back over the same ground in far greater detail to answer questions 576 and 585-588. Such extra detail would be considerably more arduous to extract.

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

1. Further to question on notice 477, how many public servants are entitled to have the rental on their private telephones paid by the Government?
2. In which departments are they and what positions in their respective departments do they hold?
3. What is the justification in the case of each such public servant for such payment?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The work involved in answering question 477 was considerable and it is not proposed to ask staff to go back over the same ground in far greater detail to answer questions 576 and 585-588. Such extra detail would be considerably more arduous to extract.

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

1. Further to Question on Notice 477, how many public servants are entitled to have the cost of a proportion, and what proportion, of telephone calls from their private telephones paid by the Government?
2. In which departments are they and what positions in their respective departments do they hold?
3. What is the justification in the case of each such public servant for such payment.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The work involved in answering question 477 was considerable and it is not proposed to ask staff to go back over the same ground in far greater detail to answer questions 576 and 585-588. Such extra detail would be considerably more arduous to extract.

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

1. Further to question on notice 477, how many public servants are entitled to have the cost of all telephone calls

from their private telephones paid by the Government?

2. In which departments are they and what positions in their respective departments do they hold?

3. What is the justification in the case of each such public servant for such payment?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The work involved in answering question 477 was considerable and it is not proposed to ask staff to go back over the same ground in far greater detail to answer questions 576 and 585-588. Such extra detail would be considerably more arduous to extract.

### BLACKHILL PARK

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

1. Whose decision was it to install lighting on the track leading from Maryvale Road through Blackhill Native Flora Park to the nursery facilities?

2. Who was responsible for selecting the design of the lighting?

3. Why was lighting considered necessary when the park is not open at night?

4. What was the cost of the lighting?

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

1. This was a joint decision between the Environment Department and the Public Buildings Department.

2. Vide 1.

3. The lighting is used at night for security purposes. The lights installed along the path from Maryvale Road to the nursery facilities will be required when the administration centre and lecture theatre are operational. The centre is to be a focal point for meetings, discussion groups, conferences, etc., for interested groups from the local and surrounding region at night as well as during the day.

4. \$10 620.

### SURS

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

1. What are the individual projects funded by the SURS programme since January, 1978 and what amount has been allotted to each such project?

2. What amounts, if any, have been added to the initially announced amount for projects since 1 July 1977 and what are the individual amounts and the reason for each such additional allocation?

3. When is it expected that further announcements of project funding will be made?

4. What is the total amount of projects submitted for funding since 1 July 1977?

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

1. The honourable member has previously been informed that it is the practice, from time to time, for lists of project approvals funded by the SURS Scheme to be placed in the Parliamentary Library. A composite list of approvals to the end of August 1978, has been so provided.

2. Since July 1977, 1335 new approvals have been given for SURS projects. In approximately 400 of these projects there has been some variation in funds provided ranging from \$1 to \$93 000 (the original approval in the later case was \$365 371). Many factors are responsible but the reasons are mainly related to normal cost escalations and unforeseen factors not included in original estimates, such as inclement weather, changes in design requirements and

the like. It would take some weeks to individually detail each alteration and staff is not available to spend time in this way.

3. Before the end of the year.

4. Approximately \$54 000 000.

### JAM FACTORY

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

1. What are the components of the \$15 000 termination payment to a master craftsman in the glass workshop at the Jam Factory and what is the amount of each component?

2. What was his period of employment with the Jam Factory?

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

1. There are no components in this amount. The payment represented a negotiated settlement with a master craftsman in exchange for the surrender of a five-year employment contract involving an annual payment of \$18 600 plus other entitlements, which would not otherwise have expired until 30 June 1980.

2. Period of employment was from 4 November 1974 to 30 June 1978.

### DEMAC BUILDINGS

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

1. How many Demac buildings were constructed by the Public Buildings Department in 1977-78?

2. What was the total cost of these constructions?

3. What Government departments or instrumentalities received these units in 1977-78?

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

1. 408 units.

2. The total cost of these constructions including the cost of Demac kits and factory assembled modules, on-site assembly of components, siteworks, services, and civil works was \$16 460 000.

3. Education Department, Public Health Department, and Engineering and Water Supply Department.

### DIALYSIS UNITS

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

1. Does the Minister intend that the member for Mount Gambier should make any future decisions regarding acceptance of renal dialysis units offered to Mount Gambier Hospital by South East service clubs and, if not, will the Minister explain his apparent reluctance to accept what appears to be a generous offer by the service clubs to meet the urgent South East community need?

2. Will the Minister explain why medical and other staff must be available for dialysis as stated in his letter, MHM 111/78 of 4 July 1978 when his reply to question 428 states that most patients after a proper course of training, are able to dialyse themselves at home?

3. Will the Minister accept the offer by the service clubs and make a room available at Mount Gambier Hospital in the knowledge that such a positive decision will have the full support of the member for Mount Gambier?

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

1. No. It is repeated again that the honourable member has not availed himself of the opportunity to discuss this matter with the Director of the Renal Unit at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and an officer from the South Australian Health Commission, and until he has done so

he cannot be appropriately and fully informed of the position with regard to dialysis facilities in the South East.

2. See above.
3. See above.

**ROYAL SHOW**

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

1. What was the total cost of the South Australian Government exhibition at the 1978 Royal Show?
2. What are the details of this expenditure?

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

1. Accounts have not been received for all elements of the Government's exhibition at the Royal Show but the following figures are representative of the total cost that has been incurred.

Audio Visual	\$	\$	
Photography .....	1 135		
Hire of equipment .....	2 785		
Music .....	1 300		
Staff .....	805		
Technical assistance .....	150		
Audio visual mix .....	1 865		
	<hr/>		8 040
Performance			
Salaries .....	7 890		
ETSA .....	1 130		
Hire charges .....	1 400		
Design, technical assistance .....	5 655		
	<hr/>		16 075
Pavilion Display			8 000
Miscellaneous			
Insurance .....	260		
Phone .....	50		
Sundry Expenses .....	20		
	<hr/>		330
Literature			
Pavilion folder .....	4 000		
Theatre programme .....	1 000		
	<hr/>		5 000
			<hr/>
			\$37 445

Officers in attendance at the exhibition have advised that in excess of 20 000 people saw either or both performances.

2. See above.

**INFORMATION SWITCHBOARD**

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

1. What will be the total cost of operating the Women's Information Switchboard during 1978-79?
2. What portion of these costs are being covered by the Libraries Board of South Australia?

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

1. The total costs of operating the Women's Information Switchboard during 1978-79 will be \$80 691.
2. The portion of the costs being covered by the Libraries Board is \$11 998.

Breakdown of costs

(a) Salaries—Six women are employed in the Women's Information Switchboard. The co-ordinator of the Women's Information Switchboard is the Information Officer of the Women's Advisory Unit, in the Premier's Department. This position is a permanent one and the salary, including penalties, is \$13 456; it will continue to be paid by the Women's

Advisory Unit. The Information Officer has been seconded to the Women's Information Switchboard during 1978-79.

The other five women are employed under the State Unemployment Relief Scheme and are paid at the rate for telephonists according to Public Service regulations. As they work shiftwork, because the switchboard is open 9.30 a.m.-9.30 p.m., seven days a week, they receive penalty rates for after hours work. They are paid according to Public Service rates. The total cost of salaries for these five women is \$55 237.

(b) On-going costs—These amount to \$11 998. The recurrent costs of operating the switchboard including telephone costs, postage and the cost of training volunteers come to \$5 998. Thirty volunteers assist the staff of the Switchboard. A further \$2 000 has been spent towards the compilation of information bulletins, through the State Unemployment Relief Scheme money made available to the Libraries Board before 31 August 1978. A further \$2 000 has been set aside for the publication of these bulletins. This publishing programme will be undertaken by the Libraries Board. The Libraries Board has also voted \$2 000 in publicity costs for the Women's Information Switchboard.

**ALCOHOL AND DRUG TREATMENT**

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

1. Have staff of the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board signed a petition objecting to the proposed move of operations from St. Anthony's Hospital, Joslin, to Birralee Hospital at Belair and, if so, how many staff signed the petition and what was the wording of it?

2. What action is the Minister taking to support the request of the staff?

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

1. Yes. 25 of the 80-odd staff employed by the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Board. The petition, based on the opinion of some of the signatures, contained objections as follows:

- The location in terms of accessibility. A central treatment centre is desirable for community needs.
- It is seen as a retrogressive step considering the widely accepted opinion toward smaller therapeutic facilities on a community basis.
- The rehabilitation of long-term patients should be separate from the short-term patient care.

2. Members of the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Board met with some of the staff who signed the petition. The objections were discussed, and the staff were satisfied with the answers. They do not wish the petition to continue.

**MARIHUANA**

604. **Mr. CHAPMAN** (on notice): How many persons have been prosecuted for allegedly growing marihuana in South Australia since 1970, how many have been convicted, what are the details of the respective penalties imposed, and how many of those sentenced received parole before completing half the sentence imposed?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The following is the only information which is readily available:

Persons prosecuted for allegedly growing marihuana					
1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	
17	20	65	74	233	

Comparable figures for the financial years ended 30 June 1970, 1971, 1972 and 1973 are not available and could

only be obtained by the individual examination of a large number of stored files, many of which are not readily accessible. Likewise, information relating to the number of convictions, penalties and parolees cannot be obtained without extensive manual extraction of data from files of the Police Department, the Courts and the Parole Board.

### GOVERNMENT BUILDING

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

1. Which department will be occupying the new Government building being constructed in Wakefield Street?

2. Is it the Government's intention to demolish or redevelop the old Government offices facing Victoria Square which used to be known as the Architect-in-Chief's Department building?

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

1. Public Buildings Department.
2. No.

### SMALL BUSINESSES

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

1. What assistance does the Premier's Department provide to small businesses, particularly those suffering financial difficulty?

2. Are funds available for any financial assistance?

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

1. The Premier's Department does not provide any specific assistance to small businesses. However, The Small Business Advisory Unit of the Department of Economic Development provides a counselling and referral service and can offer advice to small businesses in financial difficulty. Such advice can include assisting small businessmen to frame applications for finance from the banking system, debt reconstruction, marketing and new-product development.

2. No funds are provided directly by the Government for small businesses in financial difficulty. However, the S. A. Development Corporation can consider applications for financial assistance (generally loans at commercial rate of interest) from small businesses providing they can satisfy the criteria for such assistance laid down in the Industries Development Act. Additionally, the Department of Economic Development administers a consultancy grant scheme whereby the cost of obtaining expert advice may be subsidised subject to certain guidelines.

### CRIME STATISTICS

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

1. What is the specification for the position of State Government "Office of Crime Statistics"?

2. What area of inquiry has the appointed officer already initiated and what priorities has he set for the first 6 months and 12 months, respectively?

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

1. To ensure the preparation at regular intervals of statistical reports relating to crime, the criminal courts, correctional services and related matters. To make interpretative comment on such statistical information, explaining the connections between information from police, the Community Welfare Department, the courts, correctional services, and other relevant agencies.

2. The Director is presently designing the format of

quarterly reports of the state of crime and justice in South Australia. The first of these reports, compiled in co-operation with the responsible departments, will cover the period 1 October 1978 to 31 December 1978. Its publication is scheduled for mid-February 1979. The Director is also planning the implementation of an integrated justice information system which will provide responsible departments with a significantly improved statistical capability.

### ELECTRICITY

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

1. What is the programme for new electricity substation construction over the period 1 July 1978 to 30 June 1981, where are the stations, and what is the capacity and anticipated cost of each?

2. What is the programme of major alterations and/or extensions over the same period?

3. What technological changes of significance, if any, are associated with current or planned substation construction and what are the details?

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

1. New Substations

Date	Location	Capacity	Est. Cost \$
1979	Port Lincoln Docks	10 MVA	210 000
1980	Goolwa	5 MVA	170 000
1981	Blanche (Mt. Gambier)	50 MVA	750 000

Note: Programme of later works may change and other works may be introduced depending upon actual load growth in particular areas.

2. Major Alterations and Extensions

1978	Snuggery	Connection of gas turbines	
	Woodforde	Increase capacity	
	Happy Valley	Increase capacity	
	Morphett Vale East	Increase capacity	
	Waikerie	Increase capacity	
	Ramco	Increase capacity	
	Mobilong	Increase capacity	
	Uraidla	Increase capacity	
1979	Linden Park	Connect additional circuit	
	Port Lincoln	Increase capacity	
	Padthaway	Increase capacity	
	Aldgate	Increase capacity	
	Kent Town	Increase capacity	
	Elizabeth Heights	Increase capacity	
	Holden Hill	Increase capacity	
	Blackwood	Increase capacity	
	Yankalilla	Increase capacity	
	Myponga	Increase capacity	
	Willunga	Circuit voltage change	
	Para	Connect additional circuits	

Note: Programme may change and other works may be introduced depending upon actual load growth in particular areas.

1980 Not yet decided

1981 Not yet decided

3. • Possible use of metal enclosed switchgear insulated with sulphur hexafluoride gas at voltages from 66 000 to 275 000 to reduce space requirements.

• Refinements to remote control systems using computer-based equipment.

- Use of solid-state relay equipment in new installations in lieu of electromechanical devices currently employed.
- Use of plastic insulated high voltage cables in lieu of oil impregnated paper insulated lead sheathed cables hitherto employed.

**GENERATOR UNITS**

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

1. What was the cost of the major overhaul of the No. 1 gas turbine generator unit at Dry Creek power station and over what period of time was the unit out of use?
2. What is the programme for overhaul of the remaining two units and at what expected cost?
3. Is it intended to add any further similar units to this facility or at any other site in South Australia and what are the details?
4. What was the cost of each of the units and the current price for any replacement or new unit?

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

1. \$122 000: from 11 October 1977 to 3 February 1978.
2. Unit 2: September to November 1978 at an estimated cost of \$230 000. Unit 3: March to May 1979 at an estimated cost of \$230 000.
3. Three 25 MW gas turbines are currently being commissioned at Snuggery in the South-East. There are no plans at present to install further gas turbines on the trust's system.
4. The average cost of the gas turbine generators at Dry Creek power station was \$2 750 000 each. The current replacement cost of these units would be about \$6 000 000 each.

**PLAYFORD POWER STATION**

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

1. Is the damage being caused to the boilers of the Thomas Playford power station a problem that was contemplated before the present fuel was used and what are the details?
2. Is the difficulty being experienced expected to reduce the life of the boilers and, if so, what are the details and what are the anticipated additional costs associated with this difficulty in the next 10 years?
3. What has been the loss of generating capacity experienced, is it likely to escalate, and what are the details?

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

1. Yes, but the degree of erosion of boiler gas passes by abrasive ash was greater than was expected from tests on coal samples.
2. The life of the boilers is not expected to be reduced but additional maintenance will be required. Additional costs estimated to be of the order of \$800 000 over the next 10 years.
3. Output from the station during 1977-78 was 6 per cent less than during 1976-77. Most of this was due to boilers being out of service longer for repairs. The situation is not likely to escalate.

**TORRENS ISLAND**

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

1. Has the new blading fitted to No. 3 turbine in section A of the Torrens Island power house been totally satisfactory and, if not, what are the details?
2. What was the cost to the trust of the reblading and what was the total cost of the repairs?

3. What period of guarantee, if any, is associated with:
  - (a) the blades and associated parts; and
  - (b) the workmanship?

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

1. Yes.
2. Cost to the trust of reblading, after allowing for insurance—\$95 000.  
Total cost of repairs—\$180 000.
3. (a) None.  
(b) None.

**ELECTRICITY MAINS**

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

1. What schemes have been approved for the purpose of undergrounding existing electricity mains in public areas and what has been the Electricity Trust's share of cost in each scheme?
2. What schemes have been refused since the inception of the scheme and why was each such scheme refused?
3. What are the specific criteria necessary for such a scheme to be considered by the trust and what is the normal period of delay in determining either acceptance or rejection?

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

	\$
1. James St., Salisbury . . . . .	6 030
Jerningham/Stanley Sts., North Adelaide . .	10 000
Ludgate Circus, Colonel Light Gardens . . .	1 170
Adelaide Place, Port Lincoln . . . . .	4 000
Tasman/Eyre Streets, Port Lincoln . . . . .	4 500
London/King/Porter Streets, Port Lincoln	4 400
Colley Reserve Car Park, Glenelg . . . . .	1 000
Salisbury Downs Recreation Park . . . . .	10 500
Botanic Road, Adelaide . . . . .	16 300
Historical Village, Loxton . . . . .	3 500
Blue Lake Environs, Mt. Gambier . . . . .	660
Whitmore Square, Adelaide . . . . .	34 000
O'Connell St./King William St., Nth. Adelaide . . . . .	13 150
Brougham Place, North Adelaide . . . . .	9 600
Flinders Parade, Victor Harbor . . . . .	2 200
Foreshore Reserve, Milang . . . . .	9 500
Light Square, Adelaide . . . . .	1 800
North Esplanade, Glenelg North . . . . .	4 750
Lake Bonney Reserve, Barmera . . . . .	6 650
Recreation Reserve, Morphett Vale . . . . .	1 240
Wandilla Drive, Rostrevor . . . . .	1 300
Showgrounds/Jenkins Avenue, Whyalla . .	2 270
LeFevre Terrace, Nth. Adelaide . . . . .	55 000
Sir Edwin Smith Drive, North Adelaide . .	20 000
Jarrett Memorial Gardens, Renmark . . . .	6 000
Recreation Reserve, Berri . . . . .	5 500
Overland Corner Hotel . . . . .	1 100
Naracoorte Caves . . . . .	1 500
South Lakes, Goolwa . . . . .	11 000
Foreshore, Reserve, Normanville . . . . .	1 450
Henley Beach Square . . . . .	4 500
Riverfront Avenue, Berri . . . . .	4 000
Council Caravan Park, Mannum . . . . .	14 000
Valley Lake, Mount Gambier . . . . .	4 900
Beach Road, Christies Beach . . . . .	36 000
Fitzroy Terrace, Prospect . . . . .	8 460
Recreation Reserve, Mannum . . . . .	3 000
Reid Street, Gawler . . . . .	11 150
Bridge Road, Para Hills . . . . .	32 000
2. Wright Street (King William Street to Whitmore Square) Adelaide, because it was not in a 'special location'. (See 3 below).	
3. The scheme must be nominated by a council,	

recommended by the trust's Electricity Reticulation Advisory Committee and involve a special location such as a principal thoroughfare, public park, foreshore, recreation reserve, etc., where there are aesthetic benefits to the general community. The council must agree to provide trenches for the cables and arrange for alterations to electricity consumers' services and other authorities' facilities. It normally takes about three months for the trust to examine a council's proposal. However, decisions are given more quickly if this is necessary to meet a council's construction programme.

#### HUNDREDS

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

1. How many hundreds exist in South Australia, what are they and what percentage of the total land mass is represented in the hundreds?

2. How many sections exist in each individual hundred?

3. How many individual allotments exist in each hundred now and how many were in existence in each of the preceding five years?

4. What number of allotments are in excess of 30 hectares in each hundred and how many are between five and 30 hectares?

5. How many titles exist in each hundred?

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

1. There are 535 hundreds in South Australia comprising 16 384 500 hectares which represents approximately 16.6 per cent of the total area of the State.

2. The average area of a hundred is approximately 100 square miles and the average area of a section may be approximately 80 acres. On the above assumptions, which are reasonable in the absence of further information, there would be on average 800 sections in each hundred.

3. 4. and 5. To search out the data requested and collate it would take several men years and cost tens of thousands of dollars. Such a cost is grossly excessive.

#### FEMALES

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

1. How many females under the Minister's care and control orders were found to be pregnant in the years 1974 to 1978, respectively?

2. How many females under such care and control orders underwent an abortion in the years 1974 to 1978, respectively?

3. Have any females on good behaviour bonds, under the supervision of officers of the Community Welfare Department, undergone an abortion, and, if so, how many in the years 1974 to 1978, respectively?

4. In respect of those females in parts 2 and 3, was section 82a of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act complied with and, if not, what was the number in the years 1974 to 1978, respectively?

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

1. 2. and 3. Statistics are not available. Abortion is a matter which is confidential between the medical practitioners and the female concerned.

4. See 2. and 3. above.

#### STATISTICS BRANCH

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

1. What is the specification for the Police Department Statistics Branch?

2. What area of inquiry has the branch already initiated?

3. What priorities has the branch set for the past six, 12 and 18 months, respectively?

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

1. There is no specific Statistics Branch as such within the Police Department. Two members of the staff of the Central Records Division are assigned to collate data from crime reports to assist in the compilation and production of statistics required for official purposes.

In addition, work-related statistics used for administrative or operational purposes are produced by other groups within the Police Department, viz. Crime Intelligence Unit, Regional Crime Collators and Traffic Intelligence Unit.

A Departmental Crime Statistics Co-ordinating Committee periodically reviews requirements in order to determine priorities with regard to the on-going production of meaningful police-related statistics.

2. The statistical staff employed within the Central Records Division are primarily engaged in the compilation of offence/offender data for inclusion in:

(a) The Annual Report of the Commissioner of Police.

(b) Reports of Selected Crime as required by the Australian Bureau of Statistics and as published in the *Government Gazette*.

(c) Reports of the International Criminal Police Organisation (INTERPOL).

3. The priorities of the various units of the Police Department engaged in statistical collection have been primarily set towards the production of mandatory crime-related statistics and the compilation of data which will assist administrative and operational planning by identifying crime patterns and trends, etc.

It is expected that the recent development of a computer-based data collection system will allow greater scope and flexibility in future statistical production than was possible in the past using manually produced methods.

#### WHYALLA WATER

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

1. Why is there poor water pressure in the Hazel Court/Jacquier Crescent part of Whyalla?

2. Will the Minister have action taken to see if it is possible to improve the pressure, particularly during the summer months?

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

1. There has been no indication that poor water pressure exists in the Hazel Court/Jacquier Crescent part of Whyalla.

2. The matter is being investigated.

#### MOUND SPRINGS

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

1. Has the Environment Department plans to reserve one, or several, of the unique mound springs which are present in the north of South Australia, skirting the Great Artesian Basin and, if not, why not?

2. Does the Minister consider that the unusual and fragile micro-environment, which is generated by these remarkable geological sites, is worthy of preservation by inclusion in a conservation or national park and, if not, why not?

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

1. An investigation into the environmental significance of mound springs in the north of South Australia is currently being undertaken by this Department. Further-

more, the Nature Conservation Society of South Australia is currently carrying out a scientific survey of the mound springs. It is anticipated that the Department will receive a copy of that Society's report when it becomes available. Until these investigations are completed, no further action is proposed.

2. Refer to 1. above.

### GRAZING ANIMALS

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

1. Has the Agriculture and Fisheries Department considered control of grazing animals, both indigenous and introduced, in arid and semi-arid areas, by fencing waterways and piping water away from bush growth and, if not, why not?

2. Does the Minister consider that such controls would mean greater long-term productivity of the land, which would justify high initial costs and, if not, why not?

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

1. The resource management of arid rangelands is a function of the Pastoral Board in the Lands Department under the provisions of the Pastoral Act, 1936-1976. The matter of improvements such as fencing and the transfer of water by pipeline is a factor of individual lease or property management and the Pastoral Act does not empower either the Minister of Lands or the Pastoral Board to determine or direct the location, extent, or function of individual improvements on leases. These decisions are properly left to the lessees of respective pastoral leases. The practice referred to by the honourable member is in fact employed in varying degrees by many pastoral operators.

2. The co-ordinated management and use of water and other land-based natural resources is essential to long-term productivity in the arid zone. However, the economic justification of improvements is also an equally essential consideration for pastoral lessees in the overall management of individual enterprises.

### FLINDERS RANGE

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

1. Will the management plan for the Flinders Range National Park be completed, and implemented, in 1978-79, as anticipated by the Minister in answer to my question of 12 September and, if not, why not?

2. Does the Minister consider that this is a matter of urgency and, if not, why not?

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

1. It is anticipated that the Management Plan for the Flinders Range National Park will be completed and its implementation commenced during the 1978-79 financial year.

2. Yes.

### ARKAROOOLA

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

1. Does the Minister consider the Arkaroola property, owned and managed by the Sprigg family in the northern Flinders Range, to have important conservation value?

2. Does the Minister consider that:

(a) the good work which has been done by the Sprigg family in conserving this fragile arid area and its indigenous animals and plants, in spite of its heavy use as a recreation resource, deserves

some Government support and, if not, why not;

(b) processes of desertification are likely to take place rapidly in areas such as Arkaroola if it is "abandoned" or not managed appropriately and, if not, why not; and

(c) it might be cheaper for the Government to provide some support now, rather than see the property "run down" through inadequate finance, with consequent environmental degradation and a much greater problem in the future and, if not, why not?

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

1. Yes.

2. (a) Arkaroola is not considered to warrant Government support. It is a free enterprise tourist venture.

(b) It is not considered likely that the process of desertification would take place rapidly if Arkaroola were not managed appropriately. The natural environment is self-regulating and if left alone would eventually return to a position of balance.

(c) Refer to (b) above.

### HERITAGE COMMITTEE

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

1. Does the Minister regard the Australian Heritage Commission to be a totally bipartisan body?

2. Will the South Australian Heritage Committee, and Unit, work in close liaison with the Australian Heritage Commission, particularly with regard to the compilation of the register?

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

1. The Australian Heritage Commission does not come within the State Government jurisdiction.

2. Yes. There will be continued close liaison with the Australian Heritage Commission but the South Australian Heritage Register will be based on the advice of the South Australian Heritage Committee.

### MANNUM

638. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Is it the intention of the Government that Mannum should receive the same incentive made available to growth centres as announced both at a public meeting and in the House at the time of the Horwood Bagshaw retrenchments and, if so, will it receive the incentives offered to growth centres in the recently announced industry incentives scheme and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Shortly after the announcement of retrenchment at the Mannum factory of Horwood Bagshaw Ltd. late last year, I was invited to address a public meeting in the town. At that meeting I said that the Government would take urgent action to try to minimise the effect these retrenchments would have on Mannum.

This commitment has been met by the Government over the past year. We have disbursed substantial sums of money through the State Unemployment Relief Scheme to provide employment in Mannum, and the excellent community centre and the greatly improved foreshore area provide lasting evidence of this Government's concern and support. Funds have been provided for the employment for six months of a full-time Development Officer. Further, the Department of Economic Develop-



ment had maintained close liaison with the Mannum community and has tried very hard to find new employment for the town.

I am pleased to say that the employment situation in Mannum has improved in recent months, and Horwood Bagshaw Ltd. has added substantially to its workforce. Following the good rains throughout Australia this winter, it is expected that sales of agricultural machinery will improve, and it is likely that this will bring increased demand for labour at Mannum.

The Establishment Payments Scheme announced recently, aims to promote development throughout South Australia, but higher rates of incentive grants are payable to approved businesses establishing, or expanding significantly, in the designated growth centres and major service centres. Experience in Australia and overseas shows that the returns to the community as a whole are maximised if growth is concentrated in a small number of key centres or regions, which then have good prospects of generating their own growth momentum through operation of the multiplier effect. Overall growth prospects for a State such as ours would be reduced if a "scatter-shot" approach were used, whereby identical grants are given for industry at any location whatsoever.

For this reason the Government has chosen to offer the maximum incentives in a few selected areas, and lesser (but still significant) incentives in Adelaide and the rest of the State. However, special assistance to significant developments in other areas may be negotiated.

#### WOMBATS

639. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Have tests on the effectiveness of poisons on wombats been carried out at Brookfield Conservation Park and, if so:

- (a) when were the tests carried out;
- (b) how many wombats were killed by the poisons; and
- (c) who conducted these tests and under whose authority?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** No.

#### ANIMALS

641. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Have any animals other than dingoes and other pest species been destroyed in any parks administered by the National Parks and Wildlife Service and, if so:

- (a) in what parks;
- (b) what species;
- (c) how many;
- (d) how; and
- (e) is it intended that this practice should continue?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** No.

#### BUFFER ZONES

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

1. Is the National Parks and Wildlife Service presently investigating the possibility of setting up buffer zones around national and conservation parks, in view of the agreement by the Minister in answer to my question No. 482 that such a proposal had merit and, if not, why not?

2. If buffer zones are considered to be worthy of incorporating in management plans for parks:

- (a) when will the first examples be set up; and

(b) which parks does the Minister consider are in most need of such a provision?

3. Does the Minister consider that such buffer zones would go a long way towards lessening the problems experienced by land/leaseholders of adjacent properties with respect to the intrusion of wildlife on to their properties, particularly in times of drought and, if not, why not?

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

1. Yes.
2. This depends on the investigation.
3. Yes.

#### HOSPITAL BOARD

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

1. Has a Mount Gambier Hospital Board of Management yet been appointed in accordance with the provisions of the South Australia Health Commission Act, 1975-1976, and, if so, who are the members of the board, how and when were nominations called and what are the criteria for nomination and appointment to the board?

2. Were nominations sought and/or received from any endorsed A.L.P. candidate in the South-East to fill any of the board positions and, if so, under what Act or regulation was such action taken by the Minister and were any or all such nominees appointed to the board?

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

1. No.
2. A number of names have been submitted to the Minister for consideration as board members. The suggestions have come from various persons having a knowledge of the local area, including one person who was previously a city council member and nominee on the Hospital Board, and is presently an endorsed A.L.P. candidate.

#### RESERVOIRS

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

1. Will the practice of accelerating the flocculation and deposition of silt in Adelaide water reservoirs be resumed in 1978-79 and, if so, which reservoirs will be so treated?

2. What has been the effect of the use of alum in increasing the amount of silt deposition and to what extent will this reduce the storage capacity if used on a regular basis?

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

1. Alum dosing of reservoirs will be continued as raw water conditions demand. It is anticipated that, as in 1977-78, only the Millbrook reservoir will require such treatment in 1978-79.

2. 22 000 cubic metres of alum sludge has collected in the Millbrook reservoir to date, representing 0.13 per cent of the reservoir's total capacity. Dosing to the same extent on a regular annual basis would reduce the reservoir's capacity by 50 per cent over a period of 400-500 years. However, the commissioning of the Anstey Hill water filtration plant in 1979 will remove any need for further dosing at Millbrook.

#### MONARTO SHOOTING COMPLEX

659. **Mr. EVANS** (on notice): Has a decision been reached regarding the allocation of money for the Monarto shooting complex, as stated in the Minister's reply of 22 August?

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** Yes. The Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport has approved a grant of \$16 250 towards a total estimated cost of \$44 438 for the first stage development of the Small Bore and Full Bore Rifle Association's ranges at the Monarto shooting complex.

### TRAVEL AGENTS

660. **Mr. EVANS** (on notice): What stage have arrangements reached between the State and Federal Governments for the agreement on legislation to be introduced to effectively regulate travel agents?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Draft legislation has been prepared by the Federal Government after consultation with all the States and Territories. South Australia, together with the other States and Territories and other industry bodies, has been invited to comment on the draft legislation. The views of the South Australian Government have been passed to the Federal Government which is currently examining those and other responses.

### CONTAINER TERMINAL

614. **Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice): What is the minimum annual rent payable to the Government by the container handling company using the Outer Harbor container terminal?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** A minimum annual rental is payable to the Government by the company using the Outer Harbor container terminal. There is also a unit rate payable on each container leaving the terminal area and the minimum applies should the container throughput fall below a certain level. The minimum rental and the unit rates form part of the agreement between the Government and the company and as disclosure of these figures could prejudice the company in its business operations, it is not considered appropriate to disclose such figures in this reply.

615. **Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice): What is the handling capacity of the Outer Harbor container terminal in terms of ships loaded or unloaded a week?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The number of ships handled by the Outer Harbor terminal is governed by the number of containers involved and the working conditions being experienced at the time. Recent experience has shown that 110 containers could be handled per eight hour shift.

### LAND TAX

616. **Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice): When will the Premier forward the report from the Valuer-General as promised in answer to a question on 13 July 1978 in relation to equalisation factors applying to land tax charges?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The report was forwarded to the honourable member on 28 September 1978 by way of a reply to the question of 13 July 1978.

### CONSULTANTS

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

1. What moneys have been paid, or are due to be paid, to each of Cheesman Doley Neighbour and Raffin Pty.

Ltd., and Neighbour and Lapsys for work they have carried out on:—

(a) the proposed new convention and sporting complex at Wayville; and

(b) the hotel complex in the city?

2. Have the consultants Neighbour and Lapsys been given the contract for all or part of the architectural work and supervision for the convention and sporting complex at Wayville and, if so, what is the period of time for any contract or agreement that has been reached and what are the financial conditions of the agreement?

3. What other consultants have been allocated work on the convention and sporting complex at Wayville, what is the period of time for each contract or agreement that has been reached, and what are the financial conditions of the agreements?

4. If there are no fixed monetary amounts to be paid to Neighbour and Lapsys or to Cheesman Doley Neighbour and Raffin Pty Ltd for their work on the convention and sporting complex, what is the anticipated amount each will receive?

5. Were tenders called publicly for the architectural work and, if not, why not?

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

1. (a) \$55 000 has been paid for a feasibility study only.  
(b) Nil.

2. No.

3. None.

4. See answer to 1. (a) and 2 above.

5. No architectural work has been undertaken. Tenders were called for the feasibility study.

### JAM FACTORY

618. **Mr. EVANS** (on notice): To which Government departments or statutory bodies has the Jam Factory sold articles during the past three years, what were the individual articles and what price was paid for each?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** This question is similar to an earlier question (No. 245), when it was explained that the Jam Factory did not keep detailed records prior to July 1976. From that time until 4 August 1978 the South Australian Art Gallery bought 67 items with a total value of \$4 557.06. It was earlier advised that the museum had purchased these items, but the error was corrected in a letter to the member for Fisher dated 14 September 1978. Sales to other departments and statutory bodies have been:

	\$
Chief Secretary's Department . . . . .	6.66
Design Centre . . . . .	220.20
Department of Admin. Services . . . . .	8.00
Further Education Dept. . . . .	10.00
Government House . . . . .	87.30
Industrial Design Council of Australia . . . . .	40.00
Mines Department . . . . .	55.00
Department of Transport . . . . .	808.80
Marine and Harbors Department . . . . .	545.90
Premier's Department . . . . .	4 102.76
	\$5 884.62

I do not intend to list each item separately, and its cost, as it may be embarrassing to recipients of official gifts from the State to publicise the information. In addition, there would be a considerable amount of work in going back through records to ascertain the nature of each article, and that is not warranted.

**HART REPORT**

619. **Mr. EVANS** (on notice): When will the report prepared by Mr. Hart in relation to private development and planning be made public?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The matter will be considered by Cabinet shortly.

**VAUGHAN HOUSE**

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

1. How many incidents have there been at Vaughan House involving injury to staff or inmates in the months from June 1977 to August 1978, respectively?

2. What was the type of injury sustained by staff or inmates, respectively?

3. What was the sex of any staff involved in those incidents?

4. Was there an incident at Vaughan House on Saturday 16 September, and, if so, at what time did it happen?

5. What time were the R.C.W's relieved from their duties, respectively.

6. Was a doctor in attendance and, if so, at what time?

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

1. Two, both involving minor injury to residents (females);

2. Bruising in one case; abdominal pains in the other;

3. At the time of the first incident, female staff; at the time of the second incident, male and female staff;

4. Yes, at 7.50 p.m.

5. They were relieved from their supervisory duties immediately. Subsequently, they left the centre at 8.45 p.m. and 9.45 p.m. respectively.

6. Yes, at 8.30 p.m.

**BROOKWAY PARK**

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

1. How many inmates now resident at Vaughan House have been transferred from Brookway Park?

2. In which institutions have children who were recently transferred from Brookway Park been placed, how many were placed in each institution and when?

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

1. One.

2. At the closure of Brookway Park two boys were released to home at the end of their programme, three remained in Ningana unit on the Brookway Park property and 14 were transferred to Vaughan House. Of the 14, one is still at Vaughan House, three were placed at Gilles Plains Community unit (two on 12 September 1978 and one on 20 September 1978), one was placed at Ningana Community Unit on 8 September 1978 and nine were returned home.

**SALTIA CREEK ROAD**

623. **Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice):

1. What plans have the Government to reconstruct the Saltia Creek road from Port Augusta to Quorn?

2. Have tenders been called and, if so, when and has any tender been accepted?

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

1. None.

2. Tenders have not been called for roadworks. Tenders were called in early 1978 for the construction of

bridges over Saltia Creek on this road. No tender was accepted. It is now planned to install concrete floodways at the Saltia Creek crossing early in 1979.

**RENTAL HOUSES**

625. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Does the Government Valuation Department value Housing Trust rental houses at a lower rate than privately owned houses of similar style and, if so, why?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** No. However individual house values can vary between similar styles, because of differences in age, physical condition, nature of internal fixtures, size, number of rooms, etc., of those houses.

**CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS**

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

1. Who are the members of the Classification of Publications Board?

2. How long have they been on the board and when do their appointments expire?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** This information is set out in detail in the board's annual report presented to Parliament on 12 September 1978.

**MASSAGE PARLOURS**

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

1. Can the Minister give an assurance that, at any time since the Juvenile Courts Act came into operation, no young girls under his care and control have worked in massage parlours?

2. If any of those girls were working in massage parlours, did this occur with the knowledge and/or approval of his departmental officers?

3. Were any of those girls working at the massage parlours as prostitutes and, if so, how many and what was the age of each?

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

1. The department has no information of any young girl working in a massage parlour while under the care and control of the Minister.

2. and 3. See 1 above.

**CHILD CARE**

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

1. Can the Minister give an assurance that there has been no breach of section 48 (3) of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act whereby finance has been given to young females under his care and control, who are under the age of 17 years, to enable them to live and cohabit with older men?

2. If any breaches of the Act have occurred, what was the number of cases in each of the past three years?

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

1. and 2. There is no section 48 (3) contained in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

**S.G.I.C. BUILDING**

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

1. Has the Minister sought and obtained a full report establishing the cause and any areas of neglect by the contractor and/or his employees following the collapse of a

portion of the eastern wall of the S.G.I.C. building in course of construction in Helen Street, Mount Gambier?

2. What was the total cost of damage sustained by :
- (a) the S.E. Land and Mercantile premises and stock crushed by the collapsed wall; and
  - (b) the S.G.I.C. building itself?

3. Were the collapsed interior/exterior cavity walls correctly tied?

4. Had the wall been constructed to roof level and, if so, was it tied in to the roof structure and, if not, why not?

5. With which insurance company was the structure insured and did the cover adequately provide for all of the damage incurred including any trading loss to S.E. Land and Mercantile.

6. Will the Minister release the full report for public scrutiny?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The State Government Insurance Commission has had this matter investigated and a report was received from its project managers. The report has been placed in the hands of the Commission's solicitors and, therefore, the information sought by Mr. Allison cannot be released at this stage until liability, if any, has been established. This is normal insurance practice. The Public Buildings Department was not involved in the construction of the building.

#### CHILD CARE

652. **Mr. ALLISON** (on notice): Subsequent upon the release of the findings of the Minister's inquiry into unmet needs for early childhood and family support services in Mount Gambier and district will he now take action to:

- (a) appoint a permanent staff member trained in child psychology to serve the Mount Gambier region; and
- (b) upgrade the Moorak parent-child centre and make available an extra portable classroom?

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

- (a) In view of financial and manpower restrictions it will not be possible for the Department of Community Welfare to appoint a permanent staff member trained in child psychology to serve the Mount Gambier region on a full time basis at this time. The Department has a trained psychologist with headquarters at its Murray Bridge regional office who provides psychological services throughout the southern country region, which includes the Mount Gambier area.

- (b) This question has been referred to the Minister of Education for a reply.

#### CHILD MOLESTING

655. **Mr. ALLISON** (on notice): In recent months has any prisoner been transferred from Adelaide to Mount Gambier to serve a sentence for child molesting and, if so, how long does the prisoner have to serve, and does the Chief Secretary regard it appropriate that such prisoners should be incarcerated next to a primary school?

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** Yes. Details of the sentences will be supplied to the honourable member by letter. The last escape from the security section of the prison occurred in June 1977. Modifications to improve security were carried out in August 1978 and additional electronic surveillance equipment is currently being

installed. In view of these measures it is not considered that there is any undue risk to persons in the immediate vicinity of the prison.

#### ANDERSON INQUIRY

656. **Mr. ALLISON** (on notice): What was the cost to the Government in completing the Anderson inquiry into post-secondary education of:

- (a) salaries of the committee;
- (b) salaries of assistant and secretarial staff;
- (c) services by other departmental or outside consultants;
- (d) travel, accommodation and sundry expenses; and
- (e) printing and circulation of the report,

and what are the total known costs?

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** The replies are as follows: \$194 000

- (a) \$44 000—including \$16 000 paid to Australian National University to cover the cost of a replacement for Dr. Anderson.
- (b) \$52 092.59—Some additional costs were borne by SACEPR.
- (c) \$15 439.50.
- (d) (1) Committee travel and accommodation, \$11 479.82.  
(2) Chairman's travel and accommodation (Canberra to Adelaide, etc.), \$17 726.61  
(3) Sundry expenses, \$43 317.01
- (e) \$9 790.94.

#### CHILD-CARE STUDIES

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

1. Is the Kensington Park College of Further Education conducting a course in child care studies:

- (a) full-time; and
- (b) part-time?

2. When did the course commence and did the advertised or intended duration of the course include 800 hours of study?

3. Does the course have State-wide recognition and was it devised by the D.F.E. curriculum development staff and considered for accreditation by the Kindergarten Union?

4. Are graduates to be certificated and is such certificate a recognised qualification for employment now or in future within South Australian kindergartens or other pre-school centres?

5. Will the course continue to the end of 1978 and beyond, to enable all enrolled part-time students to complete the course and, if not, will an alternative course be offered by another college or colleges:

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** The replies are as follows:

1. (a) No.  
(b) The college is conducting the first four units (160 hours) only of the part-time child care studies certificate course.

2. The child care studies certificate (1920 hours in duration) commenced in mid-June 1975. It was, and is, offered at Croydon Park College of Further Education and Elizabeth Community College as a two year full-time course. The first four units (160 hours) of the course have been available on a part-time basis for some years at some metropolitan colleges of further education, including Kensington Park. The complete part-time course is to be offered for the first time commencing February 1979. It will be available at only one metropolitan college of further education. Not all subjects will be immediately

available and the introduction of further subjects will depend on the availability of staff and resources.

3. (1) The child care studies certificate course is recognised in the child care regulations under the Community Welfare Act 1972.

"Pt.IV Staffing

22. 1(b) A person who satisfies the Director-General that she has satisfactorily completed a suitable course in child care".

2. The Child care studies certificate of the Department of Further Education in South Australia is also recognised as a qualification for purposes of subsidising of salaries, in terms of the Commonwealth Child Care Act 1972.

3. Satisfactory completion of four units, namely, 160 hours of the course, provides for a wage increment under the Miscellaneous Workers Award.

4. The course was designed by Department of Further Education curriculum development staff in consultation with representatives of relevant child care organisations. This is normal departmental procedure.

5. It has been considered for accreditation by the Kindergarten Union for the purposes of employment of trained child care attendants in child care centres.

4. (1) A certificate is awarded by the Department of Further Education.

(2) Kindergarten and pre-schools do not come under the provisions of the Community Welfare Act. Independent kindergartens, however, are required to be registered. In these instances, where there is a child care involvement separate from the formal kindergarten teaching sessions, an employee with this certificate would be regarded as a suitably qualified staff member.

5. (1) The complete part-time course will commence in February 1979. It involves a substantial field experience component. Existing part-time students already engaged in relevant employment will be exempted from the greater part of the field experience requirements of the course. Other existing part-time students will need to find appropriate placements in child care establishments. The department will assist existing part-time students not engaged in relevant employment to obtain such placements, but success in organising appropriate placements cannot be guaranteed. Where it is not possible to arrange appropriate placements in conjunction with formal course work for such students, the field work component may be completed end-on.

(2) The first four units (160 hours) of the course have been available on a part-time basis for some years at metropolitan colleges of further education. The complete part-time course is to be offered for the first time commencing February 1979. It will be available at only one metropolitan College of Further Education. Not all subjects will be immediately available and the introduction of further subjects will depend on the availability of staff and resources.

#### TELEPHONE COSTS

In reply to **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (28 September, Appropriation Bill).

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The last review of persons eligible for the payment of private telephone rentals and official calls was carried out in July 1977 and is currently again under consideration.

#### OVERSEAS TRAVEL

In reply to **Mr. WOTTON** (27 September, Appropriation Bill).

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Premier's Department

officers who travelled overseas on official business in the past 12 months were Mr. G. J. Inns, Director-General, who travelled with the Premier overseas and he also visited Malaysia (8 weeks); Mr. M. U. Sullivan, Project Officer, who visited Malaysia (4 weeks); Ms. D. McCulloch, Women's Adviser, who visited North America and Europe (6½ weeks); Mr. S. R. Wright, Private Secretary, who travelled with the Premier (6 weeks); Mr. A. Hodgson, Media Secretary, who travelled with the Premier (5 weeks); Dr. D. B. Hughes, Executive Assistant (Economics), who visited the United Kingdom and the United States of America (4 weeks); Mr. C. Winzar, Arts Development Officer, who visited Malaysia (16 days) and Mr. R. Yeeles, Journalist, who visited Malaysia (16 days).

Currently overseas is Mr. L. Amadio, Director, Arts Development, who is visiting North America and Europe in the main (11 weeks). No details have been planned for further overseas visits by officers, although tentatively two pre-planning visits are proposed to Malaysia for the 1979 North Malaysia Week.

#### B.Y.O. LICENCES

In reply to **Mr. ABBOTT** (20 September).

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The Licensing Court has received only two applications for limited restaurant (b.y.o.) licences. These relate to the two restaurants referred to by the honourable member. A licence was granted to Bertie's Pancake Restaurant on 4 September 1978 and the application in respect of the Silver Spoon Restaurant is set down for hearing on 17 October 1978. This information, of course, confirms my earlier comment that there was little demand for this type of licence.

#### FISHING LICENCES

In reply to **Mr. GUNN** (12 September).

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The economic and biological survey of the scale fishery will be completed in the first half of next year and will be released for public information. While the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries is putting considerable resources into the survey, the honourable member must understand that certain biological survey work cannot be hurried. The decision to introduce a freeze on the issue of new A- or B-class licences was taken last year because of preliminary indications of a serious decline in fish stocks in a number of important fishing areas. The most serious decline appears to be in Spencer Gulf. The situation was considered to be sufficiently serious to take immediate "holding" action until the survey has been completed.

#### HIGHBURY PRE-SCHOOL

In reply to **Mrs. BYRNE** (19 September).

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I have been advised by the Childhood Services Council that a 30-place pre-school, with a daily attendance of 60 pupils (two sessions), will be constructed at the Highbury Primary School. Completion date will be such that the centre will operate from the beginning of February 1979. The centre will be administered by the Kindergarten Union.

**SUPERANNUATION**

In reply to **Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** (19 September).

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The actuarial investigations of the South Australian Superannuation Fund as at 1 July 1974 and as at 1 July 1977 are almost complete, and I understand that the Superannuation Board proposes to present them to me within the next week or so. Pursuant to the provisions of the Superannuation Act, they will be tabled in Parliament within two weeks of my receiving them. I understand that the reports include estimates of the future cost of superannuation.

**PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY**

Petitions signed by 3 651 electors of South Australia praying that the House would pass legislation to provide for Ministerial responsibility adequately to control pornographic material were presented by Messrs. Abbott, Becker, Broomhill, Dean Brown, Corcoran, Eastick, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Harrison, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Simmons, Tonkin, Virgo, Wilson, and Wotton.

Petitions received.

**PETITIONS: VIOLENT OFFENCES**

Petitions signed by 1 477 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, were presented by Messrs. Becker, Broomhill, Chapman, Harrison, Mathwin, Simmons, Whitten, and Wilson.

Petitions received.

**PETITION: MARIHUANA**

A petition signed by 31 residents of South Australia praying that the House would not pass legislation seeking to legalise marihuana was presented by Mr. Nankivell.

Petition received.

**PETITIONS: VOLUNTARY WORKERS**

Petitions signed by 433 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 were presented by Messrs. Dean Brown, Eastick, Goldsworthy, and Tonkin.

Petitions received.

**PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES**

A petition signed by 34 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to amend the Succession Duties Act so that the position of blood relations sharing a family property enjoyed at least the same benefits as those available to other recognised relationships.

Petition received.

**PETITION: SUCCESSION AND GIFT DUTIES**

A petition signed by 77 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to adopt a programme for the phasing out of succession and gift duties in South Australia as soon as possible was presented by Dr. Eastick.

Petition received.

**PETITION: WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION**

A petition signed by 212 residents of South Australia praying that the House would support the proposed amendments to the hearing loss sections of the Workmen's Compensation Act was presented by Mr. Dean Brown.

Petition received.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DRUGS ROYAL COMMISSION**

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** In answering question 472 of the honourable member for Mitcham, it seems that certain minor errors in calculations occurred. I have had this report from the accountants. The Royal Commission has been keeping responsible operational ledgers for the payment of accounts necessarily incurred. In detailing break-downs requested by the honourable member and by the honourable member for Davenport, the Commission has recompiled ledgers to provide an accurate account of expenditures aligned with the particular questions on research, travel and accommodation, legal fees, and salaries. Some minor budget errors of posting payments to incorrect ledgers were detected and these have been corrected.

In providing the replies to the questions in a way that provides an accurate "picture of expenditure" debited to particular ledgers, as distinct from "operational accounts" as provided previously, the following responses are prepared:

**EXPENDITURE SUMMARY**

	1976-77	1977-78	July-Aug	Total
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Members' fees and reimbursement of members' salaries .....	11 630-90	70 521-92	4 667-50	86 820-32
Salaries and associated expenses .....	7 820-81	94 084-01	17 355-69	119 260-51
Legal fees .....	9 234-40			9 234-40
Research .....	23 132-00	91 028-74	138-00	114 298-74
Travelling and accommodation .....	4 462-29	20 344-33	2 597-92	27 404-54
Office supplies .....	1 542-83	14 466-80	3 784-46	19 794-09
Library book and associated costs .....	1 269-82	1 340-63	177-27	2 787-92
Equipment .....	483-70	2 506-76	56-60	3 047-06
Entertainment .....		766-16	137-33	903-49
Counsel fees and expenses .....	21 007-85	79 746-59	5 840-00	106 594-44
Miscellaneous .....	1 815-67	7 615-67	1 107-58	10 538-92
Advertising, printing and media liaison .....	3 351-22	9 516-95	5 570-10	18 438-27
	\$85 751-49	\$391 938-56	\$41 432-45	\$519 122-50

An amount of \$727-91, which relates to travel expenses for a previous Commission and was debited to this Commission in 1976-77, is included in the travelling expenses.

### DEATH OF POPE

**Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition):** With your leave, Sir, I wish to raise in this House the matter of the death of His Holiness Pope John Paul. Little can be said except to express our deep sorrow that this event has happened so rapidly and so dramatically following the death of the former pontiff. I believe that the only comment made at the time that really has stuck is that he had had time only to be loved. I believe that is a most appropriate comment. I thank you, Sir, for your indulgence in allowing me to make that statement.

### QUESTION TIME

#### FESTIVAL OF LIGHT

**Mr. TONKIN:** Will the Chief Secretary say whether pamphlets distributed on behalf of the Australian Labor Party and the United Trades and Labor Council, advertising a rally to be held at the Festival Plaza on 19 August 1978, carry the name and address of the printer, as required under the Imprint Act, 1951, and, if they did not, did the Government request police to investigate a possible breach of the Act? The police have recently been asked by the Government to investigate a possible breach of the Imprint Act, 1951, by a pamphlet distributed by the Festival of Light dealing with rape and pornography, and which the Premier attacked recently in this House. It is common knowledge that very few proceedings have been brought under this Act. When A.L.P. and U.T.L.C. pamphlets also appear to breach the Act, the Festival of Light believes it has been the victim of a heavy-handed Government action based on double standards because of its disagreement with the Premier and the Attorney-General.

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** I did not look at the pamphlets the honourable member mentioned; certainly, they were not referred to me for attention, as was the other one. There was no heavy-handed Government action in relation to the Festival of Light or the printer involved in the printing of the leaflet. I am examining the Imprint Act, which has been in operation since 1951. Representations made to my office early this year from the printing industry suggested that some of the provisions of the Act should be revised, especially in the light of modern technology and ready availability of offset printers. Discussions were held between my Research Officer, the Government Printer, and a representative of the printing industry, I think in April last, shortly before I went overseas. The representative of the printing industry indicated that, when he came back from long service leave (which I think was expected to be at about this time), he would be submitting a case to the Government for modification of the Act.

I had not seen the Festival of Light pamphlet before the complaint was made. I was aware of it only after the Premier dealt with it so effectively in this House. There was no doubt about who was responsible for the leaflet, and therefore any breach was purely technical. Inquiries by the police established that fact. There was no intention of any heavy-handed action on the part of the Government.

I was interested to see, in relation to a case which was specifically referred to me, just how the legislation works. It seems to me at this stage that, so long as responsibility for a publication can be nailed on some organisation or person, that is sufficient to ensure that libellous or subversive publications are not being distributed without

some means of their being checked. That is why I inquired into that case. It was not because there was any intention to take action against the printer, who informed the police that he was aware that he had breached the Act, that it was a technical oversight, and that he had forgotten to put the information on the publication. The responsibility for it was clearly evident, and, therefore, there is no intention to take any action on a technicality.

#### MARALINGA WASTE

**Mr. WHITTEN:** Can the Premier say whether the Federal Government has kept him informed regarding the storage of atomic waste at Maralinga, and whether he has received any worthwhile assurances from the Federal Government that proper safeguards and controls will be maintained and enforced over plutonium waste at Maralinga? The Premier would be aware of the considerable public concern at the recent disclosures that atomic waste stored at Maralinga could be used by terrorists and that possibly an atomic bomb could be made from the supposedly safely stored plutonium. I draw the Premier's attention to a report in last Friday's *Advertiser*, on page 1, under the heading "Terrorist risk in A-waste—Killen", as follows:

Plutonium waste at Maralinga was in "a potentially recoverable form" which could be used by terrorists, the Minister for Defence Mr. Killen, said last night . . . This follows the disclosure yesterday that extremely dangerous plutonium waste at Maralinga could be stolen by terrorists. The *Advertiser* editorial of the same date, under the heading "The waste of Maralinga", states:

It is time Australians knew the truth about the radioactive waste, including deadly plutonium left at Maralinga after British bomb tests in the 1950's. What has been wrung from authorities during the past three years provides ample cause for concern. But yesterday's admission by the Minister for Defence, Mr. Killen, that it was possible for terrorists to steal plutonium from the area demands more than the placatory responses given in the past.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** When this matter was first raised, the Government, after inquiry, was informed by the Federal Government that plutonium was buried at Maralinga but that it was not in a discrete form; that is, it was dispersed amongst buried waste in such a way that it would not be possible to recover it in a discrete mass. At that time, naturally, the Government accepted the technical report given by the Federal Government. Now, we have been informed in the past few days that it appears that there is some discrete mass of about half a kilogram in the area. While that is rather less than would be required for some atomic device, nevertheless it is a change from the information we previously had as to what was buried at Maralinga. It necessarily raises doubts in the Government's mind as to what more may be there that we have not at this stage been told about.

Naturally enough, we have inquired of the Federal Government as to what is the situation, but to date we have not been told more than what has been disclosed publicly; that is, we have not effectively been told more, although we have been given some restricted information as to areas and the like that is obviously not for publication. We have not been told more than has so far been published about there being other wastes in the area. The fact that this is a marked change from the information we had previously is extremely disturbing. If there is discrete and recoverable plutonium within the area, obviously the requirement to guard and monitor that area

is for the indefinite future; in fact, in the future, more than the present known life of man.

That situation must give grave cause for alarm and even more point to the fact that there have not been in the past adequate provisions in relation to the disposal of high-level atomic wastes. Presently, Britain appears to be so far about the best provided of any country in covering this area, but it is quite plain that Britain's operations in these areas have not been satisfactory in relation to an area within our own State that we know. In these circumstances we have necessarily undertaken further inquiries of the Federal Government. If these are not satisfactory, I believe that the South Australian Government is called on to investigate further to try to protect the future for the people of this State.

### STATE EMBLEM

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Does the Premier approve of the use of the State emblem by the Transcendental Meditation Centre in promoting its programme in South Australia? I have received a complaint from a lady in my district who attended a meeting held by the centre in my electorate at which its programme was broadly outlined, including a scale of charges.

**Mr. Whitten:** Was it \$120?

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** There was a concession for pensioners and students; I do not know whether the honourable member would qualify. My constituent took exception to the fact that one of the brochures handed out by the group included a large replica of the State emblem and the words "Creating an ideal society through the transcendental meditation programme". She concluded that the programme had some official backing. I understand that the society has written to local government with a covering letter indicating that it has support of people in the area. It has incurred the wrath of the Uniting Church for what the church's leader states were misleading statements. It appears that it employs aggressive and smart operators. What is the Government's attitude about this matter, and will the impending legislation be invoked in cases such as this?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** No permission or authority has been given by the State Government for the use of the State emblem by the Transcendental Meditation Centre. I was not aware of the pamphlet to which the honourable member referred. I will have the matter investigated. If anything of this kind were to occur, after the passing of the legislation presently before the House, it would certainly call for action on the part of the State Government. While the honourable member has condemned the Transcendental Meditation Centre, I personally believe that some of the views which have been expressed by some of its members show an exaggerated belief, not supported by evidence, as to the social effects widely of transcendental meditation.

*Mr. Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I know some of the people who are voluntarily associated with the centre. I believe that they are people of the highest probity, who give their services without charge to assist others very widely. I do not accept strictures in relation to the centre generally. I believe that the people who are involved in it are genuine; that is a personal view from acquaintance with a number of the people who have been associated with this particular activity over some years in South Australia and who are associated in a voluntary way with the work of this particular centre. They are people of concern and probity,

and I would not want anything I said in any way to criticise them publicly. Certainly, the centre has absolutely no authority from the State Government for the use of the State emblem.

### UNEMPLOYMENT

**Mr. ABBOTT:** Can the Premier say whether he has received an official invitation to attend the national conference on unemployment and technology, called by the Victorian Premier, Mr. Hamer? Does the Premier believe that such a conference will provide some solution to this nation's greatest single problem, unemployment?

The Leader of the Opposition was reported yesterday as saying that the Liberal Party expected to be represented at the conference, but he did not believe the conference would provide any immediate answers. The Leader also felt that the South Australian Government could do a tremendous amount by stimulating South Australia's economy and development. Has the Leader passed on any constructive suggestions?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** No, he has not, and I find it rather strange that the Leader endeavours to instruct me to stimulate the South Australian economy, but supports the Federal Government, which constantly refuses to stimulate the Australian economy of which we are a part.

Members in this House can rejoice at the fact that there was a return of the Wran Labor Government in New South Wales on Saturday. The South Australian Government has run counter to the restrictive policies of the Federal Government in endeavouring to use public funds to stimulate the local economy, the funds that we have spent in that way being well known to the members of the Opposition, although they go around the State and say, "Where has the railways money gone?" It went in moneys carefully put out in the State to stimulate the local economy. The problem for South Australia, with a high proportion of manufacturing industry and with 85 per cent of its manufacturing product being bought in other States, particularly Victoria and New South Wales, was that the markets in those States were depressed.

The Victorian market is still in grave trouble, and anybody reading the material from the Chamber of Manufacturers in Victoria can only reflect that the manufacturers in that State are in much more difficulty than the manufacturers in this State. The New South Wales Labor Government has followed the policy which has been followed by Labor in this State—to endeavour to use the resources of the State to stimulate the economy. The result has been a marked improvement in the economy in New South Wales, which is the principal market for South Australian manufacturers, and the continuance of that policy in New South Wales is good news for the South Australian economy. In these circumstances we have some hope for an improvement of the employment situation in this State in the next 12 months, with the New South Wales employment level now better than the national average (as ours was for the most part of this economic down-turn).

The Labor Party and the A.C.T.U. have been trying to get a national conference for some considerable time. Eventually the Premier of Victoria decided to seek such a national conference, organising it within Victoria. Initially the Prime Minister said that he was not interested in such a thing, but eventually he was dragged reluctantly into the conference. I hope that the Federal Government will make some contribution, because it appears that the Prime Minister has now discovered that unemployment is an issue in this country.



The South Australian Government will be represented at the conference. We will be making constructive proposals for the ways in which employment in Australia can be improved, indeed not only as far as the better stimulation of the economy to achieve that is concerned in the short term but also on the long-term problems of structural unemployment now facing this country.

#### INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** My question to the Minister of Labour and Industry relates to the industrial democracy report alluded to in this morning's *Advertiser*. What criteria were used to select the 300 companies that were sent the industrial democracy survey, and how did the Government check whether the 39 per cent that responded to the survey was representative of the other 61 per cent that failed to respond? If no such check was made, will the Minister agree that the survey is statistically unsound?

The *Advertiser* report indicated that 300 survey forms were sent out to companies in this State employing more than 50 people. Obviously, many more companies than 300 employ 50 or more people, so therefore some basis must have been used on which to select these 300 companies. Perhaps the Minister could indicate (something he failed to do in the report this morning) whether or not they were companies many of which had already contacted the Unit for Industrial Democracy. It was also reported in the press this morning that only 39 per cent of the companies had actually responded to the survey. That is a minority, and no indication was given in the newspaper as to the views of the other 61 per cent who had failed to respond. That significant majority could almost halve the figures given in support of the Government's so-called policy on industrial democracy.

Also, the newspaper report referred to the fact that 78 per cent of the responding companies had some form of employee participation and the Minister, in a broadcast over the ABC News this morning, referred to the fact that this included safety committees in companies. I have checked the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act and find that under section 31 there is a legal obligation on any company employing more than 10 people to appoint a worker representative to the safety committee if so requested by a worker. Surely the Minister could not seriously include that sort of representation in his survey results if this compulsion, with provision for a \$500 fine, is contained in an existing Act. I challenge the whole validity of the survey which I believe was biased, unrepresentative—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has asked four questions, and is now commenting. I hope he will stop commenting or debating the question.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** Finally, in the newspaper report, no mention was made whether any of the companies had in fact adopted the one-third, one-third, one-third board structure as proposed in the 1975 Australian Labor Party policy.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I am the Minister in charge of industrial democracy and not the Minister of Labour and Industry, who is the Minister assisting me in this area.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** I was not sure whether I should ask—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. Dean Brown:** —the Minister—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member knows that, when the Speaker stands, he must remain quiet. The honourable member has asked his question, and must cease interjecting.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** It is significant that the honourable member goes out and talks about the Liberal

Party's support of worker participation programmes, but when it is reported that a significant number of people in firms in South Australia are involved in worker participation programmes which in fact are fewer than is talked about by the honourable member as being real worker participation, he then says that is biased, improper and strange. The honourable member demonstrates constantly his spleen against any form of involvement by workers in decisions which affect them. The statements that the Liberal Party believes in some form of worker participation are clearly belied by the kind of question just asked, and the statements supporting it, made by the honourable member.

As to the survey, the honourable member must have read in the paper this morning that, in fact, a proper sample was taken of South Australian industry and a very much higher proportion of return occurred than has occurred with any other survey that has been taken by Government departments of industry within the State. A higher level of interest in this area was shown than has happened with any previous survey of industry. The fact is that, given that high return, the reports made by the department were proper and reasonable. As to the honourable member's question whether any of these companies have adopted the one-third, one-third, one-third provision on boards, the answer is clearly "No". That was not a subject of the survey anyway, nor has it in fact been proposed directly by the Government to any companies within South Australia. As has been said time and time again, the Government has stated that it believes that the tendency to involvement of workers with industry eventually may lead to some such arrangement, but the Government has said that it is not an arrangement that will be imposed on industry, and that the whole of the industrial democracy programmes will be developed organically and voluntarily.

In the public sector the Government does intend to provide industrial democracy opportunities in all Government undertakings and enterprises. The experience in those areas will be of use to people in the private sector. It is significant that the number of companies surveyed and the requests that have been made as a result of the survey will overtax the capacity of the present staffing of the Unit for Industrial Democracy to service the requests of private industry for assistance in this area.

#### LIBRARY SERVICES

**Mr. OLSON:** Can the Minister of Community Development say whether, and when, the report of the Library Services Planning Committee will be released? At present uncertainty exists as to the future of library services throughout the State. When the report is furnished will an opportunity be afforded for the interested committees concerned to comment before any recommendations are adopted?

**The Hon. J. C. BANNON:** I thank the honourable member for giving me the opportunity to "break my duck", to use the sort of analogy that the media no doubt expects from me. I have had the responsibility of libraries referred to me only this week. Members will be aware of the initiatives that were announced by the Premier before the last State election and of the subsequent considerable development that has taken place, under the aegis of the Libraries Board and in community library services, over the past 12 months. Part of that process had been the compilation of this important report into the future of libraries and information services, and, in fact, tomorrow the Premier will be releasing that report and discussing some of the action that will arise from it.

**Mrs. CHATTERTON**

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** Can the Premier say in what capacity the wife of the Minister of Agriculture is travelling whilst accompanying the Minister to India? During her absence from South Australia is she receiving normal salary in her capacity as adviser in the Premier's Department? Who is advising the Government on matters of agriculture in the absence of both the Minister and the Premier's own adviser on this subject? The Premier may take the opportunity to explain the whole curious situation surrounding the continued employment of this couple, bearing in mind the reported accumulation of problems in which they have been involved in recent times.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The wife of the Minister of Agriculture has taken leave without pay to accompany her husband to India. She is going without expense to the Government. It is extraordinary how continually from members of the Opposition allegations are made in the course of questions which suggest that, somehow or other, Government moneys are being misused by Ministers, members of their families, or members of their staffs.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.  
*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. Chapman:** No, I am not.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Whyalla is out of order, as is the member for Alexandra. I call them both to order.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** The Premier said quite distinctly a moment ago that members of the Opposition were alleging impropriety about the Minister's wife and her position. That was not so. Nothing was incorporated in my question which allowed that sort of inference.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** I believe it is our prerogative to ask questions about—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member knows that, when the Speaker stands, the honourable member must resume his seat.

**Mr. Wells:** You couldn't read the—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the honourable member for Florey to order. There is no point of order. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** It is not unusual for questions of this kind to be raised without the slightest basis of evidence. The member for Light recently asked a question in the House as to the expenditure by the Government on advertisements on television concerning the Budget, and demanded to know what precedent there was for using public moneys on this score. He had not the slightest evidence to suggest that public moneys had been used on it, nor were they. Repeatedly, members opposite say this sort of thing and make these implications in questions. They are disgraceful.

The position is quite clear. The Minister's wife, on this occasion, has sought leave without pay and has accompanied him appropriately. The Minister's wife is a member of my staff. She assists me very markedly in relation to development policies in the rural sector, and I rely very heavily on her information and assistance.

**Mr. Chapman:** What are you going to do while she is away?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I have already called the honourable member to order, and I now warn him. If he continues in this vein, I shall take the necessary action.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The Minister's wife, immediately after the meeting with the prawn fishermen which succeeded in settling that dispute, very successfully, prepared the material for me to be sent in written form in

relation to the agreement by the prawn fishermen. She has a number of other briefs in this area upon which she is working for me, and she is of invaluable assistance to me. She has a great deal of expertise in this area, and I have the very highest regard for her. In the course of those negotiations, the Australian Fishing Industry Council and the prawn fishermen sent to me a telex specifically dissociating themselves from the attacks made by the Opposition on Mrs. Chatterton and other members of my staff.

**WHYALLA WARDS**

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** Will the Minister of Local Government have his officers make inquiries of the Town Clerk of the Whyalla City Council about whether they can assist in any way in quickly overcoming what appears to be a dilemma regarding the possible redistribution of ward boundary areas within the Whyalla council? One ward in the city council area, namely Stuart ward, would probably have twice as many voters as would any other ward, and it has had that number for some years. There seems to be some dissatisfaction within that ward. Will the Minister have his officers examine this matter and discuss this anomaly with the Town Clerk of Whyalla?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** As I understood the honourable member's question, I think that he indicated that the council was considering the redistribution of its ward boundaries. If that is the case, the submission will need to come to my officers, who will examine it before putting it forward with a recommendation for its adoption. Several criteria are used by the Local Government Office, one of which is that it will examine the population content of the proposed wards to ensure that there is something approximating equal numbers in the wards so that some semblance of one vote one value is obtained. If there is any apparent cooking up of ward boundaries so that there can be a disproportionate number of people in one ward compared to another, I am afraid that the council will not get its recommendation adopted. I agree with the honourable member's suggestion that my officers should discuss the matter with the Town Clerk initially to see whether it can be resolved amicably.

**NEAPTR**

**Mr. WILSON:** Does the Minister of Transport still stand by his statement made in the House that there is no agreement between the Government and the Adelaide City Council to preclude the releasing of the council's Clarke-Casey report into the NEAPTR scheme, in view of the public statement by Councillor Laurie Curtis that such an agreement exists? On 28 September, the member for Fisher asked the Minister in the House whether any agreement or understanding existed 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 Minister answered "No". On the following day, both on radio and on television, Councillor Laurie Curtis stated that there was such an agreement.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** What I said in the House was correct, and I stand by it now, the same as I did when I made it. The council engaged consultants Clarke and Casey. They have presented council with a report. We were given a copy of the report, and, subsequently, the Premier and I and our officers met with the council and

discussed the contents of the report. Council then decided that it was not going to release the report. I understand that, since then, further discussions have been held between the city and the consultants Clarke and Casey. Certainly, continued co-operation has been extended by officers of the Transport Department in an endeavour to try to assist the situation, although I am afraid that at this stage they have reached possibly a point of no return, because they are not getting anywhere fast. The honourable member's question ought to be directed to council, which engaged the consultants and which received their report. Whether council releases it or not is its business, not mine.

**Mr. Wilson:** Do you agree with it?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** I cannot agree—it is the council's business.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

### SUNGLASSES

**The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL:** Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Health whether his colleague has any control over safety standards applying to sunglasses in this State? My question flows from a recent report I read which stated that the Australian National University conducted some tests on sunglasses and found that the makers did not apply the same standards to the safety of the glasses as they did to the design and fixing of prices. It was found that in some cases the glasses did not protect the eyes from ultra-violet rays. In other cases one lens did protect the eye but the other lens did not. As a result of the likely danger to the community that these glasses create, I would appreciate knowing the position in South Australia.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The question raised is certainly an important one, because in South Australia we have long periods of sunny weather. We certainly have a problem with glare on occasion and, if people cannot rely on the sunglasses they have purchased and eye damage results, obviously something needs to be done about the matter. I do not know whether this matter is under the control of the Minister of Health, but I will bring the matter to his attention and see whether I can get more information for the honourable member.

### GREEN TRIANGLE

**Mr. RODDA:** Will the Minister of Community Development say whether he has had time to consider the potential of the area known as the green triangle and whether he has any plans to energise them? Much publicity surrounds this area, and the people who live in it are intensely interested in the development foreshadowed by the Government. As a result of the appointment of a Minister to deal with such matters, the people in the South-East are looking forward to some vigorous action from the young Minister to get matters relating to the green triangle off the ground. I would be pleased to hear the Minister's policy for this area.

**The Hon. J. C. BANNON:** I thank the honourable member for his question. He confronts me with a couple of problems, the first being the problem of answering the question. I have not been on the job for long, so the precise nature of what sort of energy I can provide, and in what direction, to the green triangle or anywhere else has not been fully defined. Secondly, the honourable member

would be aware that, as I am moving into a new portfolio the major components of which have hitherto been handled by my colleagues, obviously considerable co-operative action will be required with my various colleagues. I appreciate the compliment the honourable member pays me in suggesting that I, in some way, will be able to energise or electrify the green triangle, although I am not sure that the Minister for Planning, the Premier or other Ministers who have been extremely active in that area would think that I could make enormous differences there.

The Government is trying to put new and important emphasis onto community development, services and information to provide a greater catalytic action in those areas, and to do that throughout the State. I hope to be actively involved with those precise areas in my responsibility in the green triangle. I point out, however, that that is part of an overall priority and important sphere of action that the Government has adopted over a considerable number of years. In other words, nothing new will be involved in action on the arts or in the development of cultural centre trusts, or whatever in the area about which the honourable member is speaking. The Government has been extremely active over many years in that area, and it will, I hope, continue to give it continued fruitful attention.

### STIRLING NORTH PRIMARY SCHOOL

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Will the Minister of Education again review the building priority of the proposed Stirling North Primary School? As the Minister would be aware, Port Augusta is fast reaching a critical situation in relation to primary school accommodation. Every school is currently over-extended, and each day about 140 children are taken by bus from Stirling North. In addition, children are being taken by bus from West Augusta. The impact in 1979 of the power house construction force cannot be over-emphasised. It is the view of everyone, except, apparently, the Education Department, that a part solution of this problem is the immediate construction of the school at Stirling North.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I am well aware of the honourable member's concern in this matter, and I will certainly bring it again to the attention of my officers, to see whether we can upgrade the priority of this project. I have been involved for some time, in both of the portfolios I have held, in looking at the problems of this area, from the days when I was Minister of Development and we had some concern about the subdivisional part of the area for the population that would be servicing the Redcliff project. I have noted the growth in the area, and I will again draw the matter to the attention of my officers and bring down a reply for the honourable member.

### McNALLY TRAINING CENTRE

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Will the Minister of Community Welfare say whether he intends to meet the staff of the McNally Training Centre this week?

*Members interjecting:*

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

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Mr. Speaker, you want to get—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Glenelg is out of order. I wish he would ask his question.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Does the Minister intend to meet the

staff at McNally this week? If he does, what grading of workers does he intend to interview, how are they to be selected, and what issues are to be discussed? I refer to a press statement reported in the *Advertiser* on Saturday 7 October that the Minister would discuss issues that had been raised within the centre in recent weeks. Among those issues, no doubt, are the assault of the workers and the alleged assaults of some people within the institution.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** As I understand it, I have been asked three questions, and I will endeavour to answer the three of them. The answer to the first question, whether I intend to visit the centre, is "Yes". The answer to the second question raised by the honourable member, as to how persons will be selected, is that there will be no selection. There will be two meetings so that maximum number of staff members will have the opportunity to participate in the discussion. The third question that the honourable member raised was whether it was in relation to the matter contained in the press release.

**Mr. Mathwin:** No, I said "the issues".

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** That is what the press release said—issues raised in the centre in the press in recent weeks. An undesirable situation was arising wherein the conduct of day-to-day operations at McNally Training Centre was being constantly aired in the press, ill advisedly in many cases, by people who should know better. Secondly, it also seemed to me that on occasion the information that was being supplied was totally inaccurate, and I considered that it was not the way in which the affairs of such an important facet of the handling of young offenders in this State ought to be handled. That is, for someone to make an unsupported and unsubstantiated allegation, to have it appear in the press, and then to require the Minister to answer that particular unsubstantiated allegation—

**Mr. Mathwin:** That was an inmate.

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

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The honourable member has just put his finger right on the spot. He said, "That was an inmate." I suggest to the honourable member that, if he reflected on that, he would realise that it is difficult to think of some more vague term associated with a place than "an inmate". There is no real substantive basis for that to be necessarily a person. On occasion reports have appeared which have mentioned "a staff worker", and so on. I think it is an undesirable situation that has arisen through no fault of the Government but because of outside influences of which the honourable member would be well aware—

**Mr. Mathwin:** That was—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is still speaking. I call the honourable member for Glenelg to order.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The handling of young offenders is a difficult area. The staff in all of the departmental centres concerned with this activity are dedicated to their difficult work. The way in which these matters have been raised is not very helpful to them. I thought it was only fair of me to go to the centre and have a face to face discussion with the workers. The honourable member should be able to see the difficulties that would arise if all of them were to be available at one time, although he has made snide reference as to how they would be selected. I have proposed two meetings so that the maximum number can be available to participate in the discussion.

## OPPOSITION STAFF

**Mr. SLATER:** Can the Premier say whether or not Mr. Philip Scanlon, personal secretary to the former Leader of the Opposition in New South Wales, is the same Philip Scanlon who was once the personal aide of the Leader of the Opposition in this House, and whether it is believed that he will be returning to South Australia before the 1981 election to render the same sort of assistance to Mr. Tonkin as he did to Mr. Coleman?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Mr. Philip Scanlon did leave the staff of the Leader of the Opposition here to go to the staff of the Leader of the Opposition in New South Wales. He seems to have recycled his material with similar results. As to his return to South Australia and giving an opportunity to the South Australian populace to absorb more of his lucubrations, I have no information on that topic.

## HERBICIDE 245T

**Mr. WOTTON:** Will the Minister for the Environment confer with the Minister of Health and take the necessary steps to make public the report of the committee set up in South Australia to inquire into the use of the pesticides 24D and 245T? Last Friday the *Advertiser* printed the following article:

### Banfield: No SA move on herbicide 245T

There was no reason to remove the herbicide 245T from the South Australian Register of Chemicals list, the Minister of Health, Mr. Banfield, said yesterday. He was commenting on a newspaper report that 245T was about to be banned in South Australia. He said the report was causing considerable misunderstanding and confusion. A committee had been formed in South Australia recently to enquire into the use of 24D and 245T.

Contrary to the newspaper report, which had stated the committee recommended banning the herbicides, the committee had recommended that present requirements on the sale of the herbicides should continue. The committee had agreed with findings of the National Health and Medical Research Council and the Victorian Department of Health . . . Because of this apparent confusion as a result of an earlier article, it is important that the actual report of the South Australian committee should be made public. It is only proper that the people should know what this committee has said. The Minister would be aware of the importance of this matter in regard to the environment as well as to health. He would also be aware that the Premier of Victoria has asked for a full review of the recent Government-commissioned report that gave the herbicides an all-clear. It is apparent that the South Australian committee has been guided by the findings in that Victorian report.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The honourable member will be pleased to know that it was at my instigation that a committee was first established in this State to look at the problem. As Minister for the Environment, I approached the Minister of Health and asked him to establish the committee, which has now made its report to the Government. Several recommendations were made in that report, which has yet to be examined and decided upon by the Government. When that is done, I see no reason at all why the report should not be made available.

**Mr. Wotton:** Have you any idea when that will be?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I do not know. The Minister of Health will be responsible for making certain submissions to Cabinet arising from the report. When he is able to make those submissions (I do not think he will delay doing that any longer than necessary) the report can be released. I know, as the honourable member has said,

that Mr. Hamer has now said that it is necessary to have an overall inquiry, because he has said that the previous inquiry was confined to the particular area where it was said that some birth deformities had occurred as a result of the use of the insecticides. Whether that is the case or not, I do not know, because I have not seen the Victorian report. However, it would seem to me fairly reasonable and logical for the committee to have looked at the total scene at the time. I shall be pleased to confer with the Minister of Health and let the honourable member know as soon as I can when the Government will consider the recommendations in the report and when it is likely to be released.

#### BANKSIA PARK PRE-SCHOOL

**Mrs. BYRNE:** Will the Minister of Education obtain for me a report and any other relevant information as to the stage reached in the establishment of a new pre-school centre to be built and developed on the south-east corner of the grounds of the Banksia Park Primary School?

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I will get that information for the honourable member.

#### PORT LINCOLN HOSPITAL

**Mr. BLACKER:** Will the Minister of Community Welfare obtain from the Minister of Health a report on the proposed commencement date of the building of the extension to the Port Lincoln hospital? In February this year the Minister of Health announced that tenders would be called in August this year for a redevelopment plan of the Port Lincoln hospital. I take it that that has been done, but I am not sure about it. The Minister also said that work would commence later this year and that it was expected to be completed by May 1980. This proposal was to provide for the building of a new maternity block and the conversion of the existing maternity block into much needed geriatric accommodation. Because of the pressing need for geriatric accommodation on Eyre Peninsula, my constituents would be grateful if the Minister could say whether the proposal is proceeding according to the original plan.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I will refer the matter to my colleague and see whether I can obtain the information desired by the honourable member.

#### SPEECH THERAPISTS

**Mr. ALLISON:** Can the Minister of Education state the current situation regarding the number of speech therapists currently training in South Australia and the possibility of their subsequent appointment to either education or health positions? Some weeks ago the Minister said that only seven graduates had emerged from college as opposed to the 20 who initially entered the college in 1975. That appears to be a high loss rate.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I did see some figures on this a short while ago. It may have been in preparing the answer to that particular Question on Notice, but I did not commit them to memory. I will get the information required. As I recall, the report said that, although there was a shortage, within two years the output of people currently in courses would bring us somewhere near to parity with demand if not with modest over-supply. I will get more specific information for the honourable member and the House.

#### MINISTER OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

**Mr. BECKER:** Can the Minister of Community Development detail the areas of responsibility that will be covered by his portfolio and the estimated budget allocation to him? My question is not dissimilar to that of the member for Victoria. I would like the Minister to be more specific, if he can be at this stage, and to inform the House of the exact areas of responsibility he will undertake.

**The Hon. J. C. BANNON:** I cannot be absolutely specific, because the precise form of the department is still under active consideration. Now that the Minister has been appointed, the next task is to create the department formally (and this has been done) and to call for the appointment of a permanent head of that department. Obviously, the detailed and final administrative arrangements will await the appointment of someone of that nature. Broadly, the core of the department will be community development, that is, responsibility for the community councils of social development which were established by this Government six years ago, which have operated throughout the State for many years, and which were the subject of an inquiry by the committee headed by Dr. Corbett of the Public Service Board. Arising out of that report, the decision to create the new Ministry was made. Obviously, those councils and the responsibility for them will form the core of the department. Precisely how that will operate in the field is something to be determined largely by the Minister of Community Welfare and me. Obviously, there are many interlocking functions, and we expect that we will be working co-operatively in this field in the different aspects of community welfare and community development.

In addition, there are other areas, such as library and information services, regional cultural centre trusts, and arts development generally, particularly as it relates to community arts activities. Also involved is activity in community centres (of which at present there are only two, the Parks and Thebarton Community Centres), and in museums and art galleries because of their relationship to the community. As with libraries, there is considerable local activity developing museum facilities to ensure that those major bodies, such as the State Art Gallery, get out into the community and are not just restricted to the static exhibition site within the city of Adelaide. A number of other areas relating to the general field of arts development will also come across to the new department.

Broadly speaking, those areas that make up the department are going into it because of their relationship to community, local and voluntary activity throughout the State. The final details have not been worked out. Of course, that means that we do not have final budgetary allocations, but the activities being undertaken by the department, with one or two exceptions, come from an existing area of Government activity. One exception is the new youth bureau, a new activity in which some new positions will be created, three having already been called.

It is therefore expected that increases in the total commitment required from the State Budget will be very minimal. In fact, one of the aims of the department is to produce greater value for money in this area by providing, under the one department, a focus and a co-ordinating ability that will enable the various activities spread among Government departments at the moment to be consolidated and thus delivered far more efficiently to the community.

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

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

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**Dr. EASTICK (Light)**: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Dr. EASTICK**: Early this afternoon the Premier, in answering a question by the member for Alexandra, suggested that I had placed on notice an improper question that called into question the integrity of the Government. I presume that the Premier was referring to Question on Notice 513, as follows:

1. Was the paid advertisement screened on Channel 7 at approximately 10.15 p.m. on Thursday 31 August 1978 which featured the Premier in a scathing attack on the Federal Government paid for from State Government funds and, if so, who authorised the expenditure, what criteria was used to accept such advertisement as the "genuine business of the State" and therefore the financial responsibility of the State, what was the cost of the particular screening, and from which account is the cost to be met?

2. Was the paid advertisement aired on Station 5AA mid-afternoon on Friday 1 September 1978 which featured the Premier in a scathing attack on the Federal Government paid for from State Government funds and, if so, who authorised the expenditure, what criteria was used to accept such advertisement as the "genuine business of the State" and therefore the financial responsibility of the State, what was the cost of the particular airing, and from which account is the cost to be met?

3. What has been, or is to be, the total media programme for attack upon the Federal Government's Budget and what are the details as to times of presentation, avenues of presentation, cost of production and payment to individual media outlets?

4. What, if any, precedent exists for the expenditure of taxpayers' funds in this manner?

I also draw the attention of the Premier and of the House to a question that was asked in this place on 17 August this year by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Under the heading "Budget Rally", he asked a question relating to the distribution of anti-Budget material. The Premier replied (page 542 of *Hansard*):

The letter was prepared in my office and sent out from it because I, as Premier of this State, believe that it is vital for the people of South Australia to make their views known publicly to the Federal Government.

In the *Advertiser* of 18 August 1978, under the heading "Dunstan move improper: M.P.", appears the following report:

Mr. Dunstan told the House the letter had been prepared in his office and sent from there. "I believe it is vital for the people of this State to make their views known publicly to the Federal Government," he said.

My question purely and simply was based on a statement by the Premier in this House and given public airing in the *Advertiser*, against the background that a large percentage of the population of this State took the statement of the Premier as indicating that the Government would use State funds for an attack on the Federal Government because of its Budget policy. The Premier's answer this afternoon indicates that no such money was expended. That is a proper answer, if that be the answer, and I have no reason to doubt it. However, I believe that the attack

made on me by the Premier this afternoon served no purpose whatsoever and does little credit to him and his Government.

#### PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### AUSTRALIAN MINERAL DEVELOPMENT LABORATORIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

In Committee.

(Continued from 28 September. Page 1273.)  
Schedule.

Premier, Miscellaneous, \$12 290 000.

**Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition)**: A sum of \$22 500 is proposed for expenses in connection with Adelaide Week in North Malaysia, and actual payments in the previous financial year totalled \$12 066. As I understand it, Adelaide Week in North Malaysia has been cancelled, and notice of that cancellation was given some time ago.

**The Hon. D. A. Dunstan**: Postponed, not cancelled.

**Mr. TONKIN**: It is not going on. As I understand it, the Premier said that it was unlikely to go ahead for at least 12 months. Can the Premier say why the sum of \$22 500 is proposed on this occasion? The expenditure for the full exercise would be considerably more than that, but why is such a sum to be made available now? A sum of \$27 432 was paid last year for expenses in connection with North Malaysia Week in Adelaide. This seems a considerable increase over the amount of \$4 400 voted, and perhaps the Premier can explain why such an increase has occurred.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer)**: The provision for Adelaide Week in North Malaysia covers during this financial year expenditure which had occurred prior to the decision of the Government to defer for 12 months Adelaide Week in North Malaysia, and which occurred during this financial year. It will also cover some planning for the Adelaide Week in North Malaysia in November and December of next year.

**Mr. TONKIN**: Does that expenditure cover fares and necessary expenses of the officers of the South Australian Government who went to North Malaysia to explain to the people there that there was to be no Adelaide Week in North Malaysia this year? The whole subject of the exercise and the South Australian Government's involvement in it has been a matter of analysis and criticism by various members of the community, both here and in North Malaysia. My information from North Malaysia is that the exercise is considered of little value in trade relationships and trade benefits. No-one can doubt that there is a certain cultural value from an interchange with the people of any country, but considerable doubt is being expressed by business leaders here and in North Malaysia whether or not this expenditure is worth while in terms of trade development. It has been said by some people who have visited North Malaysia that the South Australian Government is regarded as a laughing stock because of its continued emphasis on Adelaide Week in North Malaysia as a means of encouraging worthwhile and viable trade

between this State and North Malaysia.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The Leader makes a whole series of assertions without the slightest basis of evidence. If he has evidence from businessmen in North Malaysia, in responsible positions, perhaps he will cite it. I shall be glad to know who they are. Does he suggest that that is the view of the Prime Minister of Malaysia? It is certainly not what has been communicated to me. Does he suggest that is the view of the Chief Ministers of the four North Malaysian States with whom the Prime Minister of Malaysia asked us to co-ordinate? It is not what has been communicated to me. Is it the view of the development corporations of any of the four North Malaysian States? Perhaps the Leader would cite which officers of those corporations have said these things. Is it the view of the Federal Investment Development Agency (FIDA), which is responsible for the approval of joint projects? So far has it regarded South Australia well in this matter that, when FIDA is seeking Australian expertise in the development of any area of Malaysia, it comes to South Australia, and not to the Federal Government. As usual, the Leader says he has been told by unnamed persons various things which he cannot substantiate. It is apiece with what he normally says in this place.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** Regarding the trade links the Premier is trying to establish with North Malaysia, will the Premier give details of the success of the Panelex housing project in Penang? Will he indicate what other major development projects increasing trade between the two countries, and particularly from South Australia to Malaysia, have proceeded to get off the ground? What are now the functions of the various companies set up by the South Australian Government, including Austral-Asia Pty. Ltd, which I think is the one in which the State Government has a 100 per cent shareholding? Are those companies now effectively trading and encouraging development in Malaysia, or has the money invested by the State Government in those ventures so far produced no fruit whatever?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** There are a number of ventures in Malaysia in which we have been involved in joint development with one or other of the development corporations of the North Malaysian States, and with Pernas, which is the Malaysian Government's trading corporation. These are: in Penang, the Panelex housing venture; in Kedah, the Allied Rubber factory, and the development of the Stramit factory; in Penang and Kedah, there is the Barkath fishing co-operative joint venture; and in Malaysia generally FIMA-Mr. Juicy, which is a joint operation with Berri Fruit Juices in the supply of fruit juice concentrate. There is under way a study financed from outside the State of paddy straw beneficiation for stock feed. Those are the major operations so far undertaken.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** Stock feed to be sent to Australia?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Largely for use in the building up of the Malaysian stock industry. The development will involve the possibility of the use from South Australia of equipment for the development of that industry. The studies on this were done by Amdel. In addition, a number of consultancies undertaken by P.C.A. and by P. G. Pak-Poy and Associates have brought work to South Australia over quite a wide area of Malaysia. Those are the basic ventures undertaken so far. Others are under investigation as a result of the recent trip to South Australia of a special trade mission headed by the now Chief Minister of Sarawak. The position in the North Malaysian States has been such that other States of Malaysia are seeking joint operations with South Australia in the same way.

Investments in Austral-Asia Investments Development

(A.I.D.), in which South Australia is a joint shareholder with Pernas and with Penang Development Corporation, are going quite well; in fact, we are getting a reasonable return on our capital. In the South Australian company, in which we hold a majority and not a 100 per cent shareholding, that company within South Australia is doing little trading. The operations were set up as mirror image companies in order to assist in the provision of technology and componentry from South Australia to Malaysia, in developments in a developing country. The major activity has been through the Malaysian company rather than the South Australian one of those mirror image companies. The Malaysian company is going quite satisfactorily.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I will speak to seven items, namely, Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, grants and provisions for the arts, Jam Factory Workshops, South Australian Film Corporation, South Australian Theatre Company, the State Opera of South Australia and production of films by South Australian Film Corporation. However, before I speak to each one of those individually, I want to say something that is relevant to all of them. I well remember, about 12 years ago, the late Sir Glen Pearson saying that the strength of a Minister could be gauged by the way in which he could get money for his departments when the Budget was being prepared. There is no doubt, when one looks at these items, that the Premier has much strength in Cabinet.

**The Hon. D. A. Dunstan:** I am glad to have your accolade.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I am glad that the Premier is glad, and I hope that he will continue to be glad, as I continue to speak. The Premier's Miscellaneous line amounts to \$12 290 000, yet there is no explanation of the detail of these items in the Premier's statement. Here we have lumped together a sum that is greater than the total of nearly half a dozen of the Ministries in the Chamber. Yet, we are to get no explanation of what I regard as the most scandalous waste of money. These items show more clearly than anything else not only the Premier's influence in getting money, no matter how hard up the State may be in other ways, for his pet projects, but also his personal interests and tastes. I believe that this is to the detriment of the State, because we should not, at a time of financial stringency, spend money on luxuries when we cannot afford adequate funds for necessities. How we spend our money is eventually a matter of individual judgment.

All I can say is that my tastes and interests differ from those of the Premier, because I believe that much of this money is wasted and that it comes from a bottomless sink. We are giving more and more to these things every year, and they are all in the red, and there may be no end to this as far as I can see. In my view, the Premier shows a complete lack of judgment, at a time of financial difficulty, in spending money on these things. This debate is the only scrutiny that \$12 290 000 is to get in the accounts of the State. The items to which I have referred do not amount to the total, but that total is \$12 290 000, and all we have had from the Liberal Party is a few piffling questions on detail.

**Mr. Becker:** What about my speech?

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** It passed over my head and the head of everyone else; I have not heard a mention of it. A couple of sentences in the Premier's Financial Statement bear on the stringency of our affairs, and I want members to contrast what he said about unemployment and the unemployment relief scheme with the lavish way in which we are asked to spend our money on the arts, theatre, and opera, and God knows what else in South Australia. I agree with much of what the Premier said about unemployment and the regret he expressed for not being

able to give more money for it. Not having said that we had to prune a number of things, the Premier said:

Nevertheless, other more unpalatable measures have to be taken. I have already announced that the Government will have to restrict its support of the State Unemployment Relief Scheme to a programme of \$7 000 000 this financial year.

What was it before? It ran into at least two figures.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** \$24 000 000.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** \$24 000 000, was it? The Premier continued:

It is a decision which the Government deeply regrets and has found difficult to take.

Have a look at the items to which I have referred. Not only do we not reduce any of them, but there is a substantial increase in every one of them. I will go through them and point out the increase, together with what the Auditor-General has had to say. In my view, this a scandal that should be aired in the House, and I hope that the Liberal Party will support me. For the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, last year actual payments were \$2 137 877; this year it will be increased by another \$200 000, and we are going to vote \$2 358 400. We are all very proud of the Festival Theatre complex, but it is costing us considerable money.

**Mr. Becker:** What about the accumulated losses?

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I will refer to them. The Festival Theatre has not been vested in the trust yet, but I do not necessarily blame the Government for that, because of a dispute with the builder. Page 293 of the Auditor-General's Report shows that the operating deficit for the year was \$3 901 000, an increase of \$1 993 000 over 1977. They had one disaster, *Ned Kelly*, but that accounted for only a \$328 000 loss. Contributions from consolidated revenue towards the trust's operation since its inception total \$11 167 000, of which \$3 627 000 was provided during the past year, at a time not of buoyant revenues, when we were spending the money we got for the country railways, but at a time of great stringency, when there are people out of work, and when a scheme on which we spent \$24 000 000 last year will now be reduced to \$7 000 000. Yet we are spending on the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust an enormous sum, and it is really only for our entertainment. Although we all enjoy it from time to time, it is not something essential to the economy of the State. All indications are that unemployment will be worse next year, not better, yet we are spending money in this way. I think that our priorities are wrong.

**Mr. Evans:** Most of the artists are imported—

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I will come to that in regard to the State Opera; I have had some specific complaints about that. Let us go on to the next item and this, in my view, is even worse, namely, grants and provisions for the arts. Last year we spent a little less than we voted. We spent \$1 676 696, whereas this year we have voted \$1 760 000. No-one can tell from this document on what that money will be spent. One has to dig hard even in the Auditor-General's Report to find it but I found it on page 205.

On page 201 of the Auditor-General's Report, reference is made to "Arts Development Division". I suppose they are the ladies and gentlemen who administer this money. The staff at June 1977 had increased to 10: 12 months earlier the figure was seven. This was at a time that staff ceilings were being pegged, we are told. Turning to page 206 we find that until 30 June 1977 \$1 101 000 had been spent on that line. In the past financial year the amount has increased to \$1 677 000, and it is now to go up even more.

This document shows what this money is being spent on and some of the allocations show an enormous increase. The amount spent on the Adelaide Festival of Arts increased from \$85 000 to \$294 000. We had the festival

during that year, so I do not necessarily reflect on that figure: I saw that the Premier was clutching at that straw to interject. The amount spent on the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra increased from \$90 000 to \$140 000. The amount spent on the Adelaide International Film Festival was about the same. The amount spent on the Arts Council of South Australia Inc. increased from \$264 000 to \$335 000. The amount spent on the Australian Dance Theatre increased from \$161 000 to \$214 000. The amount spent on Carclew Arts Centre increased from \$80 000 to \$153 000. The amount spent on Research Studies (heaven knows what research studies are) increased from \$13 000 to \$59 000.

We come then to the minor grants, some of which, in fact, reduced, but they are still large amounts. The amount spent on music and opera is down from \$82 000 to \$64 000. That is what we are spending our money on under this line, just as though we had plenty of money. We do not have plenty of money. It may be said that spending this money is good for the culture of the State. So it is, but a job is better. I would much rather see everybody employed, or an attempt being made to employ people, than see the money spent in this way. It does provide employment for some artists who give us pleasure, but it is not essential that we do this. In my view (and I do not give a damn what the Premier said) it is far more important to find ordinary jobs for ordinary people than that we should indulge in these extravagances and luxuries.

I move now to a matter that has been dusted and aired a bit—the Jam factory. Last year an amount of \$585 000 was spent by the Jam Factory. This year the amount will be \$620 000, another \$35 000. I have been to the Jam Factory on one occasion, when I was paid the compliment of being asked to open a exhibition. I went there, they were pleasant people, and I had a thoroughly enjoyable evening. I liked some of the work that I saw and thought it was worthwhile, but not at this cost to the people of the State.

I turn to page 359 of this document, which does not seem to have been used much by members so far in this debate. On this page the report mentions the objects of the Jam Factory. Then, at page 361 it states:

Since the association was incorporated in February 1974 grants from Consolidated Revenue for operating and capital purposes, and excesses of expenditure over income, have been as follows:

It then sets out the figures. The total State grants to date amount to \$1 592 000. Excess of expenditure over income amounts to \$1 229 800. This is, in my view, as with other items, quite unnecessary and an extravagance we could well avoid. If it were not for the Premier's personal interest, I do not believe that we would be paying out money like this.

I find it hard to believe that many Cabinet members would be enthusiastic about the Jam Factory or about what it does. I cannot believe that the Minister of Labour and Industry, for example (and I have never discussed the matter with him), would turn cartwheels of enthusiasm about the Jam Factory. The same would apply to many other Ministers.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** I can't imagine him doing any cartwheels.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** We will not go into that. He is a down-to-earth sort of bloke and I do not think, if it were left to him or some of his colleagues, that we would get these extravagances. Sometimes I wonder whether it is not a megalomania of the Premier's that we are spending money like this at the very time that he is saying how dreadful it is that he cannot get enough money from the



Commonwealth for unemployment relief and other purposes.

Let us come now to a matter in which the member for Fisher is interested and in which I have interested myself recently—the South Australian Film Corporation. It does pretty well. I found three separate lines, two under “Miscellaneous” and another under another Minister later on. Last year, the Film Corporation received \$1 886 930. This year, that amount has been reduced to \$1 405 600 on this line. That is not all, however, because over the page an increase in the amount for the production of films from \$666 887 to \$705 000. This, I believe, is a complete and absolute disaster financially. I have received some correspondence about this, and that is what prompted my attention to the matter. I received a letter from a person living at Tranmere in July as follows:

Dear Mr. Millhouse,

Re South Australian Film Corporation.

I am writing to you as a concerned taxpayer and as an experienced film maker for the past 25 years. It is time, I believe, that an inquiry, and an accounting, was made of the work, aims, policy, and cost of not only the South Australian Film Corporation but all film corporations in this country. The Premier need not feel aggrieved that our industry is necessarily being singled out in this respect. The letter continues:

It is my studied opinion that these film corporations are not working in the public interest. I believe that they were conceived out of self-interest, formed from political expediency, and have become an enormous waste of taxpayers' money, not only in the staffing of these corporations, but in the cost of their products, which are not wanted by the public at large. That people are not prepared to pay to see the rash of locally produced “films” would be obvious if the accounts of these corporations were examined and published.

I have had a look at the Auditor-General's Report, and I will turn to that in a moment. The letter continues:

If my information is correct, the only film in the past 10 years to show a profit was a sex spoof called *Alvin Purple*.

**The Hon. D. A. Dunstan:** Nonsense.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** The Premier says “Nonsense”: we will see about that in a moment. The letter continues:

The cinema industry in America and throughout the world is very nearly finished. Only extraordinary productions costing many millions of dollars and using talents far superior to any in this country are capable of literally dragging people away from their television sets. After an independent inquiry has been made into film production in this country, I believe that legislation should be passed whereby all public moneys spent by film corporations must be spent on the production of what people want—television programmes only—in the hope that the standards of our abysmal television fare can be raised.

I pencilled in beside that the two names *Storm Boy* and *Picnic at Hanging Rock*. I replied to the correspondent as follows:

I don't know much about this subject but I was under the impression that such films as *Storm Boy* and *Picnic at Hanging Rock* had been a financial and artistic success. Is this not correct?

I said that I would discuss the matter with him. I received another letter from that person telling me (as the honourable member for Fisher has said) that that is not correct. In a letter dated 9 August that person states:

Many thanks for your reply to my letter regarding film corporations in Australia, and the South Australian Film Corporation in particular. Nothing will be known about film making in this country until direct questions have been answered by facts and figures. It is doubtful indeed whether

the two best “known” films produced by the SAFC in recent years—*Picnic at Hanging Rock* and *Storm Boy*—have been either financial or “artistic” successes. I do believe that *Storm Boy* won some prize in a children's film festival somewhere in Russia—I hope that that is some consolation to the taxpayers of this State who footed the bill. Until we ask for an accounting, we will never know if any of the films made in Australia have recouped anything like their production costs. That may be venomous exaggeration; I do not know. Before the Premier laughs too heartily, we will come soon to what the Auditor-General said about this. The letter continues:

Let's look at how the box office gross of a film is distributed. First, the exhibitor who runs the theatre gets paid in two ways. For a start, he takes out what is known as the “nut” for the theatre to cover his operating costs; salaries, rates and taxes, rents, upkeep, expenses, etc. After taking out this “nut” he is entitled to a percentage of what is left. This is usually 20 per cent.

The amount that is left after this dual process goes to the distributor, who is responsible for the promotion as well as the distribution of the film. He, too, gets two slices of the cake. He takes out any money that he has advanced for advertising, prints, promotion, freight, expenses, and so on. It is estimated that distributors would get up to 30 per cent of the total gross to cover costs. Then, the distributor takes a percentage of what is left. It is universal practice for him to get 25 per cent.

It is easy to see that the exhibitor and the distributor get a very large slice of the cake. Taking good and bad films together, they end up with 80 per cent to 85 per cent of the total box office gross throughout Australia every year. Anything left is supposed to pay the production costs . . . It is because of the way the exhibitors and the distributors take their slices that a film will only go into profit if it packs a lot of people into the theatre over a relatively short period of time. Small audiences over a long period of time just add to the expenses of these two groups until all revenue is consumed.

*Storm Boy* ran for over 12 months in Adelaide. I saw it 10 months before it closed, and I carefully counted the audience at that session. There were 13 adults and a small school group of children, quite possibly there on a concessional basis. That meant that pickings were poor, and there was over 12 months of theatre expenses to be paid for, and extravagant promotional and advertising costs. If a cent got past the exhibitor and the distributor, I'll eat that darn pelican raw! I suppose it cost something like \$300 000 to produce. *Picnic at Hanging Rock* cost \$455 000. Just how much of this money has been recouped? In my own personal opinion *Storm Boy* was so badly made that it embarrassed me to watch it. The British cinema chain refused to show the film at all.

Again, that may be an exaggeration; it is his expression of view. I did not see the film, although I heard good things about it so that may not be right. However, that is a personal view. The letter continues:

Over the past year the South Australian Film Corporation made two films *The Last Wave* and *Weekend of Shadows*. What returns have these films had? They also invested heavily in a film about the life of swimmer Dawn Fraser which seems to have gone very quiet. What has happened to this investment? Quite apart from the money actually spent on making films for little if any return, how much is it costing the taxpayer to keep the mansion in Fullarton Road, and the studio in Norwood, with their great staff of well paid people, and for what real purpose and benefit to the community?

What is this madness that has gripped State and Federal Governments that they have become involved in the most complex of all speculative business—the making of films? Hollywood, with all its know-how and experienced talents from all over the world, and with a huge population to

entertain, can only hope for a success rate of one out of nine films produced. Times have changed; only multi-million dollar spectacular films for world-wide exhibition can succeed against the impact of colour television. I believe that Mr. Don Chipp could raise this question on a national level. The writer then finishes off the letter. Some of that may be personal pique and extravagance; I do not know. However, if one looks at the Auditor-General's Report, one finds that much of it is apparently fairly close to the mark. At page 419, the Auditor-General talks about the Film Corporation. One sees that the net deficit for 1977-78 was \$209 000 (that was certainly an improvement, because in 1976-77 the deficit was \$288 000), taking the corporation's accumulated deficit to \$1 387 000. The Auditor-General goes on to say that distribution and exhibition income have increased by \$330 000 to \$451 000. I turn now to the Auditor-General's comments on page 423 of his report, as follows:

During the year the Treasurer made available \$1 084 000—

I cannot find that item in the Estimates. It may be a typing error, and perhaps it should have been more than that. It was certainly over \$1 000 000—

as grants for capital, operating and other purposes and in addition paid \$667 000 for the production of films for Government departments. Since the formation of the corporation in October 1972 the State Government has provided grants totalling \$3 601 000, as follows.

They are set out. Under the heading "Film production and distribution", one sees:

Although income increased by \$295 000 to \$1 432 000 this was insufficient to recover costs, and an operating deficit of \$193 000 resulted.

It was down from \$310 000. Under the heading "Income", the Auditor-General continues:

Income from short film production was down \$111 000 mainly as a result of the lower average mark-up applied to productions for Government departments.

So Peter did not pay Paul quite so much. I suppose it looked better for the departments, but not so good for the South Australian Film Corporation. The Auditor-General continued as follows:

The increase in income from distribution and exhibition, up \$330 000, was due principally to the successful interstate and overseas release of *Storm Boy*.

The point obvious from that is that, even with that success (of course, as I have said, many people thought that it was a good film), the South Australian Film Corporation is still in the red and, indeed, is going further into the red. When will all that stop? When will the corporation make a profit? Will the Government get any money back from it? This is another of the bottomless sinks into which the Premier is pouring money at a time when it could be better spent on other things.

I turn now to the next item, the South Australian Theatre Company, which was paid \$850 000 last year. This year its allocation will be increased substantially to \$903 400. On page 456 of the Auditor-General's Report under the subheading "Features of the company's accounts", one sees:

The operating deficit was \$1 123 000, an increase of \$207 000; State Government grants were \$856 000, up \$209 000.

It is no doubt a good thing to have a theatre company, because a proportion of the population enjoys going to see productions. However, it is not a big proportion. Under the heading "Patronage", on page 458 of the Auditor-General's Report, we see set out the number of performances, patrons attending, and average patronage. In 1977, there were 340 performances, whereas in 1978 the

figure was down to 282. In 1977, 100 999 patrons attended performances, whereas in 1978 that figure decreased to 93 240. The average patronage (undoubtedly for each performance) was 297 in 1977 compared to 331 in 1978. The Auditor-General continued:

The average cost per head of the operating deficit to patrons attending was \$12.04 (\$9.06 in 1976-77).

At 30 June 1978 the company employed 61 persons, up from 57 in 1977. In addition, 65 actors were employed under contract, an increase from 43 the previous year. Although the Premier will say that I am wrong (it is one judgment against another) these are, in my view, extravagances, and I do not believe that in our situation, which will not improve financially, we can afford to keep on spending these sums of money. Despite this, every year we are spending more and more.

The extra amount does not take care only of inflation: there is an absolute increase in the amount we are spending on these items. I now turn to the State Opera of South Australia. As I said a little while ago, I have had some specific complaints about the State Opera. Last year we gave the State Opera \$505 000 but this year the figure is up to \$585 000. It is the same sorry picture, financially. I refer to pages 481 and 482 of the Auditor-General's Report. The State Opera had an operating deficit of \$625 000, which was covered by grants totalling \$669 000. So, while I said it was the same sorry picture, in fact, on paper, the State Opera ended up with a net surplus of \$44 000, but that surplus arose because of the money that the Government gave the State Opera. One of State Opera's problems was that, because it had not paid any pay-roll tax since February 1973, it had to pay the whole lot last year, thereby giving back some of the money that it had previously been given. We do not know what the State Opera's patronage is, but I will bet that its patronage is a good deal lower than is the patronage of the South Australian Theatre Company.

**The Hon. D. A. Dunstan:** It is not.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I hazarded that guess, and I will be glad to hear the figures from the Premier. Whether the State Opera's patronage is lower or higher than that of the South Australian Theatre Company does not affect the main thrust of my argument, that we are supporting activities that we cannot afford to support at present. The specific complaints that I have had about the State Opera are, first, that it is quite ambitious and apparently is aiming to be a second national opera company, and it should not be; secondly, that it does not use South Australian artists and that almost all of the artists are imported from other States; thirdly, that Mr. Cunningham, the Director, is an absolute dictator and tells the artists and everyone else just what they have to do, and there is much discontent.

Some time ago (I am not sure exactly when) the State Opera presented the *Marriage of Figaro*, and I am told that three guest artists came from overseas to do that production only. There were three new arrivals, two of whom have stayed on as members of the company, and there were four members of the company itself, but they all came from other States and were here on a two-year contract or a three-year contract. There was only one resident South Australian in the production, and that South Australian had only a small part. I am told (I do not know from personal knowledge whether or not this is accurate) that that is typical of the way in which South Australians are being ignored and people from outside South Australia are being brought in. A number of South Australians could be used but are not being used by the State Opera; for example, Gwenyth Annear, Norma Knight, Rae Cocking, Robert Dawe, and Daphne Harris.

It is said that some of these artists are over the hill (over 35 years of age) and cannot be used. One of the things that the State Opera could be doing (and it is in its charter, its special Act) is to train people, but there is no training going on. The only training we have (and it is under some threat at present) is that provided at, I think, Torrens College of Advanced Education or Murray Park College of Advanced Education; I forget which one. However, that training is likely to get the chop if nothing more is done about it.

So, \$585 000 is being allocated for this purpose. I wonder how many jobs could be created under the State Unemployment Relief Scheme with that sum. Of course, in all fairness, it would mean that those employed by the State Opera would be out of a job themselves, but I will bet that far more people would be employed if the money was allocated to unemployment relief than to the State Opera. These are the Premier's personal interests; these are the things he enjoys, along with food, restaurants, and all that sort of thing. That is where the money is going. The Premier does not say one word about these items in his Budget speech; he will say this is because of the traditional way in which the accounts are prepared. Unless one researches these things, they just go through with nothing said at all. I do not know what the Liberals think about this; there is so much "me too-ing" from them, as a rule. Perhaps they will agree with it all, but I certainly do not agree. The Premier often challenges members on this side to say where we would begin cutting down on expenses if taxation was reduced. I respond by referring to the money we spend on ourselves in Parliament and the items to which I have just referred. I have taken this opportunity to set out at some length why I believe these are an extravagance and a waste of money that we cannot afford to waste in South Australia at present.

**Mr. TONKIN:** It is not often that I am in this position, but I should like to express the Opposition's gratitude to the member for Mitcham for so clearly and forcefully supporting the stand we took during the second reading debate, when the honourable member was not present. The proposition that was canvassed in my speech and supported by other Opposition members was basically that blaming the Federal Government for a lack of State funds was hardly likely to be of any comfort to people out of work while State spending continued on projects dear to the Premier's heart. I would have hoped that the member for Mitcham would read some of what was said during the second reading debate by at least one or two members on this side of the Chamber, but apparently the member for Mitcham has not done so. At page 983 of *Hansard* a number of examples are clearly set out. The Opposition has already agreed in principle with everything that the member for Mitcham has referred to this afternoon about spending on particular projects. I cannot allow one matter to pass. I believe that perhaps it would have been even more strongly effective if the member for Mitcham had been here to add the weight of his contribution at the appropriate time—at the second reading stage. I believe it is a disservice to this place that second reading speeches are being made by the honourable member at a time when the Committee should be getting on with examining every line, not just a few of them. During the second reading debate I said:

How can the State Government retain any credibility when it puts projects like those ahead of measures to create employment and stimulate the private sector? It is a disgraceful state of affairs!

Almost all of those projects include projects dear to the Premier's heart. I am not allowed to refer at present to the Monarto Development Commission or to industrial

democracy, but I certainly am allowed to refer to the South Australian Royal Commission inquiring into drugs. I will refer to that later. I believe that the conduct of some of the Royal Commissioners totally exceeds the terms of reference approved.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I point out to the honourable Leader that it is contrary to Standing Orders to reflect on members of a Royal Commission. I ask the honourable gentleman not to do that again.

**Mr. TONKIN:** Nevertheless, to get on with this other business, I point out to the Committee, including the member for Mitcham, that, for instance, we have dealt with the \$16 000 for entertainment, purchase of liquor, and working lunches, the same amount having been provided last year.

**The Hon. D. A. Dunstan:** That is not on this line.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Leader should confine his remarks to the line under discussion, not broaden the debate.

**Mr. TONKIN:** Nevertheless, there are the questions of the Jam Factory and the South Australian Film Corporation, and all these are basically particular projects on which the Premier has set his heart. For that reason, I once again thank the member for Mitcham for the support that he has given this afternoon.

However, I dissociate myself and, I believe, all other Opposition members from the honourable member's personal criticism about artists and their work, and I refer particularly to remarks about various people in the State Opera Company, and, by implication, in some other areas.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I rise on a point of order. The Leader is entirely misrepresenting me. I said those people could be used for the purpose. I did not reflect on them in any way.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I do not uphold the point of order.

**Mr. TONKIN:** The honourable member said quite clearly, in referring to some people, that they were over the hill, and I take that as a gross reflection on their professional ability and dissociate myself entirely from the remark. I support the principle that the Government must confine spending to areas where it can afford to spend. There is much to be said for containing spending and directing it through the proper priorities to where it can do most good in times of financial stringencies. It is no use the Premier blaming the Federal Government for cut-backs in funds for this State when spending on projects that have been mentioned previously is continuing. Finally, I again make the point that I do not support in any way criticism of the kind that has been made by the honourable member for Mitcham against various people associated with the performing arts and other branches of the cultural scene in South Australia.

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** I seek information on the proposal to allocate \$23 000 for the working women's centre. How is the centre administered, to what purpose will the \$23 000 be put, and what priorities has the Government taken into account in allocating \$23 000 to this body when, by comparison, it allocates \$2 000 to the National Council of Women, a long-established body with national and international affiliations, and a mere \$300 to the Status of Women Committee?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** They are very different bodies. The National Council of Women is a co-ordinating body amongst many voluntary women's organisations in the State. Over the years it has been able to raise funds from areas that are largely middle class in base and, consequently, it has some basis of funding of the kind that co-operative organisations in welfare in South Australia have been able to manage for a long time.

That is perfectly proper, but it was established by my Women's Adviser Unit that there were many women in the work force who have been disadvantaged because they have been under-unionised and have not had an effective say in the areas covering the terms and conditions of their employment. That has affected the most underprivileged people, married women, particularly in migrant communities, in the work force. Therefore, it was intended to establish a working women's centre, which will be established at Trades Hall. It will assist women in the work force, encourage them to obtain proper conditions, and give them adequate information regarding their rights. This is a very distinct area of the underprivileged. It was investigated over a period and it has been decided to establish this centre to give information to people in this underprivileged area in the same way as we believe it is necessary to establish the women's switchboard so that we can give to women the information and services that they need in cases where otherwise they would lack that information.

I wish to deal now with some other things that have been said. The member for Mitcham has looked for a new area of populism in order to try to get a headline, or some support, and he seems to be fairly desperate. After the New South Wales election last Saturday, I am not terribly surprised.

**Mr. Venning:** Talk about South Australia.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I am sure the honourable member does not want me to talk about the New South Wales election, and I can understand why. The member for Mitcham has engaged in ockerism in saying that spending money in the area of the arts is undesirable in a community like ours.

**Mr. Venning:** He didn't say that.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** He wanted us to close the Film Corporation, the State Opera, and the State Theatre Company, and to reduce the money available to the Festival Centre and use the money for other purposes. He said quite specifically regarding the State Opera that the people should be sacked and money better used to employ people elsewhere.

**Mr. Millhouse:** I didn't say that specifically.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The honourable member said that, if the money was spent elsewhere, it could be better spent, and, while that would mean that the people in the State Opera would be sacked and lose their employment, the money could be better and more constructively spent elsewhere. If that does not advocate sacking people, I do not know what does.

The honourable member was a mine of misinformation this afternoon. In relation to the State Opera, he attacked Mr. Cunningham as the Director of the State Opera and said he was a dictator. Mr. Cunningham is not the Director of the State Opera; he is the Chairman of the Board of Management. The General Manager is Mr. Ian Campbell, who is not a dictator, either. The honourable member read a letter in which a claim was made of 25 years in the film industry, 25 years of undisclosed providence in that area. That person said that money could not have been made on such a film as *Storm Boy*, which had little success and was not much of a film anyway. The money expended by the South Australian Film Corporation on *Storm Boy* was recovered in one theatre alone in Adelaide. Not only was *Storm Boy* a success here: it has broken all box office records in New Zealand. As for its not being successful in England, it was bought by the BBC as its children's film and shown at Christmas time and at Easter time.

It has had enormous success on Japanese television, prompting a wide publicity campaign, at the expense not of the South Australian Film Corporation but of the

distributors in Japan. It won the award for the children's film in Moscow and was bought by Russian television. Negotiations are under way for its being shown in a number of countries in North Africa. It was shown in Algeria while I was there. It has been an enormous success, so enormous that we expect that success to be followed by the production of *Blue Fin*, another Colin Thiele story which will be premiered in South Australia soon.

*Picnic at Hanging Rock*, it is true, has not as yet adequately penetrated the United States market, but in London it outsold every Hollywood production of the multi-million dollar variety which was being shown contemporaneously in that city. That shows the sort of misinformation that the honourable member has. The honourable member complains that we have had to subsidise the Film Corporation, and so we have. The Australian film industry had to make a breakthrough as against the closing down of Australian film production by American ownership of the distribution chain in this country and the dumping into this country of cheap American films over a period of 30 years.

The South Australian Film Corporation made the breakthrough in establishing a film industry for this country and the employment which it brings. The employment is not merely of the people employed as staff of the South Australian Film Corporation but also of a wide group of people who have the expertise in the areas of technical film production and who have been able to set up here because in this State they can get a run of work, and they are doing it. The surprising thing is that the honourable member gets up and complains about this but when he was a Minister in the Government of South Australia his Leader proclaimed that the support of the then South Australian Government was going to be given to the establishment of a film industry in this State. They did not do it, however. We have done it, and now the honourable member complains.

In a country the size of Australia it is necessary in the early stages, for the first 10 years, of any film organisation to subsidise, and from the outset (it was discussed in this House and it has been discussed many times) I pointed out that we expected that the Film Corporation would not become self-funding for 10 years. Within its first few years, however, it has had success far greater than we expected for it. It has led to Liberal Governments elsewhere in Australia seeking to copy what we have done here in South Australia. The honourable member carefully lumps together the various amounts for the Film Corporation. He is taking the production of Government films; Government films used to be produced in South Australia previously, and they were purchased from the private sector. A lump sum did not appear in the Budget for them, because they were put in under various Government departments.

When we established the Film Corporation, as a necessary part of its establishment we provided a lump sum each year for the purchase of films from the Film Corporation, and it was said that would escalate at the rate at which the departmental estimates normally escalated every year; and within that budgetary line the various departments would have to apply for the films which would be made available to them. Many of the films have proved invaluable. They are necessary in many cases for publicity or for training purposes and they are extremely useful to Government. In addition to that, of course, the Film Corporation runs the film library in South Australia, which previously was a most unsuccessful operation and which is now a howling success. It gives great service to the people of South Australia, but of course it has to be paid

for directly by Government just as library services have to be paid for directly by Government. If books are to be provided upon the basis of Government expenditure, so are films, which are an associated resource.

The honourable member then refers to the Festival Centre, the subsidised statutory companies, and the Australian Dance Theatre. The Australian Dance Theatre is a joint operation: it is not funded by the South Australian Government alone; it is funded jointly by the South Australian and Victorian Governments. Its home is in South Australia but it tours both States and provides a service in both areas. Although that is an extremely successful operation, it still has, since its reorganisation, some audience building to do, but it is an essential part of any civilised community.

**Mr. Millhouse:** That's a euphemism I have not heard before—audience building.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I will now turn to audience building, because the honourable member has said that the State Opera has poor audiences. That is not true. Many of its performances, now that it has built, through audience building, a subscription audience, have been sell-outs. It is an extremely successful operation, the most successful—

**Mr. Millhouse:** Better than the theatre company?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** It has built a better audience base. Then the honourable member looks only at the audiences in the theatre and equates the expenditure in the total area as against the audience in the theatre. Each one of these operations has an extension service and a wide education service for South Australia. Many of the activities of the State Theatre Company are in relation to its theatre-in-education programme, which is absolutely invaluable in the educative process within the State.

The honourable member reflects upon the South Australian Council for the Arts. The money spent in the South Australian Council for the Arts is to provide, as has been properly demanded by the people in the country areas of South Australia, touring services to the country areas. Those services are widely appreciated, and they are certainly demanded. They have led to the demands for the creation of the Regional Cultural Centre Trusts, and those trusts are widely supported.

The honourable member suggests that, in any time of financial stringency, we should sack the people involved in these operations and close them up until economic times are a bit more buoyant. That would be an absurd operation. He then reflects that South Australia is spending extravagantly in these areas. If we contrast what is spent in this community in these areas with what is spent in the developed countries of Europe, it can be seen that we underspend every one of them by a long way. We certainly underspend the communist countries but we also underspend France, Italy, Austria, Germany, Holland, Denmark, Sweden and the United Kingdom by a marked degree.

Mannheim, which is an industrial town in West Germany, about less than half the size of Adelaide, has an entertainment centre as large as our Festival Centre and it has its own fully supported opera company, orchestra, ballet and theatre company, and per head of population the State pays a very much higher amount than does South Australia.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Do you think we ought to put up the amounts then?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** No, I do not, but I do not believe that the amounts we are spending are either extravagant or unconscionable and, in addition, I do not believe that they are unsupported by the populace, either, because the polls that have been taken in South Australia

show that a very high degree of credit indeed is given to the Government of South Australia by people, including those who have been mistaken enough to vote for the honourable member in the past, for its work in this area, of which people are proud, and deservedly so.

In relation to the expenditure in these areas, there is a special Government committee, a committee of financial oversight, which examines very closely the budgets of each one of the State-operated arts organisations. The budgets are gone through with a fine tooth comb. I believe that they are economic and effective operations, and I do not accept the strictures that the honourable member has offered upon this matter, and I do not believe that many members of the public do, either. The honourable member has just seen an area that he thinks he can get a headline about, so he has got up and sounded off, obviously without having done his homework.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I think I need say little about the comments of the Leader of the Opposition. All I can do is apologise to him. His splendid speech, and those of his members who supported him on this general theme, I am afraid passed right over my head, and I saw no mention of them. I am afraid I did not bother to sit through them all, but I saw no mention of them in the newspapers, either, and if I covered the same ground I am sorry for that, but this is a debate in which we are able to raise all sorts of matters and, of course, this is the opportunity to get a reply from the Minister responsible for the particular item. We have now had from the Premier just the sort of reply I expected from him, and it merely illustrated further the point I had made, that is, that these are the areas of activity in which he is particularly interested and which he will defend by hook or by crook. Some of the things that he said about my remarks, of course, were twisted and coloured by his own prejudices, and I do not propose to go into every one of them. I would have thought that, talking of the Film Corporation, I was probably a dolt and an idiot, if it were not that, despite all that he has said about the magnificent successes, the Film Corporation were not virtually bankrupt. I do not know what the Premier thinks of the Auditor-General, or whether he thinks that the figures here are wrong, but let me go a bit further than I did before just in answer on this particular item to him. We find on page 4 in the summary of references to special comments that, in the case of the South Australian Film Corporation, liabilities exceed assets. Looking at page 424, we find:

With the transfer of the deficit for the year, \$209 000, the accumulated deficit amounted to \$1 387 000 and exceeded the combined balances of capital grants and provisions for long service and annual leave by \$246 000, which represented the excess of liabilities over assets.

Then under "Current liabilities", we find:

Advance payments on short films in progress—When undertaking the production of short films for Government departments and other bodies, the corporation generally required advance payments from clients. At the end of the year advances received from clients for short film productions in progress amounted to \$971 000 and exceeded the value of short film productions in progress, \$376 000, by \$595 000.

I take it, unless I have completely misread that, that in fact it has got money for work that is not to be done, but certainly liabilities exceed assets of the South Australian Film Corporation. It does not matter how successful *Storm Boy*, *Picnic at Hanging Rock*, *Blue Fin* or whatever else has been, the cold hard fact is that the Film Corporation has been, and must continue to be, supported by the Government. In my view, despite all that has been said, it is not a justifiable operation. The Premier can ridicule me

if he likes, as he has tried to do this afternoon, not for the first time in our political careers, but I stand by what I said. If I am an ocker, that is bad luck, but I do have some concern, which I would translate into action for those who are unemployed and seeking work and for whom the Premier says he has not got enough money.

I come now to the item "Advisory Council for Inter-governmental Relations", on which we are going to spend \$21 170. I can find no other reference to this council. As I understand it, it is a body that has been set up between the States, or with the Commonwealth as well, to try to get some common understanding. I know nothing about it apart from that. I do not know whether members of the Liberal Party or the Country Party are better informed on this than I am, but I would like to know what the Council for Inter-governmental Relations consists of, who is on it, where it operates, how it operates and how our money is to be spent.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The Council for Inter-governmental Relations is a body that was set up after the 1975 Federal elections as a result of an election promise by the Federal Liberal Government. It consists of members of the Federal Parliament, representation from the State Parliament—

**Mr. Millhouse:** Who represents us?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The Chief Secretary represents us. It has local government representatives, and it deals with matters which are referred to it from Premiers' Conference involving inter-governmental relations between the tiers of government.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Has much been referred to it?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Not a very great deal but some work has been done, and it has its office in Hobart.

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** I refer again to the Working Women's Centre. I certainly acknowledge that working women, particularly those in low-paid occupations, and migrant women, have been exploited and neglected and need advice and information, but I would have thought that such a centre would gain from being seen not to have any political affiliation. Therefore, I see an immediate disadvantage for such a centre to be housed in Trades Hall. But, that aside, I ask who administers the centre. Is the \$23 000 that has been allocated the salary of one person or more than one person in charge of the centre; and, if the money allocated does not go entirely towards salaries, to what other use if the money put?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I have not got that detail with me, but I will get it for the honourable member.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** I refer to the line relating to payments to industries. First, I draw attention to the fact that \$451 000 was allocated last year, and this came under the Government's decentralisation policy. I am sure all members will recall how the Premier, with a great deal of gusto and publicity, announced his so-called decentralisation incentives that included, amongst other things, a 5 per cent or the complete rebate of pay-roll tax if the industry happened to be decentralised. On that occasion the Opposition strongly criticised the policy adopted by the Government, not because it had adopted a scheme such as a pay-roll tax rebate but because the Government in doing so had placed restrictions upon the allocation of that money.

A list of criteria was given which any company had to meet before there was any chance of getting an allocation under the decentralisation grants. Although this Parliament allocated \$451 000, only \$171 000 was spent. Despite his earlier defence of the scheme, the Premier has admitted that it has failed, and he has decided to adopt a different strategy.

The new strategy is the South Australian establishment

payments scheme, whereby companies that are about to expand into a totally new area or that are about to establish operations in the State for the first time are able to get a grant of up to \$375 000 to assist their development. The individual allocations to the companies vary, depending on where the company tries to set up operations. If it is in the so-called growth centres, it is \$375 000; in a major service centre, such as Barmera, Berri, Wallaroo, or Waikerie, it is \$325 000; in the Adelaide metropolitan area, it is \$315 000.

The allocation of \$1 900 000 provided under this line is quite inadequate to have any significant effect upon the creation of new job opportunities in South Australia. A recent survey by the *Bulletin* revealed that South Australia had firm mining and manufacturing projects valued at only \$121 000 000, compared with a national figure of \$5 040 000 000. To ensure that this State, on a per capita basis, had the same sort of development expenditure as had the other States, we would need to increase that rather miserly \$121 000 000 by a further \$333 000 000; in other words, we would need to quadruple the amount.

The Premier has allocated \$1 900 000, suggesting that this might significantly increase employment opportunities in South Australia, but the allocation would need to be about \$330 000 000 just to bring South Australia on to a per capita basis equal with that of other States.

In the propaganda sheet put out to support this allocation of \$1 900 000, the Government has developed a large number of rather restrictive criteria which must be met before any grant or loan can be made to any individual company. I have grave doubts about whether this scheme will not have exactly the same failings as the previous decentralisation scheme, the possible exception being that it may assist companies developing in Adelaide.

When the scheme was first announced by the Government (the Deputy Premier made the announcement), it was stated that in the current financial year \$2 000 000 was being allocated. The Budget line shows only \$1 900 000. I understand that the State Government has existing commitments in pay-roll tax rebates to companies already established here, such as the Fletcher Jones organisation in the South-East, and that those rebates are already included in the \$1 900 000. If they are not, I am sure the Premier could say where they are included. If we allow for pay-roll tax rebates at a figure similar to that for last year, \$170 000, we see that the total allocation under the new payment scheme is more like \$1 700 000, and certainly not the \$2 000 000 claimed by the Deputy Premier. Perhaps the Premier can say why the Deputy Premier mentioned \$2 000 000 when the figure is more nearly \$1 700 000 or \$1 800 000.

Can the Premier say whether any Federal money is being received and handed out by the State Government as decentralisation grants? Recently, the Federal Government adopted a scheme enabling decentralised industries to receive Federal Government assistance to establish in specific areas. On previous occasions, the State Government has taken Federal moneys and has been only too willing to include them in its lump sum allocations when boasting to the South Australian public, but when we get down to the facts we find that those moneys have been excluded. A classic example is the way in which it is taking Federal Government allocations under the "sweet pea" scheme and handing out the money under the State Unemployment Relief Scheme. It has already imposed a condition that any body applying for funds under SURS must be eligible for the "sweet pea" payment. Here is a classic example. Looking at the Budget line for SURS, we see an allocation of \$4 700 000, but the Premier says he is spending \$7 000 000. Will he say whether the announce-

ment of \$2 000 000 for decentralisation and other industrial incentives included an allocation from the Federal Government under the new decentralisation grants?

I have added up the various lines under which grants have been made for the arts, for films, through the South Australian Film Corporation, and for the cultural activities of the State. I have excluded specific lines where money was being allocated to the Film Corporation to produce Government films; I thought that was an unfair inclusion. The total figure was \$10 400 000. I went through the Budget lines, here and elsewhere, and added up all the grants for industrial development, industrial research, and feasibility studies that might lead to increased employment in this State; the total figure is a mere \$2 800 000. I highlight the difference between the \$10 400 000 for the arts and cultural activities and \$2 800 000 for industrial development. Perhaps that is why this State has had the highest rise in unemployment of any State in Australia in the last 12 months.

The Government's policy of trying to attract new industry to this State has failed in the past and is likely to fail again. I am concerned that the strategy is wrong. The Government should be turning its attention to ensuring existing employment in this State, as well as ensuring that existing industry is viable and not moving out of the State. New industries will be attracted by any viable manufacturing industrial base, but that does not exist in this State at present, and that is why we do not have the industrial development the Premier so dearly would like.

The Premier needs to review his industrial and employment strategy. It is disappointing that the State Government, despite South Australia's having the highest unemployment of any Australian State, has no new strategy in this Budget to secure our employment base. We are well and truly higher, in terms of unemployment, than is the next nearest State, Tasmania, and there is every indication that South Australia is moving further above the national average. Over 12 months ago, we had the second lowest unemployment in Australia; we now have the highest. We have the highest youth unemployment of any State—a very poor record—and yet the Government, in this entire Budget involving an expenditure of more than \$1 000 000 000, can come up with only \$2 400 000 for industrial development. That is not good enough.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The honourable member has suggested that either in the \$7 000 000 being spent for the unemployment relief scheme or in this line we are spending moneys received from the Commonwealth Government. That is quite untrue. It is not the case in either matter. I do not recollect the statement by the Deputy Premier concerning the expenditure of \$2 000 000, and I should like to know the circumstances and the context in which the comment was uttered.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** He said it on television.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I am so used to the honourable member's misquoting, quoting out of context, and distorting, that I would rely upon him for absolutely nothing in that regard.

Under this line, while it is true that \$171 000 was spent last year, the applications processed towards the end of the year had risen significantly and, in consequence, the committed funds under the old pay-roll tax incentive scheme exceeded \$300 000, and there are applications in hand in respect of another \$126 000.

**Mr. Tonkin:** Will they still proceed?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Yes. That will leave \$1 400 000 provided this year for a part of the year in respect of the Establishment Grants Scheme. We expect in a full year, of course, that that will be \$2 000 000 and

more, but for the remainder of this year that was the estimate of what we would be likely to achieve, given the fact that there will have to be time for processing and that most of the new applications will be applicable for only part of the year. We have already had a significant number of applications in this area. If, of course, we have to go into excess in that line it will be possible for us to do that. We will certainly meet all the requirements of industry in this area.

The honourable member then cited a survey reported in the *Bulletin*. Those figures do not accord with the figures which were released recently by Mr. Lynch, the Federal Minister in this area, and which pointed to South Australia's having the highest of the three industrial States' prospects in relation to the establishment of additional manufacturing industry. He then suggested that the way in which we should establish incentives in South Australia was for the State Government to meet the whole cost, including the total investment, of any new industry within the State, apparently as a State grant. I have not come across any Liberal Government in Australia, and particularly not the Federal Government, that has gone along with a policy of that kind.

**Mr. EVANS:** Will the Premier say, first, where I can find reference to the Wayville project? Does it come under item 4072 referring to the consultants involved in the Small Business Advisory Unit?

**The Hon. D. A. Dunstan:** I think the CESE project is under the Premier's Department consultancy line.

**Mr. EVANS:** Secondly, the Jam Factory concerns me, as it concerns the member for Mitcham. I think that it is in many ways propped up by the Government. Even though some good work may come from that venture, we do not get full value for our money. What concerns me is the Government's secrecy that is evident when one tries to ascertain how much is spent in any particular area and how much is paid for any particular item. I recently asked the Premier about \$4 557 being spent on 67 items. I had been told that this purchase involved the museum, and I was subsequently told that it involved the Art Gallery. I then asked what the items were and what was spent on each of them. All I received in reply was details of the departments which had bought items from the gallery.

I accept that it would have been difficult to track all the items that I asked about. However, after I had said that I thought \$2 500 was a lot of money to pay for one teapot and I would like to know whether that item was involved, the Minister could have at least disclosed the main items in question. What really concerned me was the latter part of the Premier's reply:

I do not intend to list each item separately, and its cost, as it may be embarrassing to recipients of official gifts from the State to publicise the information.

Out of the \$5 884-62 given away by 11 departments, the Premier's Department gave away \$4 102 worth of items bought from the Jam Factory. It is not the Premier making the gift. He is making the gift on behalf of the people of South Australia, and surely the donors of a gift have a right to know how much that gift is costing them. I am not asking to whom the gift is made, but surely there is nothing wrong if the person concerned happens to read a press report stating that a certain amount of taxpayers' money was spent on a token of appreciation which he may have received from the Premier for services rendered to the State, for some benefit he may have brought to the State, or in recognition of a visit he had made to the State. The Premier refuses to disclose that information. If we are going to spend \$600 000 a year on the Jam Factory, there should be no secrecy about that place at all, but there is secrecy in this instance.

Under "Ethnic Organisations" (item 3024) \$40 000 is allocated for 1978-79, and I take it that F.I.L.E.F., an Italian-based organisation situated at Ebor Avenue, Mile End, is included in that allocation. The Premier told me, in a reply on 26 September this year, that \$6 500 had been given to that group for 1978. I asked the Premier the following question:

How many of the persons involved in F.I.L.E.F. are known by the Government to be active Communists, and what are their names?

The Premier answered:

The Government has no such knowledge.

That may have been a reasonable reply because the Government as a whole may have no knowledge, but I am sure that some members of the Government know that people in that organisation are active Communists.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. McRae):** I doubt very much whether the political affiliations of these people have much to do with this line. Even applying the greatest generosity on that, I am sure the knowledge of some members of the Government has nothing to do with it. The honourable member should bear that in mind.

**Mr. EVANS:** I respect the point you make, Sir, but I asked a Question on Notice to which the Premier gave me an answer which I do not believe is 100 per cent accurate. We are going to vote money to this organisation again, and we have the right to know the facts. I have nothing against a person being a Communist if he so wishes, but Government money is being used for a political front, and I believe that that is an improper use of that money. The organisation at Ebor Avenue, Mile End, also runs a child-minding centre of a type. I asked the Premier the following question:

What are the aims and objectives of F.I.L.E.F.?

The Premier, in reply, cautiously referred to the "stated aims". Members of the Italian community have been to see me about this matter, and they are concerned that this Italian group, which is Communist-based, is working as a political and not a community organisation. We are voting money for a political organisation to receive help through the Premier's Department.

Concerning the Port Pirie and Whyalla Regional Cultural Centre Trusts, although \$40 000 was voted to each organisation last year, only \$3 050 was actually spent by each trust, and no amount is allocated to either organisation for this financial year. Were the projects completed with the \$3 050 expenditure, respectively, or have they been dropped?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** First, the Jam Factory workshops were established on the basis of three different aims. The first was that by the provision of craftsmen of world standard in South Australia we could improve the general level of craft performance in this State. If we are to establish widely based craft industries, it will require some years of work and, in those circumstances, it is essential for us at the outset to establish the standards. This was a strong recommendation by James Noel White, who was sent to South Australia on a British Council grant to advise us on this topic. He said we should delay the provision of wholesaling operations for crafts in South Australia because the level of crafts in the State was not good enough, and that they must be brought to an adequate standard by the presence of people here of world standard who could then set the standard that others were to reach.

The Jam Factory workshops are there not merely to effect work done within the workshop but also in the wider craft community in South Australia. We spend much money in South Australia providing the basis of craft work through the Further Education Department throughout the State. The improvement in the craft standard that has

resulted from the work of the Jam Factory is marked. We are steadily getting to the stage where we have products which we can reasonably market and which can be marketed outside the State.

Secondly, it provides a training base for people who have had some training elsewhere and who can work with master craftsmen. This requires a subsidy of the master craftsmen in respect of the training activity. Thirdly, it seeks to provide a market for the output. However, the establishment of a marketing operation in such a place is a long-term and fairly difficult matter because, in what is a workshop plus a teaching situation, we have to develop a basis of production in which a production run can be maintained and orders can be fulfilled over a long period.

One of the early problems experienced in the Jam Factory was that marketing operations were attempted without it being possible to provide either the back-up in marketing services (packaging, forwarding, invoicing and the like) or a sufficient production run to ensure that, where orders were placed, they could be met over a period. In consequence we then had to undertake the establishment of a proper marketing operation. All of those things will take some time, but we are moving steadily toward improvement in this area, and I believe that it will have long-term benefits for the State.

We have established a specific working party on the marketing and design collaborative, which was recommended in the Hackett-Lemercier report and which we believe is necessary not only for the craft industry but also for industry generally in South Australia. I hope that its report will assist us in furthering this operation.

I do not propose to list gifts to distinguished visitors to this State in such a way as to disclose their price, any more than I am willing to say how much was the cost of what each person ate. It is demeaning and it is not a proper operation. I take responsibility for the amount set forth, and I believe that it is proper.

The honourable member then raised the question of grants to ethnic groups, and protested specifically about a grant made to F.I.L.E.F. As far as the State Government is aware, this is a proper community-aid organisation, and we have no evidence to show that it is operating as a political Party. I am told that the Liberal Government in Victoria gave \$6 000 to F.I.L.E.F., and I believe that the Federal Government has also given about \$5 000 to it. I may have been misinformed, but that is my information at the moment: I will check it. So far as we have any information, we believe that it is a proper community-aid organisation, and we have no details that would lead us to any other conclusion. The honourable member makes allegations about Communist Party activity and involvement. We have no information upon which to judge of that. If the honourable member has specific allegations, he should make them, but I hope that he will take responsibility for them outside this House as well as saying it in here.

**Mr. BECKER:** I point out to the member for Mitcham that on page 1057 of *Hansard* (20 September 1978) during the Budget debate, in referring to the Festival Centre Trust and the South Australian Theatre Company, I stated:

The Premier has never told the people of South Australia that he will tax them at a rate higher than the rate of inflation. He has never explained the reason for it, except that he has created the problems that he cannot finance. I believe that this has occurred.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! Just so that the Chair is clear, to what debate is the honourable member referring?

**Mr. Millhouse:** He's saying that I should have been here



to hear what he said.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Is the honourable member referring to his second reading speech in the debate on this Bill?

**Mr. BECKER:** Yes. I believe that the Government has created and financed certain projects that it is now finding extreme difficulty to fund. In his report the Auditor-General stated:

The Corporation of the City of Adelaide was responsible for the construction of the Festival Theatre which was officially opened in June 1973. The theatre has still not been vested in the trust because the statutory arrangements required prior to vesting cannot be concluded until outstanding disputes with the builder have been settled. It is not known when the questions at issue will be determined.

I did seek information earlier this year in relation to this problem, and I am surprised that at 30 June 1978 settlement still has not been reached. As the centre was opened in 1973, it is in the interests of the Government, the trust, and the Adelaide City Council to resolve the problem.

**Mr. Millhouse:** If it's a building dispute, it could go on for a very long time.

**Mr. BECKER:** I believe that this matter should be settled and that the Government should take an active role in the settlement. It is a shame to realise that the Festival Theatre is not properly vested in the Festival Centre Trust. I am also concerned that the cost of the organ has now escalated to \$100 000 more than the originally estimated cost of \$350 000, and that there has been a tremendous short-fall in the public contribution. I hope that no taxpayers' money will be used to complete paying for the organ but that the trust will undertake considerable fundraising projects and appeals.

Regarding the production *Ned Kelly*, it is interesting to note that outside investments of \$117 000 will have been lost to the shareholders. Was the opening night party paid for out of the total cost of \$328 000 or was it paid for by shareholders?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Regarding the vesting of the land, there is no real difficulty. It is proper that the building dispute be cleared up before the final act takes place. For all practical purposes the land is in the hands of the trust, is administered by it, and the trust is under no disability in respect of it. I do not know why the honourable member is so fussed.

**Mr. Becker:** The final settlement concerns me.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** As soon as we can get a settlement in the building dispute, I shall be pleased but, as the member for Mitcham has said, building disputes can be of long standing. The Government has tried to see some finality reached in this matter, but it is certainly not going to give taxpayers' money away in reaching a finality. We will stand on the rights we believe that the trust has in the matter, and it will be settled as soon as we are able to get to a reasonable basis of settlement. In the meantime, the trust is under no disability by the present legal situation. Originally, the land was vested in the Adelaide City Council, which was the constructing authority but did not have the money or expertise to construct or operate the project. I arranged with the council that a trust would be created to complete and operate the Festival Centre. With council's agreement, that was done, and the legislation passed through the House.

I believe that the Festival Centre has done considerable work in trying to raise money for the organ appeal. Unfortunately, the appeal came at a time when economic stringency was such that it was difficult to raise money for appeals in South Australia.

**Mr. Millhouse:** It wasn't very well organised; something

went wrong in the beginning.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I saw some of the organisation, and I believe that it was very good. Certainly, the Chairman of the trust spent an enormous amount of time in seeking contributions here and in other States. I believe that as much as possible has been done in raising money of that kind. The Festival Centre will have to take from its own resources the money to meet the short-fall.

The production *Ned Kelly* was an entrepreneurial exercise by the Festival Centre Trust. It was, unfortunately, the least successful of any of the entrepreneurial activities the trust has undertaken.

**Mr. Wotton:** It was a complete disaster, wasn't it?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** It was not a complete disaster, but it was not as good as it should have been: it folded in Sydney. It is essential that the trust undertake entrepreneurial activity from time to time, and some of it has been very successful. Without that entrepreneurial activity, it is not possible to get the maximum audiences into the Festival Centre: that is, in order to fill booking dates, some entrepreneurial activity has to be undertaken by the trust. Previously its activity in promoting Gilbert and Sullivan has been extremely successful, and it has had sell-out performances. We were widely advised that *Ned Kelly* was likely to be a "goer" but, inevitably, an entrepreneur in this area must take some risks.

**Dr. Eastick:** It has its pluses or minuses.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** They have pluses or minuses. J.C. Williamson and Ken Brodziak, its Managing Director, would testify to that. I recall going to Ken Brodziak's production of *Pippin*, which it was hoped would make very good money, but it did not. It is inevitable that some losses occur in this area. As to the payment for the opening night party, I was not present, I do not know about it, but I will inquire for the honourable member.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** Regarding payments to industry, I recently attended a dinner at Fernilee Lodge to farewell Mr. Colin Branson as General Manager of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, at which the Premier addressed the audience of businessmen. He boasted that his Government contributed more per capita to industry than did any other State Government.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** He must have been skiting.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** That is what it sounded like. I always question him when he skites like that and when I check on the details. A recent edition of *Journal of Industry and Commerce*, dated March 1978, lists the entire allocations by State Governments and State Government expenditure on assistance to industry during the period 1972 to June 1976 (the latest figures available). It is interesting to see the various areas where State Governments have allocated their finance. South Australia allocates money for factories through the Housing Trust, and guarantees loans to industry. The Victorian Government allocated more than \$11 000 000 during 1975-76 as rebates on pay-roll tax. New South Wales and Victoria heavily subsidised freight costs to industry. Having done some calculations for the latest year for which a complete set of figures is available, namely, 1975-76, I note that South Australia had only 7.12 per cent of the national total. On a per capita basis, this State requires about 9.2 or 9.3 per cent to be able to boast that we are even equal with the national figure. If we are to believe the Premier's claim, we would need to be well above that. However, South Australia is well below the national average, and certainly does not have the best record of any Australian State for assistance to industry.

Regarding the Small Business Advisory Unit, the Premier has boasted for some time about the number of

claims made to, and the people who visit, the unit, and how successful it has been.

**Mr. Millhouse:** It doesn't look like that from the figures, does it?

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** I am coming to that. I have seen the unit and the work that it does. What I am about to say is not a reflection on the people in the unit, because this is a universal problem throughout Australia: small businesses are not willing to go to Governments to seek advice. Perhaps this is because of the way in which assistance is offered by Governments in Australia. However, it is fair to say that Governments have been totally unsuccessful in helping small businesses. That is a shame, because such businesses account for about 48 per cent of employment in Australia, and make up a significant part of our trade within and outside the State.

I ask the Premier why, in the past financial year, only \$38 000 of the total allocation of \$250 000 for outside consultants was taken up by small businesses. Does this reflect the complete lack of confidence that small businesses have in this type of aid, or would it be better for the State Government to offer other forms of assistance? I suggest that a far more suitable one, which would cost considerably more than this form of consultancy, would be further to lift the base exemption on pay-roll tax well above the present level. Although we have heard the Premier's recent announcements on this matter, this is the sort of assistance that small businesses would appreciate.

Most small businesses have neither the time nor the financial resources to worry about seeing Government agents and employing outside consultants, even if the costs were partly subsidised by the Government in an attempt to help them. Most small businesses do not think at that type of level. They are small and want the least amount of interference by government. These businesses do not have the confidence or, at times, the expertise to enable them to seek outside advice. The obvious solution to their problems is invariably for them to get that outside expertise, although obviously this opportunity is not being taken up.

Is the Government reviewing its policy on how to give this advice to small businesses and, as only \$38 000 was spent last year, why has the Premier allocated \$200 000 for this financial year? Also, does he expect that that full sum will be granted to businesses this financial year?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The branch was not fully operational for all of 1977-78 in setting up the consultancy scheme. As a result, we had a lower expenditure than was expected. However, with applications coming in at the present rate, it is expected that the \$200 000 figure will be reached for all of this financial year. Assistance to small businesses rendered by the Small Business Bureau in South Australia is more extensive than that of any Government small business operation in Australia and, indeed, South Australia has been admired at the Ministers' conferences for the extent to which we have worked the operation.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** The University of New England's Small Business Unit, with Meredith as professor, has been outstanding and has gained national recognition.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I am talking about Government departments' small business bureaux, which have been referred to at Ministers' conferences. Outside consultancies are not necessarily an indication of the use being made of the Small Business Bureau by businesses, because the provision of outside consultancies is only a small part of the bureau's work. Much work is done directly by the officers themselves in advising small businesses on procedures, ways in which they may get additional assistance, and so on. As much of this work is

done directly by the officers, it is not necessary in many cases to employ outside consultants. Assistance can be given directly by the department, and this is indeed a valuable service.

Regarding pay-roll tax exemptions, I point out to the honourable member that, except for those businesses that employ between seven and thirteen persons in this State (for that level of employment, Queensland has a slightly higher exemption than South Australia), South Australia's exemption levels mean that industry and commerce in this State pay less pay-roll tax than do their counterparts in other States. In fact, the South Australian Government is doing better by this State's industry in relation to pay-roll tax than is any Liberal or Country Party Government in this country.

Regarding assistance to industry, the honourable member has cited freight subsidies and pay-roll tax exemptions in country areas in New South Wales and Victoria. I point out to him that nothing is included in the South Australian figures in respect of the low level of freights that obtained in this State without railways freight subsidies. The maintenance of those special freight rates, which were below the standard rates in Australia, was part of our agreement with the Federal Government on the sale of the railways.

In addition, the kind of incentives that are given to businesses in country areas in New South Wales and Victoria do not cover the sort of incentives that are given to industry anywhere in South Australia, and we cover a wider range of industry than does the incentive given in the other States.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** Rubbish! You know that New South Wales and Victoria have by far the best decentralisation policy.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I am talking not merely about decentralisation but about general assistance to industry. One cannot in Victoria begin to get the assistance in the metropolitan area that one can get in South Australia. What is more, in Victoria assistance is given in many areas across the board, regardless of whether the company concerned needs that assistance from the taxpayer. In South Australia we have insisted that our assistance be given directly to ensure that the money is spent where it is needed. South Australia should not go in for the kind of general hand-outs that are given in many cases in Victoria to wealthy companies which do not require or need them either to maintain or increase their employment.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** They have certainly got a better employment record than South Australia has got.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** During the period of economic down-turn, South Australia has had a better employment record than has Victoria. It is certainly true that in the past 12 months South Australia has taken a down-turn in employment, having gone through a considerable period when our employment figures were better than the Australian average during periods of economic down-turn. This has not happened before in a period of economic down-turn.

The honourable member knows perfectly well that the present employment situation is not a reflection on the Government's incentive schemes: 85 per cent of our manufacturing product is marketed in New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland. The state of the market in those States determines the health of employment in South Australian industry. In addition, this State has suffered from certain other disabilities, the first of which was the closure of the shipyards as a result of Federal Government policy and despite the fact that this State offered the shipyards assistance, something that not other State did.

Further, we had the drought situation, which meant that, whilst we had 40 per cent of Australia's agricultural implement manufacture we had a nose-dive in agricultural implement employment. We had the general effect of the drought upon the State and the reduction in meat industry employment when we had the biggest meatworks in the Southern Hemisphere. All of these things contributed directly to the employment situation in this State. The honourable member, in suggesting that those figures are affected by the State's industrial incentives, is not being real. He is being deliberately disingenuous.

**Dr. EASTICK:** I refer first to the provision for payments to industry. On Thursday 28 September 1978, the Committee debated the provisions for the Economic Development Department, particularly the administration, and questions were asked of the Premier about the availability of funds for assistance to agricultural service organisations. The Premier asked across the Chamber, as recorded at page 1267 of *Hansard*, whether an approach had been made to Beneficial Finance Corporation, which was seeking to assist wherever possible, organisations of the kind to which I was referring. On that occasion I said that I was not aware whether that was one of the financial organisations that had been approached, but I now know that it was approached some months ago. The person seeking the assistance was informed that at that time the policy of Beneficial Finance was that it did not operate beyond 25 miles from Adelaide. This matter is being pursued further, so documentary evidence on the matter will be available.

**The Hon. D. A. Dunstan:** I should be grateful if you would let me have it.

**Dr. EASTICK:** This is an extremely important matter in several agricultural communities at present. We will only be fooling ourselves if we believe we can walk away from our responsibility to existing business organisations, and at the same time promote or assist the establishment of new ones. I take it from the nod by the Premier that he acknowledges the genuine thrust of what I am saying.

I refer now to the provision for the Redcliff Petro-Chemical Project Working Committee. An amount of \$12 000 was made available for 1977-78 and actual expenditure was \$4 697. For 1978-79 there is a proposed expenditure of another \$12 000. If the Redcliff petro-chemical works, in whatever form it takes, is going to be obtained for South Australia, that is a plus that everybody will laud. The State certainly needs a major industrial uplift and we do not want to see the flaring off of a valuable liquid petroleum gas. We do not want a downturn in the general economy, or the general financial ability of the organisations which are currently looking for petroleum gas and petroleum in the North of this State.

Whilst I acknowledge that this \$12 000 will be money well spent (and indeed a larger sum would be well spent if it achieved a petro-chemical works) can the Premier say whether anybody, be it the working party, Santos, or any of the other persons who are vitally interested in the development of the Redcliff project, have yet been able to get Dow to sign a piece of paper indicating a commitment by Dow Industries to go ahead with the Redcliff petro-chemical works, even if the Federal Government said that it would go ahead with it?

Alternatively, is it the situation that the Federal Government could not be blamed, in the long term, for not accepting the responsibility of the Loan programme for the Redcliff petro-chemical works if the vital ingredient in the whole exercise, Dow Chemicals, have refused, and continue to refuse, to give a positive indication of its commitment to the project? I say this against the background that I am of the belief that Dow

has options on four projects at different places in the world today. The company is playing a game of wait and see, as to where it will get the best deal for Dow Chemicals. Whilst we in South Australia will not deny the company a return on funds or a reasonable profit (because "profit" is no longer a dirty word, I remind the Premier), if Dow Chemical will not give a firm commitment for South Australia, then it would be quite ludicrous for the Government or anybody else to damn the Federal Government if, in the meeting to be held in the next week or two, that Government said it was unable to accede to the request for assistance for Redcliff. I fully support the creation of a functional Redcliff for the benefit of South Australia and, indeed, for the whole of Australia, but the whole scene must be put in proper perspective. I want to know from the Premier that it will not be the Federal Government that is the nigger in the wood pile if this project goes off the rails in the next week or two, but it will be the reticence of Dow Chemicals to positively indicate, to the parties involved, its commitment to this vital project.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I do not know whether the honourable member is trying to square off for the Federal Government in advance. I hope he is not.

**Dr. Eastick:** I treated it seriously: you do the same.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I am wondering why the honourable member is making hypothetical excuses in advance. The Prime Minister and Loan Council were informed by Dow Chemical that, upon the undertaking by the Federal and State Governments to provide finance for the infrastructure projects the company would immediately proceed to the completion of their studies. To date their studies have led them to believe that a commitment can be made in respect of the Redcliff plant. It is impossible for Dow Far Eastern to get the commitment of corporate funds to the completion of those studies if the infrastructure finance will not be available. If the infrastructure finance is not available, the company would be pouring money down the drain, because the project would not be viable.

The Federal Government knows that and it has been accepted by Mr. Anthony. Indeed he urged the most recent Loan Council meeting to approve the project, but the Prime Minister was not willing to accede to that proposition. I expect that the meeting of Loan Council will be held soon, as the report of the officers on infrastructure financing has now been received by the Governments. The petro-chemical project for Redcliff satisfies, I believe, all of the criteria laid down for infrastructure financing. It shows overwhelmingly the best benefits to Australia for any project in this area. Specifically, it provides very great benefits to Australia in replacement of imports.

It helps the balance of payments more than does any other project in view. In these circumstances, I am hopeful of getting a favourable decision from Loan Council. I know that other Premiers have said that our project has been the best researched and best presented of any project currently before Loan Council. Therefore, I am not prepared to speculate on the Federal Government's not supporting the project; indeed, I should roundly condemn the Federal Government if it said, "We cannot agree to the project because we do not have a specific final commitment from Dow."

The final commitment must depend on the condition that Governments are prepared to provide the infrastructure. It is like someone coming here and saying, "Will you provide wharfage facilities for us?" and our saying to, for instance, Mobil, "We want a commitment from you that you will put the project there, regardless of whether we provide wharfage facilities for you." That is an impossible

situation. One cannot negotiate on that basis, nor can we do it in relation to Redcliff.

**Mr. TONKIN:** I must take issue on the last example that the Premier has used. It is a rather fatuous comparison to make. I say clearly and unequivocally that the Opposition is totally in favour of a petro-chemical plant being established at Redcliff; the member for Light made that clear. What the member for Light has been saying clearly is that South Australia could find itself in a "catch 22" situation, whereby Loan Council may say that, until a firm commitment has been entered into (or at least a letter of intent has been issued), it may not be able to approve the final borrowing for the construction of the infrastructure at Redcliff.

I hope that Loan Council will find it in its power to give at least conditional approval: approval on which Dow can approach the producers and, having conducted its investigations, conclude a satisfactory contract with the producers. We desperately need that industry in South Australia. We have producers who desperately need the market, so that they can get on with the job of providing natural gas to Sydney and South Australia. It is in everyone's interests that that project should go ahead. If Loan Council can approve the project, even conditionally, I am certain it will do so. I, for one, strongly support the project's going ahead.

Bearing in mind that the member for Mitcham has already made his intentions known on this matter, I wish to refer to the Royal Commission into the Non-medical Use of Drugs. It is significant that the sum being spent on the Royal Commission into the Non-medical Use of Drugs far exceeds the sums spent on the Royal Commissions that dealt with the dismissal of the Commissioner of Police, Juvenile Courts, and shop trading hours. Indeed, the sum so far spent on the Royal Commission into the Non-medical Use of Drugs exceeds the total sum spent on the other three Royal Commissions. I am even more appalled when I see that \$336 000 is proposed for this year, bringing the total allocation for the whole exercise to more than \$700 000.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Obviously you have not seen the reply that I received today.

**Mr. TONKIN:** I shall be interested to see it. Today, the member for Davenport received a reply concerning the travel authorised by the Government for Mr. Muirhead, counsel assisting the Royal Commission. Mr. Muirhead has made several trips dating from 27 February 1977, returning on 25 March 1977, leaving again on 3 May 1977, returning on 5 July 1977, leaving on 23 July 1977, returning on 7 November 1977, leaving the United Kingdom on 8 December 1977, returning in May 1978, leaving the United Kingdom on 29 May 1978, and returning on 13 August 1978. He has returned to Adelaide, having left the United Kingdom on 7 September. It is amazing that we should have in South Australia a Royal Commission investigating the non-medical use of drugs with this sort of expense being incurred when other officers are available to assist the commission.

In the reply given to the member for Davenport, I note that the experience listed under research projects and the *curricula vitae* of the person concerned are admirable; indeed, he is highly qualified for the task, but surely people resident in South Australia could do the job equally well. There is at least the cost of six return visits to add to that cost; I am counting the last trip to South Australia as incurring a return fare. Under Standing Orders and the practices of the House, we are not going to deal with anything more than the terms of reference and the activities involving expense of the Royal Commission,

but what most South Australians want to know is how much longer the Royal Commission is likely to take to give its final conclusions and bring down its report.

**Mr. Millhouse:** I have an answer to that, too.

**Mr. TONKIN:** That reminds me of one of the difficulties associated with Questions on Notice, when matters arise on the same day as the day when a reply is given.

**Mr. Millhouse:** It is lucky for me that you don't have them all.

**Mr. TONKIN:** I am not in any way trying to upstage the honourable member from his pleasure in moving to reduce the line.

**Mr. Millhouse:** I am looking forward to your support.

**Mr. TONKIN:** It was interesting to see the honourable member leap to his feet so rapidly when this matter came forward: all credit to him. The terms of reference of the Royal Commission, which we can discuss, are very broad and in many ways approximate to, or in some cases are parallel to, the terms of reference of the Commonwealth Royal Commission into the use of drugs.

**Mr. Millhouse:** And the terms of reference of the New South Wales Royal Commission.

**Mr. TONKIN:** Yes. We have reached a disgraceful situation when this Government is spending so much money on a Royal Commission whose terms of reference are so near that it does not matter to duplicating those of a Royal Commission in another State and a Royal Commission in the Federal sphere. Surely some rationalisation of approach can be thrashed out. We will not spend quite as much this year, but we are spending nearly an equivalent amount. Even at this stage the duplication of function could be avoided. One of the difficulties is that at the present time the Royal Commission is, I understand, allowing time for public discussion of an interim report.

It would not be proper for me to discuss the contents of that interim report but I believe that the delay is costing this State much money. The time which is elapsing is spent in public discussion and is being used by members of the public to listen to the views that are being expressed very forcibly by members of the Royal Commission. I do not believe that the terms of reference of this particular Royal Commission in any way cover that eventuality. The activities do not correspond to the terms of reference.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! Is the honourable member suggesting that the activities of the Royal Commission do not match the terms of reference? If that is his comment, I will ask him to withdraw it because it is a reflection and the honourable member is not to reflect on the Royal Commission.

**Mr. TONKIN:** That was my intention but, following your ruling, I will withdraw my comment. I would not want to suggest that members of the Royal Commission were deliberately setting out to influence public opinion.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member should cease that line of debate.

**Mr. TONKIN:** The expenditure of public funds on this particular project is fast becoming a farce, especially in a time of financial stringency and at a time when we desperately need funds to stimulate the economy of South Australia. It is totally unjustified. The basic reason why this Royal Commission was set up does not justify the expenditure of these funds.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** For "Classification of Publications and Theatrical Performances Boards", actual payments last year were \$4 809. This year \$10 000 has been provided. What splurge of activity has caused this increase? I refer now to the provision for various committees of inquiry, and this Government loves to appoint committees to inquire into difficult issues. Often,

we never hear any more; they are buried for good. Last year, \$40 000 was allocated and \$24 069 was paid, this year \$57 000 is provided and I would like to know on what that \$24 069 was spent and on what the \$57 000 is likely to be spent.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Regarding the item relating to the Classification of Publications Board, I point out that the Classification of Theatrical Performances Board did not exist previously.

**Mr. Millhouse:** It got money last year.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** No.

**Mr. Millhouse:** According to this it did.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Theatrical performances?

**Mr. Millhouse:** The provision is for Classification of Publications and Theatrical Performances Boards, \$4 809.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** It is "Boards".

**Mr. Millhouse:** Yes.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** It was the Classification of Publications Board last year. We have only recently passed the Theatrical Performances Board legislation.

**Mr. Millhouse:** You have run the two together, have you?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** That is right. It covers the same people but they sit now in different capacities and additionally. There have been some increase in fees in line with other increases in fees and in changes in general award conditions.

In relation to the various committees of inquiry, I have no record of all those proposed for this year. Last year these included the Film Training Committee, the Community Development and Assistance Committee, Superannuation Working Party, Manpower Study Committee, Cummins Advisory Committee, Emergency Housing Committee, and Committee on Urban and Regional Boundaries.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** That was not exactly a mine of information on either item but I think we will leave them. Last year \$40 000 was provided for the Builders Appellate and Disciplinary Tribunal; \$32 536 was actually paid and we are voting almost that amount this year. Obviously, there has been an increase in activity, and I would like to know the reason for that. Further, for "Government Royal Show Pavilion", last year we paid \$21 994 and this year we will spend \$50 000.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I have no information on the increase in the Builders Appellate and Disciplinary Tribunal. I will get this information, although I assume that the increase is merely because of an increase in activity in that area.

**Mr. Millhouse:** I suppose it must be.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** We have been approached by the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society to have a Government pavilion. The Government endeavours to take some aspect of Government activity and display this each year. The reason for the increased sum was that this year the cost was more. Some moneys have had to be expended because the bills have come in in respect of this year at about \$37 000. This allows a sufficient provision for any conceivable escalation that may occur.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** For "arid zone ecology" last year nothing was allocated but this year \$75 000 has been provided. Why is this?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** It is provision to meet a request for funds for Dr. Lange, of the University of Adelaide, to establish a base at Middleback-Roopena, near Whyalla, for the arid zone research programme.

**Mr. BLACKER:** Has the Premier any further information on the type of work involved and whether it is purely on pastoral-type country, or does it get into the

agricultural field?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I will get that information for the honourable the Minister.

*[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]*

**Mr. EVANS:** In his earlier reply to the member for Mitcham regarding the Government Royal Show Pavilion, I understood the Premier to say that accounts came in after the end of June amounting to \$37 000 more than had been expected.

**The Hon. D. A. Dunstan:** The accounts for this year were about \$37 000 to date.

**Mr. EVANS:** Is it correct that \$21 994 was for the 1977 show, \$37 000 was for the 1978 show, and we have \$13 000 in preparation for the 1979 show?

**The Hon. D. A. Dunstan:** That is correct.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Has provision been made in the sums proposed for ethnic festivals or ethnic organisations for assistance to the Schutzenfest? The Premier made statements last year about assistance to this function.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I am not certain about amounts provided in relation to the Schutzenfest. I have not got the details of all ethnic festival grants here, but I shall get that information for the honourable member.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I am under an obligation to mention a matter I omitted to mention this afternoon, because I had promised to raise it. It concerns the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. I have had a complaint from a man in my district (and I have here a photocopy of it) to the effect that tickets for the Festival Theatre (and this is one for the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra) are printed not in South Australia but in America. He complained very much about the matter and asked why they could not be printed in South Australia, where we have competent printers. Certainly, the photostat I have shows that it was printed in the U.S.A. There may be some good reason for this, but will the Premier take up the matter to see whether it is necessary to have tickets for the Festival Theatre printed out of this country?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** It may relate to the fact that it is computer ticketing with the BASS system.

**Mr. Millhouse:** This is BASS.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** That may be the reason for it, but I shall inquire.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** moved:

That the line "Royal Commission—Non-Medical use of Drugs" be reduced by \$100.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member is in order in moving to reduce this item. However, I should like to point out to him, as I pointed out to the Leader of the Opposition earlier in the Committee stage, that the area of debate is necessarily very limited. Members are entitled to criticise the Government for appointing the Commission, and the practice of the House allows members to suggest an extension to the terms of reference but does not allow discussion of the manner in which the Commission is conducting its inquiries, discussion of the evidence presented to it, or any interim findings or publications of the Commission until they have been presented to the Governor. It is the intention of the Chair to ensure that Standing Orders are adhered to.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** As always with me, Sir, you can rest easy. I do not propose to canvass any of those matters in what I shall say.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** I appreciate the assistance of the honourable member.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** As always, Sir. I first became interested in this matter through an approach made to me over the line "Premier, Miscellaneous". It is an interesting

story which may find some sympathetic or unsympathetic chord in the minds or ears, if they have them, of the members of the Liberal Party.

A lady in my district whom I should think was normally a Liberal voter telephoned me one day in high annoyance. She had seen in the *Government Gazette*, I think of 30 June (her husband is a well known Adelaide solicitor, by the way), the Treasurer's abstract which simply stated, "Premier, Miscellaneous, to 31 March, \$10 000 000", or something like that, with no details given. She thought this was strange, and she spoke to the Leader of the Opposition and said, "This is bad. You should try to get some details." He said, "There's nothing we can do about it, it's no good."

She rang me, and the obvious thing was to do as I did and put a Question on Notice. That has grown into a series of questions which have elicited more and more information, first about the line, "Premier, Miscellaneous" to 31 March 1978 as compared with the figures to 31 March 1977, and culminating today in information about the Royal Commission—not about the matters you raised, Sir, but about its appointment and remuneration of Mr. Muirhead particularly and other administrative arrangements, which, even if I had not proposed to move this motion just on the line and the amount of money being spent, would have amply justified my doing so.

When I asked my first question, I found that the Royal Commission had spent, to 31 March 1978, \$268 400. The Juvenile Courts Royal Commission, on the other hand, in the preceding year had spent about \$34 000 and only \$1 200-odd in this year. There was something about prisoner allegations at Yatala, a flea bite. The Shop Trading Hours Royal Commission (about petrol stations) had spent \$77 000. In other words, the amount spent on this Royal Commission was so enormously disproportionate to the amounts spent on other Royal Commissions that it warranted some further inquiry.

I cannot help saying, as I have heard the Premier say, and as I have seen written, that whenever anything goes wrong in South Australia the present Leader of the Opposition immediately says, "Let's have a Royal Commission." He knows damn well there will not be one, but it is something to say. I have never realised fully before, and I wonder whether he has, the expense which he is suggesting for any Royal Commission.

Having got the information about the "Premier, Miscellaneous" line to 31 March, I then started to ask some questions, more particularly about this Royal Commission, to get a bit of detail on how what looked an enormous figure was made up. On 12 September (page 777 of *Hansard*) I got the detail that, of the \$268 399.92 spent in that nine months, the large figure of \$54 421.44 had gone to "Muirhead, fees and expenses". That is how it is written down.

The figure of \$133 801 for salaries was of particular interest to me. Dennis Muirhead is not one of the Commissioners—he is merely counsel assisting the Commission. He received \$54 421. I asked also what was the total expenditure to 31 August 1978, and under the same heading we found that Muirhead's fees and expenses amounted to \$106 594.39. I was staggered about that. No wonder people think that members of the legal profession do well, when such figures are published. I would not pursue this matter if it were not completely atypical in my experience of fees paid to counsel, either for a Royal Commission or in any other way. In a moment I will deal with counsel fees that are at present allowed by the Master of the Supreme Court, in view of the answer that I obtained today.

I must say (and members of the Committee may not

know this) that, when the Royal Commission was appointed and it was announced that Mr. Muirhead would be counsel assisting it, there was much protest, either expressed or silent, in the profession to this. Dennis Muirhead is a South Australian. I could not remember him (although I could remember the name), and when I saw him (when I was entertained at lunch by the Royal Commissioners), I immediately recognised him.

He is a practitioner of quite good standing in South Australia who left here a number of years ago to practise in London, an unusual thing to do. Whether he was a junior partner or managing clerk in one of the big firms (Thompson Muirhead, I think, or one of the successor firms), I am not sure. When I saw him I remembered him as a very nice bloke, but of no particular standing in the profession here when he left. Certainly, he was junior in age to many people in the profession in South Australia.

The profession complained. I believe that the Bar Association made some complaint about it. The Premier may remember, as he is a member of the association (although he comes to hardly any meetings, if any). Complaints were made about the appointment, for this reason: that there are plenty of people in South Australia who could well have acted as counsel assisting the Royal Commission; indeed, we have had a number of Royal Commissions in South Australia on all sorts of topics and there has never been any trouble since, I think, the time of the Stuart Royal Commission, in finding someone to assist from within the profession here.

It is no good the Premier saying that there are not practitioners in South Australia who have had experience with drug trafficking cases and so on—there are. There are a number of them, and he knows that well. There was much annoyance in the profession at the appointment of Mr. Muirhead in the first place, and there was some formal protest about it. I wonder now why he was appointed, because we find through the Questions on Notice that I have put, particularly from the answers that I obtained today, that he is being paid an enormous sum; more, I should think, than anyone in the profession would have reasonably asked or expected to be paid for this, or for anything else. I asked (Question 532) this question of the Premier:

What are the financial arrangements made between the Government and Mr. Dennis Muirhead for his services in connection with the Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs?

The answer was:

Financial arrangements made between the Government and Mr. Dennis Muirhead at the time the Commission was established took into account the current level of fees in South Australia for counsel.

That was some time in the preceding financial year. I suppose it must have been in 1976 that it was established, and I shall assume that it was. The reply also states:

Given the fact that work for the Commission was continuous over a considerable period of time, a fee of \$262.50 per day, plus an allowance for keep of \$37.50, was considered to be a reasonable figure.

I should like to know who thought it was reasonable. This was not just one day or a few days—it is every day. I assume it is five days a week (I do not know whether he was paid for seven days a week, as I have not done the sums). The reply continues:

The Government was advised that, in view of the disruptions to Mr. Muirhead's London practice, a high figure on brief of \$10 000 should be set, and that it would be appropriate as compensation for the whole of the disruption, plus an initial briefing fee.

Dennis is on a fee on brief of \$10 000 (this is how he

started) and \$262.50 a day plus \$37.50 living allowance. Additionally, because of the considerable period of time over which the Commission would extend, the Government allowed four first-class (God knows why it was first-class: I have never travelled first-class in my life. Economy is always good enough for me; one gets there just as quickly) return air fares to London for Mr. Muirhead to attend to the business of his London practice. For his wife and family the Government would meet one economy return trip a year. In fact, his family has made use of only one of these trips, although the Commission is in its second year, and I suppose we must be grateful for that saving.

It was also stated that, since the setting of Mr. Muirhead's fees, there have been three increases in counsel fees. I cannot find that, but I will go into it in a moment. When I read this reply this afternoon I was willing to accept it, but on the way home I thought that it did not sound right, so I checked. It was also stated that the Public Service Board had made increases to the allowance for keep.

We were also told that the Government increased his fees to \$300 a day plus \$41.90 expenses from 1 March 1978. Here we have the plum of the lot, this is a concession: "A reading fee of \$60 an hour was set for when Mr. Muirhead was outside Australia but, it has not been charged." That is something.

On the question of the three increases in counsel fees, I just do not understand that. I have the Law Society Handbook here. I went to Bar Chambers on the way in and picked it up. It is a guide to me and other members of the profession in fixing their counsel fees. There is nothing secret about it. It is the scale that the Master of the Supreme Court, who has to tax bills of costs, will allow. It is a tariff. One can charge more if one can get one's client to pay it, but this is all one can get on taxation, and I may say that for myself (and I believe for most other members of the profession), it is what is charged, although I may be under-cutting. If I am, perhaps I am unethical.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** You would still be too dear.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Perhaps I would.

**Dr. Eastick:** Perhaps the others do not have a double salary.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I do not think that has much to do with it.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** Do they get value for money?

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I try to give value for money. I say modestly that if I did nothing else but this, I might be better off than being here (and perhaps other members would think they would be better off, too, if I were doing that). This is the Supreme Court guide to counsel fees issued in May 1978, but operative since August 1977. We have not had an increase since August 1977. For fee on brief (that is for a silk), \$547; for junior counsel (that is me), \$300 to \$420; the fee on brief—this is in an action in the Supreme Court and, as far as I know, there is no scale of counsel fees for Royal Commissions.

**Mr. Arnold:** What do you normally charge?

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I normally charge \$300. It is the fee on brief for the first five hours in court, and normally includes a conference beforehand. That is what is set by the Master. Thereafter, refreshers, as we call them (put it in the little sack on your back), senior counsel \$360, junior counsel, \$200 to \$280.

**Mr. Whitten:** Bloody burglars.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** The member for Price says "Bloody burglars", but his own Government is allowing Dennis Muirhead day after day \$300, and a \$10 000 fee on brief. Who is the bloody burglar?

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I have ruled before that the use of "bloody", which is creeping into Parliamentary debates, is unsatisfactory. I ask honourable members, if they wish to interject, not to use the term, and those honourable members speaking not to respond to it.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** It is blasphemous. I apologise. I was carried away by the member for Price. Those are the fees which are charged in a Supreme Court action. I just do not remember! I have taken out the previous ones, and I would be amazed, absolutely staggered, if there have been three increases in counsel fees since Mr. Muirhead was first appointed in 1976. I do not believe that there have been. This, or some such other scale, has been used as the justification for jacking up his fee. How on earth, on the figures I have quoted, one could justify the fees he is being paid, I do not know. I suspect that it was assumed that no-one would go behind the answer and check it. I have a grave doubt about that. That is what he is being paid.

**Mr. Harrison:** Haven't you ever appeared before the Privy Council? What fees did you get over there?

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** One does not get more, or only little more, for appearing before the Privy Council than for appearing before the High Court of Australia or the Supreme Court of South Australia. In a High Court matter, the other day I charged more than \$300 a day fee on brief, but it was not up to the \$420. I can assure the member for Albert Park that, before the Privy Council, one does not get a fee anything like this.

**Mr. Wilson:** You enjoyed running around Hyde Park.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Yes. I showed my loyalty by running around Buckingham Palace every morning.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I am sure that the Committee is interested in the honourable member's legal activities, but he should ignore the interjections and get back to the matter before the Chair.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** In my second question, I asked what was the estimated total payment likely to be made to Mr. Muirhead. We got the most curious odd figure of \$177 254.59. That is what it is expected he will get *in toto* for being counsel to the Royal Commission.

**Mr. Mathwin:** Not a bad slice of the cake!

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** It would keep me going for many years. I also asked when it was expected that the Royal Commission would make a final report. The answer was that the Royal Commission anticipated that the final report would be available in March 1979. My fourth question was what was the estimated total cost of the Royal Commission, and the answer was \$813 690.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** Getting on towards \$1 000 000.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Yes, well over \$800 000 is expected to be the final cost. I bet my boots that the report we will get will be the same as every other report that has been produced by any commission of inquiry into the drug problem, going back to the 1880's. I was told that by the Commissioners themselves when I went to lunch. That is what we are going to pay, and I bet that it will be more by the time we finish. It is well over \$800 000 for this Royal Commission, on the Government's own figures. Frankly, that information alone would justify a vote of no confidence in the Government.

Dennis Muirhead is a nice bloke. He was very courteous and friendly to me when I had lunch there. I enjoyed having lunch there with him and the Commissioners. I do not dispute that he has had some experience in this field, but he is not, in my view, so outstanding as to have warranted bringing him from London or for paying him these fees. I believe that the real reason he was brought here is that he is a personal friend of the Premier and of the Attorney-General. If I am wrong, both honourable gentlemen will, I hope, deny it. That is my belief, and it is

the belief of many other people in the legal profession.

In question No. 543 I sought details of the break-up of the \$106 594.39 that has been paid to Mr. Muirhead. The following are the details of his payments since 1976: travel for Mr. D. Muirhead, wife and members of his family, \$18 128.27, to bring them out from England and return; fees and allowances paid to Mr. D. Muirhead, \$88 262.50; sundry expenses incurred by the Commission credited to Mr. Muirhead on behalf of the Royal Commission, \$203.62.

In question No. 543 I asked whether such payments included air fares for trips between here and the United Kingdom for himself, his wife and other members of his family and whom, and the answers were "Yes, yes; yes, Mr. Muirhead's three children." He has had five return trips, and I think that the Leader mentioned this this afternoon. Mrs. Muirhead came out in mid-May 1977. She is still here. The three children came out, I assume, with her in mid-May 1977. The third question was, "What is the justification for such payments?" The only answer was the gem, "The justification for the payment was that it was in accordance with the Government's agreement with Mr. Muirhead for the engagement of his services." If that does not beg the question, I do not know what does.

Regarding question 545, I had a tip-off, when I asked the earlier question, that Dennis Muirhead was not in the country, so I put a Question on Notice about that as follows: is Mr. Muirhead, counsel assisting the Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs, at present out of the State, and, if so, how long has he been out of it, where is he, and when is he expected to return and, if not, when was he last out of the State and how long has he been out of it? The answer I received was that, as agreed under the terms of his engagement, he had returned to his London practice on 13 August 1978 and returned to Adelaide on 16 September 1978. One wonders what happens to all the other people we are paying on the Royal Commission while he is away. I do not know whether this has delayed things or not. In reply I was also told that, for part of his five weeks, he accompanied the Chairman (Professor Sackville) on an inspection tour of United Kingdom drug centres to gain information on the most recent developments for inclusion in the Commissioners' final report. For part of it, he went with Professor Sackville. Why? I do not know, but I suppose that is some justification, but that obviously is not the reason for his trip.

In question No. 544, I asked for details of research projects which, in the earlier answer, had been set down. We got the answer (and I think this is what has gone slightly wrong) in the Premier's explanation this afternoon in which he merely said that the accounting was not as good as it should have been. I have in my possession a table, all of which I will not quote, and I will not ask to have it inserted in *Hansard*. Regarding research projects, summary of expenditure, there are a dozen or more research projects, including one about which I would like to know more—study of criminal statistics in South Australia. For that study, in 1976-77, someone was paid \$11 124. Goodness knows what it is. That is easily the largest sum paid for any of the projects.

I refer also to pharmacology of drugs. A total of \$9 623 has been paid to someone for that. The member for Torrens will know whether or not that is justified. I refer also to legal regulation of drugs. I do not know what it means, but \$6 100 has been paid for a research project of that name. A number of internal projects are also referred to. Apparently, these sums are paid to someone outside the commission. A Mr. W. Heine, Manager of Survey, also involved in other projects, has been paid \$14 000.

There are computer charges totalling \$4 115.32, and printing costs of \$3 198.

One charge staggered me: that for interviewers. Who has done the interviewing or who has been interviewed does not appear. However, interviewers' wages and delivery of notices involves a sum of \$30 752.53. Mileage and other expenses, presumably for the interviewers, involves \$7 539.32, making a total of \$59 605.59. Whether this is some sort of survey that has already been conducted, I do not know. I presume that it is. However, it seems, on my experience, to be expensive, anyway.

I turn now to travel and accommodation for those involved, and find that travel and accommodation for commission members are quite modest. Professor Sackville has had only \$2 228 while in Adelaide. Interstate travel accounts for \$9 170; overseas travel \$2 527; and country meetings, travel and accommodation, \$2 180.29. Travel for other people in the commission accounted for \$10 569.90, making a total of \$27 404.54. So the whole of the rest of them really have not had much more than Mr. Muirhead has had on his own.

I should like now to turn to another fascinating item about which I have asked questions. In this respect I refer to legal fees, totalling \$9 234.40. I could not understand why the Royal Commission should incur legal fees. One would expect that any work that had to be done would be done by the Crown Solicitor, but no: we find that the well-known and reputable legal firm of Johnston, Layton, Withers and Company sent in a bill on 22 June 1977 for \$7 340, and eight days later sent in another bill for \$1 894.40, making a total of \$9 234.40. I should like very much to know, without appearing to pry, just what that could be for. I cannot imagine why nearly \$10 000 in private solicitors' fees should be charged in June 1977 for a Royal Commission. There may be some innocent explanation for this, but I am waiting to hear it.

I come now to the matter of salaries, about which I asked. I refer, first, to staff salaries. The reply shows that the person who has received the most is the Director of Research, Dr. A. Mant. She has received a total of \$23 460.20. So, one can see who is raking in all the shekels for the Royal Commission: it is not the staff or the Commissioners. She has had the most, and is followed by B. Thomas, a research officer, who has received \$18 906, making a salaries total of \$119 260.51.

I turn now to members' fees and reimbursement of salaries, and bear in mind the counsel assisting the Commission. The total sum paid to Professor Sackville is only \$19 600. With respect to him, that is enough. Regarding Dr. Earle Hackett, there is an explanation that he is paid his normal salary by the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, which the Commission has reimbursed. He has had \$42 911.20. Dr. Richard Nies of the Institute of Technology has had \$3 500. The University of New South Wales had been paid \$20 809 as reimbursement for half of Prof. Sackville's salary. So, the total fees and salaries for Commission members is only \$86 820.32. They are not, therefore, the ones who are getting the money. Although the Commission members are doing reasonably well compared to the counsel assisting them, their earnings are almost peanuts.

Although I have perhaps spoken in a tone trifle flippant, I do not regard this as anything but a serious matter. Although we are in a time of financial stringency, South Australia (and the Leader said this this afternoon), New South Wales and the Commonwealth all have Royal Commissions in the same area (although certainly the terms of reference are slightly different), and we are paying an enormous sum of money to get a report when the answer that the Royal Commission will give is really



not in much doubt.

My views are not dissimilar to those that I have heard expressed by Commission members, so I do not intend to criticise on that ground. It is not as though I, like the Leader of the Opposition, have some blind, fanatical opposition to the views that have been tentatively put forward by the Commission: not at all. However, it is perfectly obvious what the Commission's report will say. Whether or not this whole thing is a public relations exercise to try to condition the South Australian public to accept the views that the Government also holds, I do not know. However, it could be.

We have often quoted what Sir Thomas Playford used to say: that he could always write the report of any Royal Commission before he appointed it. It depended on the people whom he appointed. I suppose that is as true of this Royal Commission as it is of any other. The Premier is no fool. He has learned a few tricks from Sir Thomas Playford in his time and this is an obvious one. Undoubtedly he has used it many times.

I do not believe that the Government comes out of this matter well. Had it not been for the chance remark made by this lady to the Leader of the Opposition (perhaps it was not a chance remark; perhaps the Leader was not interested in her getting in touch with me), this may not have come out. Undoubtedly, however, the enormous global figure being paid on the line would have come out. However, all the rest of it might not have come out at all, and no doubt the Government wished it had not.

This is a great waste of money, and it is not in any way, in my view, necessary. I do not speak disparagingly of Mr. Muirhead. However, it was not necessary to go outside South Australia, let alone to London, to get someone to assist the Royal Commission, and then to pay such an enormous sum. Counsel could have been engaged from within the profession here or, if the Government considered that there was no-one suitable here, surely someone from within Australia could have been engaged. However, it had to go to someone in London who, I still say, is a personal friend of Government members, brought out here at unwarranted expense, on the most favourable of conditions, for a long time, not to write it himself but to assist in the preparation of the report by three Royal Commissioners who are competent in this field. And it will cost us well over \$800 000!

It is for these reasons that I have moved the motion to reduce the line. This is a vote of no confidence in the Government. I do not know whether I will get any support at all, although I suggest that, on the facts and figures that I have put (which are not mine but which are from the Government's own pen, being answers to my Questions on Notice), a vote of no confidence on this item is amply justified.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** When the Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs was appointed, it was the first of the Royal Commissions in this area to be appointed in Australia. It was obvious at that time it was impossible in Australia to take material which had been published in this area from here or elsewhere, and come to dispassionate conclusions upon the evidence that was offered. The views and the facts stated were so confused and conflicting that there was no basis upon which a Government could accurately assess what needed to be done to the laws relating to the non-medical use of drugs. It was apparent that the law in this area was not working particularly well in Australia.

While it was not working well here, it was apparent that in overseas countries like the United States and Great Britain there had been very much more experience of drug traffic, a far higher incidence of serious hard drug usage,

than had yet occurred in Australia, but the danger was very clear that that was the way Australia could go if it did not learn lessons from experience elsewhere. In those circumstances the Government resolved to appoint the Royal Commission on drugs. It was resolved that if such a commission were appointed it would be an extensive inquiry surveying the material available in developed countries of the world, in order to come to conclusions. The job had to be done properly, and in those circumstances it would be the most comprehensive inquiry into this area in any developed country this century. I outlined that to the House at the time the Royal Commission was appointed. On our original investigations of this matter it became obvious that no such inquiry would be a cheap one: if the job were to be complete and thorough, it would be expensive.

Not one but three Royal Commissioners were to be appointed, giving a broad basis upon which the Commissioners could assess the evidence before them: a Chairman with wide experience in the law; a man with wide experience in a medical background; and a man with wide experience in the social sciences. To assist them, it was resolved that there would be counsel who was already prominent within the profession and who had experience in the drug area overseas. There was only one counsel that we knew of who could fulfil those conditions. The honourable member is obviously not saying with any serious conviction that counsel in South Australia would have been perfectly adequate.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Yes I am.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** In that case the honourable member is simply deceiving himself, because whatever their involvement in drug cases (and there have been some in South Australia certainly) no counsel in South Australia could have had the experience of the London drug studies and the changes in the law which took place there and in New York. That was the way that Australia could go and the difficulties that Australia could face were apparent if we did not take account of overseas practice. What was being advocated widely in Australia was simply Draconian increases in penalties. It was quite clear already that increases in penalties were simply not meeting the problem of drug traffic within this country.

There were no counsel in South Australia who had experience of the changed drug laws in the United Kingdom or in the United States, the operation of them, or the various associations servicing drug users and facing the rehabilitation problems of drugs adequately. In consequence, we sought counsel who had that experience, and who could assemble and present the information to the Commission necessary for it to determine its conclusions. Mr. Muirhead was properly qualified and was a practitioner of South Australia, anyway. He knew the local scene and he knew the scenes in London and New York. He had also been closely involved with drug cases and with the associations which had surveyed drug usage and drug law. I knew of this. Mr. Muirhead is not any close personal friend of mine. The Commission has operated now for nearly two years and the member for Mitcham has had lunch with Mr. Muirhead; I have not in the whole of that period. I have not had a meal with him, seen him socially or been involved. For the honourable member to say that the basis of Mr. Muirhead's engagement was that he was a close personal friend of mine or the Attorney-General is without basis in evidence and demeans him, as is the case with his accusations or imputations of ill motive to members of the Government or to members of the Opposition who do not join with him.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Are you speaking for the Attorney-

General as well?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I am not aware that the Attorney-General has any closer association with Mr. Muirhead than I. I certainly have no information to that effect. The Attorney-General was in no way involved in the engagement of Mr. Muirhead; I was. Because of my knowledge of Mr. Muirhead's background in this particular area, and because of material that he, as a South Australian practitioner, had sent me from London concerning drug laws in that country and the usage under them, I knew there was a counsel who could do this work.

The honourable member has glossed over the fees that he quoted from the Law Society circular. If senior counsel is to be appointed, and the bill from Johnston, Layton, Withers and Company, I imagine, was for payments to counsel junior to Mr. Muirhead assisting the Commission—

**Mr. Millhouse:** It does not say so.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Junior counsel was appointed from Johnston, Layton, Withers and Company to assist, as junior to Mr. Muirhead, in assisting the Commission. The honourable member knows that it is frequently the case that counsel assisting Royal Commissions are treated as senior counsel, even if they have not taken silk, and are paid on that basis and have junior counsel assisting them.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Has he not got anybody assisting him now?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I believe he has, but I have not seen the bills in relation to it.

**Mr. Millhouse:** The only bill stops at 22 June 1977, I believe. There is no payment for a junior since then.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I do not know whether a bill has come to hand on that matter. Originally, the payment to Johnston, Layton, Withers and Company was in respect to counsel junior to Mr. Muirhead assisting the Commission.

**Mr. Millhouse:** The two-thirds rule does not apply?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I do not know whether the two-thirds rule applies in this particular matter. I know that junior counsel was appointed from that firm when the Royal Commission commenced its work. In regard to Mr. Muirhead's applications for fees, quite frankly his original quotation for fees was higher than the amount that was fixed. That was queried originally to me by officers of the Crown Law Department.

**Mr. Millhouse:** I'll bet it was.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I then sought advice from people who could give me the views of previous taxing masters on this matter, and a fee was settled on the basis of what would be an appropriate fee to be allowed for counsel who would be treated as senior assisting a Royal Commission. If the honourable member looks back at the fees he quoted for senior counsel in respect of refreshers, he will find that that was in accordance with the amounts he read out from the Law Society circular. There is nothing unusual about it at all. In respect of the fee on brief, the original fee on brief, of course, had to be very considerable in relation to the size of the brief, which was quite unusual, being for a commission that would last for two years. In addition to that, it would involve the complete disruption of counsel's practice in London.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Is he at the bar in London, or is he a solicitor?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** He is a solicitor in London.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Yes, I think he is a solicitor in London.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** He is a member of a firm in London.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Not even at the bar.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** But his practice was

considerably disrupted inevitably. In consequence, I was advised that it would be appropriate to fix the original amount he had been paid as a fee on brief and as a fee for disruption of his practice in England. The provisions in relation to his return to England during the period of his engagement were obvious requirements of any counsel who was being brought out from a practice elsewhere to assist a Commission in this country. Obviously, with members of the Commission, we had to make provision that they were returning to the work that they had to do elsewhere. The honourable member has contrasted the amounts that they were paid. Since they are, in fact, paid in respect of work that is their continuing work in other avocations, the conditions of their employment elsewhere mean that they are not paid a vast extra sum for their work on the Commission, and some offsets occur in those areas, as occurred, for example, with Dr. Hackett. There is nothing untoward or unusual about what has been done. The honourable member cannot point to anything that is unusual in the arrangements that were made in connection with Mr. Muirhead, despite all the levity that the honourable member went on with. Mr. Muirhead's refresher fees are in accordance with the provisions of the Law Society in relation to this matter.

**Mr. Millhouse:** I think you are a bit "under". If you are treating him as a silk, you should be paying him \$360.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Of course, the arrangements are that it is a long-term brief. So, there are some offsets there. Nevertheless, the honourable member cannot suggest that the refresher fees are unusual.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Are you paying him for five days a week or for seven days a week?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** We are paying for the days on which he appears.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Appears where?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Before the Royal Commission.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Is the Royal Commission having formal sittings?

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member for Mitcham can enter the debate later. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Mr. Muirhead is paid for his appearances before the Commission by day.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Every day? I suggest that you find out for me.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** In the circumstances I have outlined, Mr. Muirhead's fees are perfectly normal and perfectly proper. In order to achieve the kind of inquiry that we set out on, it was obvious that we would have to go in for a much more lengthy, expensive, and wide-ranging inquiry than the Royal Commission with which the honourable member draws comparisons.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Or any other Royal Commission we have had in South Australia.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Quite so, because there has been no Royal Commission that has had such a wide range involved in its inquiries. If we are to assemble evidence from around the world (and that is what has been done) it is a very different matter from the Royal Commission into Juvenile Courts and from the Royal Commission into the dismissal of the Commissioner of Police, where the facts could be confined within a narrow context. However, in regard to the non-medical use of drugs, if we were to provide the most comprehensive and up-to-date inquiry seen in a developed country, obviously we had to go into the matter in depth and to do the job properly.

The honourable member then says that New South Wales appointed a Royal Commission, and so did the Commonwealth Government. The New South Wales

Royal Commission and the Commonwealth Royal Commission arose out of the same set of facts: the murder in Griffith of a man who was involved in drug inquiries as a private citizen. The New South Wales Royal Commission was set up to look at the background to drug trafficking in New South Wales, and the Commonwealth Royal Commission endeavoured to cover something of the same ground and also to deal with importations of drugs. When those Royal Commissions were set up, the South Australian Government sought to rationalise the areas of inquiry and, in fact, the South Australian inquiry has looked at the basis of drug laws. It is the other Royal Commissions that have gone into areas like the degree of drug trafficking and the sort of thing that was happening in Griffith to a far greater extent than our Royal Commission has done, whereas our Royal Commission has been concerned with the basic question of how the law should effectively operate to reduce the menace particularly of hard drugs in this community. That was the menace that Australia was facing. For the honourable member to say that the Royal Commissions have done the same work is not right. In fact, they have concentrated on different areas of concern.

We have endeavoured, where there was any overlapping, to provide evidence from one Royal Commission to another and to see to it that they were properly rationalised. To date, the material that has come from the South Australian Royal Commission does not at all run with the material that has come from the Commonwealth Royal Commission or from the New South Wales Royal Commission, because they do not trench upon the same matters. We have not, thank goodness, to this date got any evidence of the kind of trafficking and wide-scale criminal activities with which the New South Wales Royal Commission and the Commonwealth Royal Commission have been directly concerned. It is because we wanted to see to it that we did not get to that stage and that we could provide in our laws a proper and effective means of dealing with the scourge of drugs that our Royal Commission was appointed, and I believe it is doing a first-rate job.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** The member for Mitcham stated that we have learned something from T. Playford in the past, and perhaps we may have learned something from R. Millhouse. The amount spent on this Royal Commission should cause us some concern. When a Royal Commission is likely to cost up to \$1 000 000, we should examine closely what is coming out of that Royal Commission. I recall the quandary in which the Labor Party found itself at one of its annual conferences at which a resolution was presented to legalise marihuana. The Premier and the Government were in the hot seat, because they did not know what to do. They knew there was widespread concern in the community concerning marihuana. If they legalised marihuana without anything to back up that decision, they would have been in hot water, and yet there was pressure within the Labor Party for marihuana to be legalised. I believe that that was one of the compelling reasons for the Government's setting up a Royal Commission into drugs.

The Premier, in defence of the Royal Commission, stated that there was concern with the horrors of hard drugs. Most of the publicity surrounding the Royal Commission's activities so far have been in relation to marihuana.

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** It is not our fault.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** I do not know whose fault it is.

**Mr. Millhouse:** That is the controversial part of the whole thing.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** The Royal Commission saw the

light of day because the Labor Party was under pressure at its State conference to legalise marihuana.

**The Hon. D. W. Simmons:** Who from?

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** I think it was from a Young Labor group: a resolution was advanced about three years ago.

**Mr. Allison:** It was to legalise possession for personal use.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** I forget the exact details. That was a thorny question and one of the political questions that were worrying the Government at that time. The usual solution for this Government is to set up a Royal Commission for any thorny problem. In this way it can get some sort of back-up for what has been done or what is intended to be done. The Royal Commission into the sacking of the Police Commissioner validated what the Government had done.

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** Who demanded the Royal Commission?

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** We well know the result. The Government has much to answer for when the costs of this Royal Commission are considered. The Premier states that attempts were made to see that there was no overlapping of the three Royal Commissions operating in the country at present. There was a strong case for letting the Commonwealth deal with this matter. The Government can call off a Royal Commission if it wants to. This was done in what was called the Murray case, where there was a Royal Commission in connection with the Teachers' Institute and staffing in the Northern Territory (the John D. Murray Royal Commission). In that case, the Commissioner fell ill suddenly, and conveniently, and the whole thing went into limbo.

**Mr. Millhouse:** He had a heart attack.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** In any case, the Royal Commission was called off.

**Dr. Eastick:** There were a couple the Government brought into being that it wished had never been.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member should not reflect on Royal Commissions and Royal Commissioners. The honourable member is reflecting on a previous Royal Commission.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** We will reflect on the Government, which set them up. The Government thought it had the member for Light cold when the Royal Commission into Monarto was set up. The Minister for the Environment was rubbing his hands together when the member for Light said everything in the garden was not as pure and sweet as it ought to be. A Royal Commission was set up to trap the then Leader of the Opposition. It was found that everything was not as rosy as had been thought; there was some graft behind the scenes.

If the Government wanted to call this Royal Commission off and co-operate with the Commonwealth Government, which seems to be the appropriate authority to conduct a Royal Commission on aspects of drug abuse, hard drugs and the curtailing of them, and the control of trafficking, it could do so.

The fact that counsel was brought from London because this is a problem in which they have more experience overseas is particularly thin. The New South Wales and Federal Governments did not go overseas to obtain personnel, the only people in the world who were adequate to get the sort of information and with the type of experience that is needed to prosecute successfully on behalf of a Royal Commission. That does not wash, and to my mind is absolute nonsense. When one examines what the Government has done for this officer from overseas, there is some cause for concern. The member for Davenport asked a question, which followed questions

asked by the member for Mitcham, to which he had an answer today. The question was as follows:

What overseas travel by Mr. Muirhead has been paid for by the Government in relation to the Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs, what are the details of each trip, was he accompanied by other persons and if so whom, and what places were visited by Mr. Muirhead during this travel?

The reply stated:

Date	Particulars
1. Left UK—27/2/77	Air travel—London/Sydney,
Return UK—25/3/77	Adelaide/New York, Washington/London
2. Left UK—3/5/77	Air travel—London/San
Return UK—5/7/77	Francisco/Salem/San Francisco/Sydney/Adelaide/ London
3. Left UK—23/7/77	Air travel—London/Adelaide/
Return UK—7/11/77	London
4. Left UK—8/12/77	Air travel—London/London
Returned UK—6/5/78	
5. Left UK—29/5/78	Air travel—London/Adelaide/
Returned UK—13/8/78	London
6. In addition, Mr. Muirhead returned to Adelaide.	
Left UK—7/9/78	Air travel—London/Adelaide
(not yet charged to Premier's Department account)	

These trips are at the expense of South Australian taxpayers, and first-class, too. It is a ludicrous situation to fly this man back and forth in six trips from London, simply to give advice as a counsel to a Royal Commission in Adelaide.

That is quite unreal. For the Premier to assert that this is the only man who can do the job because he is in London, where there is a bigger drug problem, is sheer nonsense. I do not believe that the Williams Commission, at Federal level, would find it necessary to fly out an expert from Europe or from Amsterdam, because the drug problem there is greater, nor would the New South Wales Royal Commission. It would have been more sensible for the Government to try harder than it did to come to terms with the Federal Royal Commission, to see whether that Commission could assume the major responsibility of investigating drug trafficking, particularly in relation to hard drugs, throughout Australia.

Details of payments were given in reply to a question from the member for Davenport, as well as details of Mr. Muirhead's background and qualifications. The question sought details of payments to people who had done research for the Royal Commission. The member for Mitcham mentioned that Mr. Heine had been paid \$14 000. He was given another payment in addition. The member for Davenport asked the name of the researcher, the research project, and the cost.

The South Australian Institute of Technology, Social Planning Unit, was the researcher. Mr. W. Heine and Mr. D. Rimmington did a study entitled *Study of Criminal Statistics*, and were paid \$11 124 for the job. Ms M. Mune carried out a project entitled *Health Welfare Feasibility Study* and was paid \$1 200. There was another project costing more than \$9 600, and one costing \$1 400 entitled *Drugs and the Media*. A project entitled *Extent of Drug Use—Literature Review* cost \$2 210. Mr. M. Goode was paid \$6 100, whilst Dr. G. Cheshier, for a project entitled *Effects of Cannabis*, was paid a total of \$3 625 for his submissions—and so the list goes on.

If I believed that we would get from this Royal Commission conclusions that would settle the controversy in relation to our drug problem, and that we would get specific information that would not be elicited from the Federal Royal Commission, perhaps I could visualise \$800 000 to \$1 000 000 being well spent, but in my judgment it will not bring to South Australia the answer to any questions, particularly in relation to hard drugs, that

will not be answered by the Federal Royal Commission.

The fees paid to Mr. Muirhead I find astounding. I am allergic to lawyers as a breed. When the Premier tells us there is something wrong with us because we are not lawyers, that does not improve my attitude to them. To pay Mr. Muirhead such sums, and to fly him to and from London because he is the only person who can advise this Royal Commission, is incredible. As the member for Mitcham has learnt something from T. Playford, so we have learnt something from the member for Mitcham. I am convinced that these figures give cause for concern, particularly when South Australia is in such a parlous financial position. It is as close to going broke as it has been since I have been here.

**The Hon. D. W. Simmons:** Rubbish!

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Minister is out of order.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** If I had used my reserves and had a record deficit of \$25 000 000 when my neighbours had balanced their Budgets, I would be uneasy. We have the highest unemployment rate in the country, a deficit of \$25 000 000, and we have run down our reserves. The money from the sale of the railways has been dissipated on a short-term unemployment relief scheme, which has not created any long-term jobs. In a time of financial stringency, we should look hard at spending a sum approaching \$1 000 000. I support the motion.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I am obliged to the member for Kavel for his support. I do not intend to canvass all the matters the Premier raised but, frankly, he was at times hawing about this matter, to use his word. He took a guess on the question of legal fees paid to Johnston, Layton, Withers & Co. of \$9 234.40. I do not know whether he is right, but I doubt it. If it were a fee for assistant counsel, it should have been shown as that item, and not merely as legal fees. The Premier has made out this extraordinary argument that Mr. Muirhead, even though is not a silk, not even a barrister, not even at the Bar in London and could never take silk over there, has to be treated as senior counsel, as though he were a silk here in South Australia, and that is the justification for his fee. In my view, even if he were a senior silk, he would be being paid too much.

The Premier knows as well as I do that a silk must have a junior with him, and the rule in this State, as he well knows, is that the junior is paid two-thirds of the fee of his senior. That is the two-thirds rule, and that is why I interjected while he was speaking. The laymen in the House, the member for Kavel and others, should know the truth. If one has a silk, one must have a junior as well. The rule in this State is that the junior gets two-thirds of the fee of his senior, in addition to the fee paid to the senior. This is nothing like that. If Mr. Muirhead is to be regarded as a silk for the purposes of his own fee, then his assistant counsel should be getting two-thirds. It seems that he has not got a junior at all at the moment. I should like the Premier to make a few more inquiries about this matter, because he was guessing, and I think he guessed wrongly.

The Premier took a wild stab in the dark and said that Mr. Muirhead was being paid for the days he appears before the Commission. He may have kept away from it for two years, but he ought to know. I will not put it any higher than this: I am tolerably certain that I was told when I went to lunch there (I accepted it and have taken it for granted since) that it has not had any formal sittings.

There is no courtroom in which the Royal Commission is sitting. It is not taking evidence in a formal way as other Royal Commissions have taken it. There is no question of Mr. Muirhead's appearing before a formal tribunal of three men. They are not operating in that sense at all.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** What do they do? Do they sit down

and have a natter?

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Yes, it is completely informal. I believe, and I am sure this is right, that Mr. Muirhead is simply being paid for at least every working day that he is in Adelaide on this matter. There is no question of his appearing. If I am wrong, perhaps the Premier will tell me where I can go to watch the Commission in session. It sits where the Planning Appeal Board used to be. The courtroom has been dismantled, and I have had a look at that. We had lunch in a courtroom where I had appeared. It is wrong, and the Premier should not have tried to mislead the House in that way, even if it was only unwittingly. It is just lucky that I happen to know that.

I asked the Premier whether Dennis was being paid for seven days a week at \$300 a day or only for five days a week. I am sure it is not for only two days or three days a week. I suppose they are just going into the office every day (I hope they are), and doing whatever work there happens to be. There is no formality about it. The Premier should have known that, because it is his Royal Commission.

The Premier said that Dennis Muirhead is the only person that he knew of who could do the job, and he happened to be in London. Perhaps he is not a personal friend of the Premier or the Attorney, but that is what I have been led to believe. Indeed, it seemed to be the only credible reason to bring him here: that he was favoured and intimately known by these two gentlemen.

**The Hon. D. A. Dunstan:** Favourably known and being intimately known are different.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Not necessarily. The Premier will not divert me by that. I accepted what I had been told, that they were friends and that he had been appointed because of the friendship. I still cannot see any reason for his appointment if it were not that, because I am not at all convinced by the arguments that the Premier has advanced (I am glad to know that the member for Kavel was not convinced), and I do not believe that many people, certainly not in the legal profession, will be convinced by the defence that the Premier put up tonight.

I am still groping for the reason for Dennis's appointment. If it is not friendship, there is nothing else credible being put before us to justify the expense and inconvenience that is being caused. The Public Service (and even now they are creeping down here into Parliament), is riddled with people called researchers. It is absurd to say in such a matter as this that a person must have first-hand personal knowledge of the scene in London, New York, or San Francisco (if that is where he spent two months), to be able to do research.

What is research? Why cannot these things be researched by people in the Premier's Department, the Chief Secretary's Department, the Parliamentary Library or somewhere else? Is this not the very purpose for having these people? All this information is available nowadays. Communications are good, so that that argument does not wash at all. One does not need to have someone from London merely because they will know the scene in London. Indeed, it would be cheaper to send a researcher to London to look around and make a report than to bring Mr. Muirhead here for two or three years. That is just not acceptable to me. I know that I will never convince anyone on the other side, because they have to stick together and stand behind the Premier, whether they believe it or not, but I suspect that some of them are too shrewd to believe it, but they say that they do out of loyalty.

Those are the points that I make. It is nonsense to say that the fee of Johnston Layton Withers and Company is for assistant counsel. The Commission is not sitting formally on Sundays and Muirhead is being paid for the

days on which he appears before it. It was not necessary to bring someone out here when research could have been done from this end, anyway. It is no good saying any more: everything has been said. This, of all things, is a completely unjustifiable waste of money.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (17)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (23)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannan, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Drury, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Klunder, Langley, McRae, Olson, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Tonkin. No—Mr. Corcoran.

Majority of 6 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Line passed.

Services and Supply, \$8 363 000—passed.

Auditor-General, \$1 473 000.

**Mr. EVANS:** In Auditor-General's Reports in past years, when there has been an area of concern to him, it was the practice to have his statement printed more prominently, thus making it easier for the reader to pick it up. In the report for 1977-78, there appears to have been what I call a simplification. I am concerned that there may be a drift in this direction to make less and less material available, but my main concern is the change in past practice.

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Chief Secretary):** I do not know why any change has been made. The arrangement for the printing of the report is made by the Auditor-General. It seems to me that the report is at least as comprehensive as it has been previously. I do not think that there is any reason for the honourable member to complain. Certainly, the Government has not given any direction as to how he should present his report.

**Mr. EVANS:** I hope that the Chief Secretary will at least obtain a report from the Auditor-General as to why his comments on areas of concern to him are no longer printed in what I call proud type, thereby making them more conspicuous to the reader, so that Parliament may know why this change in practice has been made.

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** I will ask the Auditor-General why the change has taken place, if it has taken place.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** About three weeks ago, I asked the Premier to release to the House details of the Auditor-General's Report on the Frozen Food Factory. Pages 240-3 of the Auditor-General's Report refer to the operations of the Frozen Food Factory. Page 243 states:

Deficiencies disclosed by audit were referred to the Committee of Management on 13 July 1978. Discussions have taken place and certain matters are being reviewed.

At least three weeks ago, I asked the Premier whether he would release all the correspondence and reports that had passed between the Committee of Management and the Auditor-General. The Premier promised to look into the matter and to report back to the House, but he has not done so. To remind the Premier of the promise that he had made, about two weeks ago I took a note to one of the staff members in his office here, asking whether the Premier would tell us whether those reports and that correspondence could be released to members. Today I was disappointed that no such answer was given. I believe that the Government is responsible to make available to Parliament all matters raised in the Auditor-General's Report and in associated reports. It is important that Parliament know some of the reasons why the audit at the

factory was deficient, so I again ask that those reports be made available as quickly as possible.

**Mr. BECKER:** Can the Minister say whether the Auditor-General is satisfied that he has sufficient staff? I have been concerned for some time because, when the Auditor-General comments that such and such has happened or that there have been discrepancies in various departments, it is difficult to ascertain what has happened thereafter or whether anything has been rectified.

I realise that it is up to us to seek that information. However, on 12 September I asked the Minister of Education a question regarding school losses. I referred to the entry in the Auditor-General's Report this year that property valued at \$125 396 had been stolen from 398 schools. I compared that to the losses for the financial year ended 30 June 1977 wherein the Auditor-General stated that there had been 273 thefts from 239 schools, involving \$36 848. On 26 September, the Minister of Education advised me that, in relation to the Auditor-General's Report regarding school losses, the amounts quoted included theft and replacement of equipment damaged by vandalism; also, due to an error in the Auditor-General's Report, the sum of \$36 848 for 1977 should have been \$64 617.

This is not the first time that there has been an error in his report. I understand that last year the figures quoted for out-patients for the Flinders Medical Centre were incorrect and varied considerably. In the Auditor-General's Report, they were understated. I find it difficult to match the figures from one year's report with the figures for the next year. I would not expect his reports to contain errors. Can the Minister say whether the Auditor-General is satisfied with the present staffing situation in his department?

Also, can members be assured that, when reports are made to us, members are not left up in the air, as they were in relation to hospitals and other Government departments? One must read between the lines to work out what the Auditor-General is trying to relate or whether something needs closer scrutiny.

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** I shall be pleased to get particulars of staff numbers in the Auditor-General's Department for the honourable member. I can give a reply about whether the Auditor-General was satisfied with his staff levels. When the Cabinet announced the manpower freeze, I asked the Auditor-General (as I did each of my departmental heads) whether it posed any problems, to which he replied, "No, I can live well within the existing staff level." In fact, no provision has been made for extra staff in the Auditor-General's Department this year. The Auditor-General does an impartial and efficient job for the benefit of this Parliament, and I was indeed pleased to see that he could continue to do so.

**Mr. Becker:** What about the error regarding the Education Department?

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** My attention has not been drawn to that but it would be incredible if, in a report of the size of the Auditor-General's Report, there were not errors occasionally. However, the general level of accuracy and efficiency in the Auditor-General's Department has been extremely high for many years.

**Mr. EVANS:** Can this Parliament be satisfied that the Auditor-General has available to him the necessary expertise and equipment to be as sure as possible that this State is not likely to be have a major computer crime committed in it, which crime would be difficult to track down? In other countries where it was thought that these aspects were covered, computer crimes have occurred and major amounts of public funds have been defrauded. Will the Chief Secretary give me a report so that members can

be assured that, because of the sophistication of computers and their operators today, this area is covered?

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** Again, I have heard no complaint from either the present Auditor-General or the previous one about any deficiency in this area. I note that in the contingencies item provision is made for nearly \$18 000 extra this year, and part of that sum is for additional computer charges incurred through the A.D.P. centre for a full year for the common pay-roll system, as well as greater use of the computer by the A.D.P. Specialist Section to test the computer systems in Government departments. An extra allocation is made this year to pay for extra audit tests of Government department operations. I can only assume that the Auditor-General is aware of the problems involved and is taking steps to deal with them.

Line passed.

Police, \$60 905 000.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** I refer to the allocation for overseas visits by officers. Does this relate to the overseas visits that were announced by the Premier in connection with the work of Special Branch? If it does not, where will that expenditure be incurred? One remembers the Government's announcements that it intended to dismember Special Branch and to reduce its numbers to, I think, two members in its eagerness to get rid of what, to the Government, were obviously painful recommendations in Mr. Justice White's report into the activities of Special Branch.

It was revealed that files were being kept on Labor members of Parliament, which revelation obviously hurt the feelings of Government members, and, in its haste to get the records destroyed, the Government was going to reduce Special Branch to only two members.

We understand that the Premier was negotiating with the Federal Government to rationalise security services throughout the Commonwealth. When I asked the Chief Secretary how far negotiations had gone in relation to rationalising its efforts, he said he did not know and that the matter was being conducted at the Premier's level. That seemed strange, because the Chief Secretary is in charge of the Police Department, and I understand that he vets all communications that go to the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation from South Australia's Special Branch. I also understand Mr. Justice White was going to vet anything that went to ASIO. However, the Chief Secretary said that Special Branch was finding it difficult to do its job of destroying the files, which seemed to be its main activity.

**Mr. Klunder:** How do you know?

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** I know, because the Chief Secretary said so. The two fellows left in Special Branch were busy destroying the files and had to get someone to help them. Mr. Justice White, with these two policemen, is really snowed under destroying files. I was a little curious about who was keeping an eye on security matters while these two men were busy destroying the Special Branch files that were so damaging to the sense of propriety, particularly of Government members. However, the Premier said at one stage of this shooting match that the Government would send a high-ranking officer overseas to investigate the latest in security measures.

I presume the officer would be sent to Britain. I do not think he was being sent to America, because Mr. Justice White was not complimentary about security measures in that country. Indeed, he was at pains to quote a long section from a publication called *New Yorker* which was critical of security services in America. Although the Government intended to send someone overseas to check up on the latest security services, the Chief Secretary did

not know what arrangements had been made with the Federal Government. Therefore, the scene seemed fairly confused.

The only clear fact to emerge was that two police officers plus Mr. Justice White were snowed under destroying files. In relation to this item are the overseas visits by officers connected with security services? If not, what is the item connected with? What overseas visits of security officers does the Government envisage?

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** The item for which \$6 000 is provided this year is not to send security chiefs overseas. It is to provide for forensic science training to be undertaken in the United Kingdom during 1978-79. That is why the Commissioner of Police has put that item on the lines.

If the honourable member is interested in the situation with the Special Branch it is not quite correct (and I would like to correct the *Hansard* record) to say that I said I did not have a clue about what was going on. The situation was, and still is, that arising out of the Salisbury case and the notification the Premier sent to the Prime Minister, the Prime Minister showed remarkable initiative and suggested to the States they should formalise relations between State Special Branches and ASIO as recommended by Mr. Justice Hope. That matter is still in the hands of Mr. Justice Hope to formalise something which will no doubt be agreed upon at a Premiers Conference in due course.

I was unsure of the latest position regarding those negotiations, but I checked after the honourable member asked his question and I was assured by the Commissioner of Police that no information had been passed to ASIO, because there had been no requests for any information. It was never the intention that I, as Chief Secretary, would cast a fatherly eye over the information to see if it was proper. It was intended that Mr. Justice White would examine the request and recommend to me that certain information should be passed or if he thought it was appropriate. The setting up of the Star Force is still in the organisational stages.

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** I refer to the salaries of members of the Police Force. Does the increase in salaries for assistant commissioners, superintendents, inspectors, sergeants, constables and probationary constables represent an increase overall in numbers, or solely increased salaries? What is the reason for the decrease in salaries paid to cadets? Are fewer cadets being recruited? Is there a need for fewer cadets or are fewer responding to recruitment drives?

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** There are three new commissioned officer appointments this year, which accounts for some of the increase in expenditure. There is also provision for nine non-commissioned officers to be promoted to the rank of inspector and that will further add to that group.

As far as the sergeants, constables and probationary constables item is concerned, I will explain that, and also the next item, relating to cadets. The Police Department is in the process of changing over from a three-year to a two-year cadet course. This will mean that there will be a reduction of the number of cadets in training at any one time, but in the short term there will be more people coming forward to serve in the force. The changeover in cadet training from a three-year to a two-year scheme will result in the appointment of an increased number of cadets, estimated at 270, to the rank of probationary constable. There is are two years' output in the cadet course whereas there would be one in a three-year course.

There has been an increase in the strength of the force and the number of cadets will be reduced, but only for the

reason I have just mentioned. The strength anticipated for 1978-79 of 435 will be down to 214 by 30 June next year and this will more than cover the continuing impact of salary determinations of automatic age increments. There will be more cadets being appointed as probationary constables this year, but fewer cadets in training because they are doing a two-year course instead of a three-year course.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** I refer to the higher allocation of \$38 951 600 for salaries. Is it anticipated that the Drug Squad will be enlarged? What is the present manpower of the Drug Squad? Is it intended to extend the manpower of the squad, and will dogs be used to assist? We are all aware of the increase in the drug problem and in Virginia now there is going to be a shortage of tomatoes because they are all growing drugs up there.

**Dr. Eastick:** Rephrase that, say "some".

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Apparently there are still some people growing tomatoes at Virginia. There is a problem using dogs in relation to drugs, but I believe that has been overcome in other countries and the operations are quite successful, particularly in using dogs on cases when the police have special information.

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** I cannot say what the intentions are in connection with strengthening the drug squad, but I will find out from the Commissioner of Police what the plans are for the coming year. I do not think the Commissioner would fail to increase the strength of the squad if he thought it was necessary to increase it. He deploys his staff extremely capably, and I have been most impressed since I have been Minister in charge of the Police Department with the various measures taken to get the most effective use of the manpower available. Regarding dogs, only last weekend I read a report of a Ministerial conference held in Sydney or Canberra in June which the Minister of Health, then Acting Chief Secretary, attended. The conference considered the policing of the drug problem, and my colleague referred to 12 dogs being trained for this operation in South Australia. The Commonwealth Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs (Mr. Fife) stated that Commonwealth assistance was available for training dogs in sniffing out heroin. There was also discussion as to why German shepherd dogs were used for this purpose. One of the Ministers thought that bloodhounds might sniff more sensitively than German shepherds would. I think Commonwealth assistance is available for dogs to be trained in sniffing out heroin. Only yesterday morning, after reading the report, I asked my staff to see whether we were taking up that offer, because we cannot afford to miss a chance of getting something out of the Commonwealth Government.

**Mr. BLACKER:** Regarding State Emergency Services, there are increases in the allocations for salaries, operating expenses, minor equipment, sundries, and subsidies to local government bodies. However, there is no allocation at all for the purchase of motor vehicles, plant and equipment for State Emergency Services. What plans does the Government have for the further extension of State Emergency Services, particularly in country areas?

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** I am informed that provision is made for the appointment of three regional officers, as required by the State disaster plan, subject to vacancies occurring elsewhere in the department. This provision would account for the increase in salaries.

**Mr. Wotton:** Where will the three regional officers be?

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** I do not have that information at present, but I will get it for the honourable member if it is available. I am informed that no motor vehicles will be purchased in 1978-79. If the officers are appointed, I do not know how they will be serviced with

motor vehicles.

**Mr. WOTTON:** Can the Minister explain exactly what the item "North-west policing" covers?

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** The Police Department has been active in recent years in providing police surveillance of the North-West of the State in Aboriginal reserves. At about this time last year Mr. Salisbury made a one-week inspection of the area, and I think he was also in the area last January, when the White Report was first considered. The Police Department believes it is desirable to expand its surveillance of the area not only to enforce the law but also to pursue a policy of promoting good relations between Aborigines and the Police Department. This provision allows for increased operating costs, including aircraft maintenance, because aircraft are an integral part of the Police Department's activities in that area.

**Mr. RUSSACK:** Does the provision for the development of a firearms control system relate to the legislation passed some time ago for which regulations are now being prepared? If so, when is it expected that regulations will be completed, and for what purposes will the provision of \$250 000 be spent?

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** The honourable member is quite correct: this provision relates to the implementation of the firearms regulations. Draft regulations were prepared and sent out to a wide range of interested parties, who made submissions. These submissions have been considered, and I hope a final draft will be available within the next few days. I have arranged for that draft to be sent to the people who made submissions, to ensure that the alterations made in response to one set of submissions do not adversely affect someone else. I think we have a high measure of agreement between the interested parties.

Only two weeks ago a firm of consultants was given the job of the first 14-week stage of preparing a system to handle the matter on a computer. It is expected that 150 000 licences will be issued annually under the new legislation. The only effective way of handling this big job is by computer. The first stage should be completed before Christmas, and the rest of the computer work will take place next year. It is expected that almost all of the provision of \$250 000 will be used for the design of the computer system. The implementation of it will be much more expensive, but that will take place in the next financial year. The target date for introducing the regulations is 1 November 1979. Again, the critical time is not the time involved in writing the regulations; that job has been going along steadily and thoroughly. The regulations could be made available quickly, but the implementation of the system is a much bigger and more expensive job, because it requires a separate computer.

**Mr. EVANS:** I am astounded that this is only a minor part of the total cost of putting into operation legislation about which the Opposition raised some doubts and fought for amendments. I suppose we were remiss in not asking the Government what would be the cost of putting the legislation into operation. I take it from the Chief Secretary's comments that \$250 000 will be only a minute part of the total cost. I am concerned at the large sum that will be involved in relation to the registration of guns and that the legislation may not achieve all the goals we want to achieve anyway. More particularly, I am concerned that the Minister admits that copies of draft regulations have been made available to persons who have shown an interest by making submissions on the proposals, yet members of the Opposition who made submissions in this Parliament about the proposed legislation have not been given a copy of the regulations or the updated regulations.

I ask the Minister why the Opposition has not been given a copy of the draft regulations of the updated draft regulations. We have shown our interest by debate in this House and by comments outside the House, and submissions have been made to the Government in this House.

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** The updated draft is not available yet, because it is still in the process of being worked out. I hope it will be available in a few days. I think that a copy of the initial draft was supplied to the Parliamentary Library. I asked that it be supplied, but I did not check to see whether or not it was. However, I shall be delighted to give any member of the Opposition a copy of this clean draft. That will save a lot of work, because some things were ironed out and very valuable suggestions were made by a range of organisations. The clean draft, which should be available next week, is pretty close to a final and satisfactory document. It is desirable to let people who are interested and involved see what is the final wash-up of all the considerations and submissions. For that reason, it will be open until about the end of October for any new comments or any observations on alterations that may have been made. If members of the Opposition want to make any submissions during that time, the Government would be pleased to have them.

Concerning the total cost, the honourable member is quite right: it is estimated that the total cost of implementing the scheme will be about \$1 800 000, because of handling the matter by computer. Because of the magnitude of clerical operations, the most practical way of doing it is by computer. A substantial capital outlay will be involved in implementing this scheme. The Police Department has designed a system called SPARS, which is an acronym for South Australian Police Automated Retrieval System. This will be one of the jobs that will be put onto that computer system. I am concerned about that, because it will be a much more expensive operation than just handling the fire-arms legislation. I am concerned to see that it will be a properly integrated system. It will be possible, for example, to obtain information relating to crime statistics and so on, in reply to questions from Opposition members. That is not the only reason why we should have more adequate crime statistics, but it will be useful to have some more reliable statistics readily available. There is an obvious relationship between police statistics and convictions and corrections, length of sentences, and that sort of thing.

I consider that the SPARS system, which was designed originally by the Police department to look after the needs of that department, ought to be expanded. When I was in New Zealand about a month ago I went to Wanganui where there was a special law enforcement computer system designed by the consultants who are doing this work. They would be pre-eminent in the world in designing such systems. The system at Wanganui is divorced from the A.D.P. system at Wellington, which deals with housekeeping operations and it is run under special security conditions and under a special Act designed to prevent unauthorised access to information. This also gives protection to people in relation to the accuracy of the records contained in it. Obviously, that is the correct way to go about this sort of thing. Although this is the first instalment of just over \$1 800 000 to handle fire-arms registration regulations, it is part of an intergrated police computer system which will add considerably to the efficiency and effectiveness of the police force.

I was most impressed in Scotland when I went to Police Headquarters at Strathclyde. The Chief Superintendent who was showing me around put his name into the console



and four seconds later information was received from Hendon about his name, address, any convictions and so on. Of course, he had no convictions. In Kansas City, U.S.A., one-man patrol cars are used, and they are equipped with a computer console. The number of a car can be keyed in and in about 18 seconds information can be received from Phoenix, Arizona, on that car. All cars in the United States are covered in the data base for that system. This is of immeasurable value to the Police Department. It is also very expensive and not a thing we will rush into but I am actively looking at the scheme and having a top-level committee look at where we are going in this whole area. We cannot afford to do it piecemeal. Returning to the original question, a considerable sum will be involved and this provision is a first instalment of what will be used to implement the fire-arms regulations.

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS** moved:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

**Mr. BECKER:** I seek information relating to the Police Commissioner and his residence. I understand that the Commissioner still resides at the police barracks at Thebarton and that the officer-in-charge of the Thebarton barracks has always resided at the barracks. In November 1976, the State Government purchased a property known as *Cummins*, at Cummins Park. The Government paid \$185 000 for the property, which is costing \$5 000 per annum to maintain. I am not aware of any use to which the property has been put since its purchase from the Morphett family. A committee is looking into the matter to advise the Premier on its use. There is a resident caretaker.

Perhaps the Government should now consider whether the property would be an appropriate residence for the Police Commissioner. In the past, of course, the Commissioner has been a South Australian, with his own house, but I believe we should consider providing the Commissioner with a residence. As I understand his role, he is required on occasions to entertain visiting officers from other States and from other countries, and *Cummins* would be ideal for that purpose. I am concerned that, when we acquire properties of historic value, they should be put to some viable use. The State is paying the maintenance and has provided a caretaker. There is a separate cottage within the property complex. I believe *Cummins* would be a suitable residence for the Police Commissioner, whether he was a local person or not.

**Mr. Mathwin:** What about the garden?

**Mr. BECKER:** The caretaker could be retained. Recent media reports indicate that the department has acquired land north of Lightburn's, but I do not know for what purpose that land is to be used. If the Police Commissioner is required, as part of his duty, to entertain, I do not think he should use his own residence, and we should be prepared to offer him a suitable residence. The Morphett residence is historic, a gentleman's residence, with grounds sufficient to be in keeping with the appointment and position of Commissioner. The Minister may wish to consult the Commissioner and the Premier to see whether such a suggestion is practicable.

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** The decision has been pre-empted by the Commissioner. For some years, as Deputy Commissioner and as Commissioner, he has been living in a house at the Thebarton barracks, but he has built a house at Echunga and will be moving into it next weekend. I was on a visit to the training depot of the mounted section at Echunga only on Wednesday last, when the Commissioner told me that his house was only two or three kilometres away. It would have been ready earlier

had it not been for the wet winter.

The house he presently occupies at Thebarton barracks will be made available for the State Emergency Services, which will move there from some less satisfactory accommodation at Thebarton barracks. Part of the Thebarton operation will be transferred to the Lightburn land, and I look forward to the day when the Police Department will be able to leave the Thebarton area completely, allowing the land to revert to park lands. I am moving in that direction.

**Mr. WILSON:** Does the Minister foresee any difficulties with police stations, especially those in country areas, being proclaimed as sobering-up centres, as contemplated in new legislation before the House? There is a possibility that many police stations will be proclaimed as such centres. Does the Minister foresee difficulties in staffing or administration, and will additional costs be involved in administration?

In relation to raids on market gardens and glasshouses containing marihuana crops in the Virginia area, I do not ask the Minister to pass on information at the moment if it would be prejudicial to any investigation, but I should like information at some future stage. Such raids must have been planned well in advance. Can the Minister say how long the planning has gone on; what degree of co-operation has existed between the South Australian Police Drug Squad and Federal authorities, such as the Narcotics Bureau and the Commonwealth Police; whether any additional staff has been required for this enormous endeavour on the part of the South Australian Police; if possible, can we find out where the seeds came from for the growth of the marihuana, and how many crops; finally, is it intended that information gained on these raids will be placed before the South Australian Royal Commission into drugs or before the Australian Royal commission?

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** It would not be appropriate for me to give some of the information here, even if I knew it. I shall take note of the questions and let the honourable member have as much information as possible. It might be difficult to find out where the seeds came from, even though a considerable amount of seed must have been used.

Obviously, marihuana is a freely growing plant, and I guess that one can get the seeds in a number of areas. Certainly, I shall be surprised if the police are not giving evidence before the Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs. I will get an answer as quickly as I can for the honourable member.

Concerning sobering-up centres in the country, I have had no complaints from the police that any problems will arise. I know that the Police Department is keen to get rid of as many extraneous duties as possible, so that it can concentrate on its primary function of maintaining law and order, but I have received no complaints on that score.

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** An item deals with the payment for termination of services of one of the finest Police Commissioners that South Australia has ever known. So far as the Opposition is concerned, this provision spells the hypocrisy of a Government that will stop at nothing to achieve its purposes. I imagine that it represents the last official word of the Government on the subject of the former Police Commissioner, and doubtless the Government hopes that the matter will now be forgotten. However, we are here to assure the Government that it will not be forgotten by the people of South Australia: not in the life of this Parliament or of many Parliaments to come.

**Mr. RUSSACK:** Referring to the development of a firearms control system, the Minister said that the establishment of the computer service would cost about

\$1 800 000. Is that for the initial establishment of the system, or is it the annual fee? If it is not, what will be the annual cost or estimate?

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** It is not the running cost of the system: it is the cost involved in establishing it. That will be considerable, involving not only the purchase of the computer but also the provision of the necessary accommodation in which to house it, the provision of remote terminals, and so on. It will be necessary to check the existing record of registrations of firearms, bringing that record up to date, and so on. There will be a high establishment cost involved in this operation. The running cost will not be small, but it is expected that a fairly nominal charge will apply. It has yet to be finally determined (the computer consultants, as I have said, are still in the early stages of planning the system), but it has been suggested that the fee could be about \$4 a licence. Its objective is to make the system self-financing, so that if we think in terms of about 130 000 firearms licence applications a year, we are thinking of about \$500 000. It is not a cheap operation, but the Government believes, and the Police Department certainly believes, that it is necessary to achieve this level of control if we are to combat the problem of firearms.

**Dr. EASTICK:** I refer to the State Emergency Services, for which there is a great increase in funding this year. Concerning the purchase of motor vehicles, plant and equipment, no sum is allocated this year, yet the amount provided for operating expenses, minor equipment and sundries has increased from \$7 979 last year to \$57 180 this year. Subsidies to local government bodies, previously \$17 240, have been increased to \$40 000.

I appreciated the opportunity earlier this year to attend, at Mount Macedon, the special briefing given to members of Parliament from around Australia, in association with their directors or their representatives of the various emergency services in Australia. I acknowledge the contribution that the member for Morphett made on this issue in a recent report in the *News*, in which he referred to South Australia's activities under the control of Chief Superintendent Ern Ashton, who, as one of the longest-serving State directors, has made a worthwhile contribution, and whose views were keenly sought by other participants, particularly the directors and deputy directors from other States.

It became apparent at that briefing that some States (regrettably, South Australia appears to be among them) have paid only lip service to preparing legislation to implement the State emergency powers should a major emergency arise. We are most fortunate in Australia not to have experienced the type of emergencies that have taken place elsewhere in the world. One of the worst tragedies to which I could refer would be the 87 deaths in the Granville train disaster; yet, the size of that disaster pales into insignificance when one considers the loss of life in the floods in Bangladesh, and elsewhere, where they talk of 200 000 and 300 000 people being lost. The word coming out of the Republic of China on the major earthquake that occurred there two or three years ago is that the number of deaths could have been about 650 000. We have the experience from South America, Greece, Turkey, Iran and other Middle Eastern countries, where major calamities have occurred, and we do not seek to emulate their record. I hope that we are never placed in the position of requiring emergency services of that magnitude.

We need to be prepared, however, and I believe that the work undertaken in South Australia over a long time has been significant. I recall, as Mayor of the Corporation of Gawler, being required to nominate persons to undertake

special activities associated with the disaster organisations. From the Deputy Director (Mr. Nicholls) I have had several briefings on the activity that has taken place to bring into line the various services available throughout South Australia. I recognise that many service organisations play a significant part. I acknowledge the exercise that has already been undertaken of determining where refugees from a major accident in South Australia would be deployed into country areas, and which organisations, buildings and transport arrangements would be involved and put into use early should any calamity arise. I am not decrying the increase in the allocations, but I question whether they are adequate. I have noted the Chief Secretary's comment that it is intended to deploy the staff of the unit into more appropriate surroundings at the Thebarton barracks.

Although I welcome that news, I should appreciate hearing from the Chief Secretary a fuller explanation of the nature of the proposed changes. I should certainly like to see an opportunity given to more members of Parliament to undertake at Mount Macedon a briefing on the state of preparedness around Australia. I would certainly support any arrangement that might be entered into between the States and the Commonwealth to enable at least an annual briefing of a member of Parliament of both political persuasions. I do not believe that too many people can be made aware of the importance of this organisation, so that they know about the work it does and can speak more widely about it.

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** I welcome the honourable member's comments, particularly those relating to Chief Superintendent Aston. I have been concerned recently about the State's Emergency Services, which come under my responsibility. I have had a chance recently to catch up with some of those areas. Indeed, about five weeks ago, when I went to Tasmania for a couple of days to look at correctional institutions I also took the opportunity of seeing that State's emergency centre, of which a South Australian is in charge. Tasmania has a highly-developed emergency service, as the honourable member probably knows. The increase from \$7 500 last year to \$57 180 this year for operating expenses, minor equipment and sundries for the State Emergency Services has arisen partly because of increased operating expenses as well as the establishment of regional offices in certain parts of the country.

**Dr. Eastick:** Can you give details of that?

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** I will obtain for the honourable member what information I can. The honourable member also referred to the increased allocation for subsidies to local government bodies. The marked increase from \$22 000 last year to \$40 000 this year has occurred because it is intended in the coming year to increase from \$1 000 to \$2 500 the maximum subsidy to councils to help them in this part of the co-operative exercise. We in South Australia are fortunate that, generally speaking, we have a much more stable environment than they have in other parts of Australia. Certainly there is no comparison between South Australia and Bangladesh. I agree that an earthquake or a major bushfire is probably likely to be the most common cause of emergency here. We are probably more fortunate than other parts of Australia, where those concerned must provide more actively for contingencies such as cyclones, typhoons, and so on.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** I refer to the lines dealing with additions to the motor vehicle fleet, the net cost of fleet replacements, and the purchase of technical and other equipment. Last year, I raised the matter of motor cycles. Will the Minister ascertain whether motor cycles are now

equipped with radios? I said last year that only three motor cycles were so equipped.

**Mr. Evans:** Three out of 120!

**Mr. MATHWIN:** That is right. What is the situation now? It is imperative that the solo motor cyclist have contact, because he is sent into areas where he is alone and, if anybody needs radio contact, it is the officer who is alone. He needs it for communication and in some cases to get help from colleagues. On the same line \$1 159 100 is provided for extra fleet replacement. I presume there would be some allocation for further Q cars in an attempt to make roads safer, to catch people who speed, and so on: they are one method of deterring people from breaking the law. The Minister would be well aware that in other parts of the world, particularly the United Kingdom, Q cars are of different makes, to keep people alert and stop them from breaking the law.

There was an advancement in equipping the police with silver-grey uniforms last year, as that was an improvement on the dark blue uniform, but when the dark is just breaking dawn or when it is just getting dark the silver-grey suit worn by motor cyclists is difficult to see. Perhaps some consideration could have been given by the Minister's department on equipment for these motor-cycle police, because they are vulnerable, as are all motor cyclists. One of the greatest problems a motor cyclist has is not being seen by a motorist, a situation that may cause accidents. As the colour used should be orange or yellow, has any thought been given to further safety clothing for motor-cycle police?

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** I will pass on the suggestion to the Commissioner. Knowing the thoroughness with which the police research these things, I would be surprised if research had not been undertaken into the most effective form of clothing to be worn. My notes inform me that there is provision for the purchase of an extra 13 motor cycles. Five will be going to Traffic and eight to Christies Beach Traffic. Because of the regionalisation of traffic operations, it is necessary to deploy more motor cycles in that area. In the past few days I have been reading a report of the Commissioner of Police for the year ended June 1977 that I hope will be tabled in the House tomorrow. That report refers to a reduction in the number of motor cycles.

Provision is made for the purchase of 13 additional motor cycles, because of regionalisation. When I spoke to the Commissioner of Police about the question of radios, he told me that many problems are experienced in connection with radios on motor cycles, because of the vibration. I do not think the Commissioner was so impressed with the need for radios to be supplied on motor cycles; at any rate, not in the form of attachments to helmets. I will raise the question of uniforms with the Commissioner.

**Mr. BECKER:** For several years I have raised the question of the need for a helicopter. During the 1977 election campaign the Premier announced that the State Government would acquire a helicopter for the use of the Police Department and the Health Commission and that the helicopter would be operating by the following summer. Last April I issued a press statement about the need for a helicopter for emergency work and police work, because I was concerned that little progress had been made. The information I had at that stage was that the Police Department and the health authorities could not agree on the type of helicopter that should be purchased. I issued a press statement that the Government had gone cold on the idea. An article headed "Rescue 'Copter ready soon", in the *Southern Times* of 12 April 1978 states:

State Government plans to buy an emergency-rescue

helicopter are "well under way", according to Mawson M.P. Les Drury.

He said statements by Hanson M.P. Heini Becker in last Saturday's daily paper that the Government had "gone cold" on the proposal "were nonsense".

"The Government will most certainly buy a helicopter," Mr. Drury said.

He said Health Minister Don Banfield had advised him of the latest development in the purchase of the \$300 000 helicopter.

"The delay in purchasing the helicopter is due to the fact none are manufactured in Australia," Mr. Drury explained.

"For this reason tenders have to be advertised overseas and maintenance staff have to be trained."

"Mr. Becker's claims are nonsense, and he would do better checking his facts before making statements for publicity's sake."

I did not reply to that stupid article, because I am sick and tired of the slandering meanderings of incompetent Labor politicians. The honourable member's information is incorrect. Before I asked Questions on Notice and before I made the press statement that Government departments could not agree, the agent in Sydney had not been approached. We will let Mr. Drury see for himself. The article continues

In his policy speech last August Mr. Dunstan said the Government was examining ways to finance a helicopter and this included giving the Police Commissioner the borrowing power of a statutory corporation.

"Since the election was only held six months ago time must be spent thoroughly investigating the scheme so that taxpayers' money is spent wisely .

"When the cost of the helicopter is considered—\$300 000—with running costs at \$100 000 per year, time spent checking all aspects of the purchase will be time well spent."

Mr. Drury said the Victorian Government recently decided to buy a helicopter and had already called tenders. They used a helicopter to assess its potential, and the Victorian police are convinced it will be an asset in crime fighting and other work," Mr. Drury said.

On 5 July, I received the following letter from the Deputy Premier

I refer to your Question on Notice (No. 429) asked of the Premier during the last session of Parliament, regarding a proposal to purchase a helicopter. The following information is now provided in answer:

1. The investigations are still being conducted. The Chief Secretary will be continuing inquiries, both into the use of helicopters and types and cost of such vehicles on his current overseas tour.
2. It is intended that the helicopter will be shared by the Police Department and the Health Commission.
3. As soon as possible .
4. See 1. Above.

That article in April, and the Deputy Premier's reply to me, proved that election promises had been made without any homework being done. It was promised to the people for the summer of 1977-78; yet we were told well into July that the matter was still being investigated. As early as March I knew that the two departments could not agree on the type of helicopter suggested in the policy speech.

This is a classic example of the Government, and particularly the Premier, making election promises and working the problems out later. He has been getting away with this for years. Buying a helicopter is not a nation-rocking decision even for South Australia, but it is an example of how people are being misled. We are getting fed up with the Government getting away with this type of tactic. If this sort of thing was done in Canberra, I can

imagine the scream and the motions that would be forthcoming by Government members here. The Government takes every opportunity to openly criticise anything that a Liberal Government does anywhere in Australia. Yet in this State, people were told that the Government was concerned about the various services for which this helicopter would be made available.

The helicopter was quite a real issue for the electors of Mawson. It is also of concern to people in the southern part of the city, around the Christies Beach area, because of the difficulty of access to Flinders Medical Centre. There is no hospital in the Christies-Noarlunga area and, with the huge volume of traffic on the main South Road, it is essential that there should be some emergency service to take accident victims to Flinders Medical Centre and also to render assistance in accidents that occur along the seafloor and the cliffs.

At about the time my attention was drawn to the problem regarding the Government's decision on the helicopter, a rescue operation was necessary when someone fell down a cliff. The people tried to get the only helicopter normally available in South Australia, that being from the R.A.A.F. at Edinburgh, but regrettably it was not available. If the helicopter is at Edinburgh, it can be made available for emergency use if it is not being used for training purposes or for R.A.A.F. work, or if it is not on standby in relation to aircraft exercise. It is now 13 months since the State election, and we have not got the helicopter. I was informed by the Deputy Premier that the Minister was going overseas to study this matter, and I would appreciate a report on what has happened. A report in the *News* some weeks ago states

An Adelaide aviation firm has purchased this \$200 000 helicopter for commercial and emergency rescue hire. Already the helicopter is at work—yesterday it was used by the South Australian Housing Trust for aerial photography over Elizabeth and Noarlunga. Next week the Bel Jet Ranger, purchased by Lloyd Aviation, will be hired for television commercial pictures and later to spray agricultural crops. Manager of the firm, Mr. Guy Lloyd (pictured with his aircraft), said today: "We are also tendered for a Fisheries Department exercise."

I do not know whether that is the type of helicopter the Government is looking at, but it is a pity the Police Department and the Health Commission were in conflict about the type required. Can the Minister say when the machine will be purchased and when it will be in operation in this State?

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** I do not know exactly when the helicopter will be in operation, but it will be much earlier than the hospital the honourable member's Party promised for the same area at the 1977 election. The provision of the helicopter was an election promise, and it will be fulfilled. The Government's term still has some time to go.

Initially, the Health Commission and the Police Department put forward quite radically different specifications for a machine. The health authorities wanted an aerial ambulance, which would cost \$700 000, and the Police Department would have been satisfied with a helicopter for ordinary operation, such as traffic surveillance, for which the Bell machine would have been satisfactory, at about \$300 000.

Whilst overseas, I looked into the matter. I had heard that the Poles had the second largest light aircraft industry in the world and were specialising in supplying the whole Soviet bloc, and they are now selling to Arabia as well as to, I think, Esso, outside their area. The type of the machine was rationalised within the Soviet bloc, and it was available at an appreciably lower price than that of the

American and continental machines. I looked at a machine, and went up in it. Subsequently, in New York I paid to go up in a helicopter to see how effective it would be for surveillance. In Chicago, the Australian Consul-General arranged a luncheon at which I met several leading people, including the Chief of Police Special Operations Group, who arranged for me to go up from Meigs Airfield in one of the group's helicopters.

In Tokyo I went up in one of the Fire Brigade helicopters. They also do ambulance work, so it was relevant to my investigations. The Chicago man told me that their experience was to try not to transport people to hospital by helicopters where one could avoid it. It was much better to transport them by surface vehicle with all the facilities that could be made available.

There was less shock to the victim, but it was most important to get medical aid to a victim and have his condition telemetered back to the hospital so that effective aid could be given to stabilise the condition of the patient, who could then be transported in a more normal and less traumatic way by surface vehicle. That was their conclusion and it was most encouraging, because it means that, instead of having to have a big machine with room for much apparatus, stretchers, and so forth, one could get back to the type of machine that would be suitable for police work.

I had discussions only the week before last (during the last sitting week) with a representative of a firm who came to see me in this place about this matter. We are going into it as quickly as possible, but it is not a cheap operation. I was staggered in Tokyo to be told that they have five helicopters and that they generally manage to keep two available at any one time.

In Tokyo it was a French machine, which I am told is not terribly reliable. The Tasmanian Service runs a helicopter, which is a hired machine. In the first year, they had it on standby and on a 45-minute response time, a fairly long time. It cost the service \$60 000 standby time, apart from the operating cost.

This year the service is cutting the response time to 15 minutes but this is increasing the cost markedly as a result. Tasmania was fortunate because it had one firm doing much work by helicopter and, therefore, it was able to guarantee the availability of a machine much more easily than could a firm with only one helicopter, or even a Government department with only one helicopter. This matter should be looked at carefully. It is being looked at carefully and as quickly as possible so that we will provide the helicopter to give effect to that election promise.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** I was pleased to hear the Minister speak of the possible purchase of a computer for statistics in the Police Department. Part of a reply to a question that I received today states

There is no specific Statistics Branch as such within the Police Department.

Yet we know that Police Commissioner Draper has stated that, "The quality of crime statistics in South Australia needed improvement for a variety of reasons". I was further surprised at an answer I received from the Police Department to a question I asked recently concerning drunk driving. I would have thought that the department would have had the information concerning drunk driving and juveniles. The reply to my Question on Notice was that the information was not available, but surely that would be a department in which it would be imperative for such statistics to be maintained. We know the complications of it: we know what happens with drinking and driving. Indeed, we know of the high number of casualties related to alcohol and driving. Certainly, I found it hard to understand why there was no information

on this matter in the Police Department. I doubted the statement. I suggest that the department must have such figures.

There may be a good reason why the department does not keep separate statistics for drunk driving offences involving juveniles. If a system is to work, we must have the statistics to know where we are going. Otherwise, we are wasting our time. I was pleased to hear the Minister say that, possibly, a computer will be purchased for the Police Department, because that could only improve the situation in regard to statistics.

**Mr. RODDA:** I refer to the item North-West Policing, for which \$79 450 has been allocated, or an increase of \$13 450. Does the Minister intend to step up protection in the North-West? Recently, when I was in that area, a vehicle was stolen and, although I was not privy to the discussions, it seemed to me that a police officer would be coming from Oodnadatta. The modest \$13 450 increase would not mean much if there were many patrols like that. I am sure that this part of South Australia must be wide open to the stealing of vehicles. This meagre sum is little more than a drop in the ocean in what must be an urgent need to police the area in question, which I think is known as the "gun barrel" area. I know that some bush pilots were lending their services in an attempt to locate the stolen vehicle.

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** The Police Department has been developing a programme in the North-West of the State over the past two or three years. It now deploys three aircraft, two that it owns and one that it hires. One is based permanently at Woomera, to cover that area. The allocation is to enable that programme to develop in 1978-79, and includes provision for increased operating costs, including aircraft maintenance, which will be part of that operation. I think that the scheme is moving as quickly as the department can effectively develop it.

**Mr. BECKER:** I refer to the allocation for administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries. I am concerned about the siting of radar machines on footpaths. I have always been led to believe that radar machines are supposed to be sited as near as practicable to the kerb. However, several times in the past few months I have seen machines well back against property alignments, behind trees and shrubs. This makes one wonder whether the person operating the machine has a clear view of the approaching traffic.

Will the Minister ascertain what is the policy regarding the siting of radar machines and the distance that the machine is placed from the police vehicle used to wave down speeding motorists? I have no complaints about the police using radar machines, although I think they should be used as a deterrent rather than as a means of obtaining revenue. I have received complaints about where machines are located when used on metropolitan roadways.

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** I should have thought that the police would deploy their machines in the most effective way to achieve the desired result. It is hard to believe they are not placing the machines where they will be most effective in catching traffic offenders. The reduction in the number of road deaths this year is a measure of the fact that the police are doing their job efficiently. I will obtain a report for the honourable member on the technical aspect of using these machines.

Line passed.

Correctional Services, \$9 760 000.

**Mr. WILSON:** I refer to this year's allocation for probation and parole staff, which has increased by about \$94 000 on last year's actual payment. Will the Minister say how many parole staff this will cover? I see from the

Auditor-General's Report that in 1975-76 the department had 71 staff; in 1976-77, it had 75 staff; and in 1977-78, it had 81 staff, who are being paid nearly \$1 000 000. The probation and parole services are conducted from the head office and institutions, and from 11 district offices throughout the State.

Will the Minister say exactly how much staff the \$994 238 proposed for the current financial year represents? Also, will he ascertain the number of probationers or parolees whom these people service? With other crime statistics, one can get a ratio of staff to prisoners in corrective institutions, although no figures are available to show the ratio of Parole Board staff to probationers and parolees.

I also refer to the allocation of \$71 000 for the purchase of motor vehicles. For the probation and parole staff, in 1978 there was a vote of \$31 928 for the purchase of new motor vehicles. How much of the \$71 000 in the coming year will be taken up by purchases of vehicles for the probation and parole branch?

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** The first question the honourable member asked dealt with the provision of salaries for probation and parole staff. Provision has been made for salaries of existing staff plus cadetships current as at 30 June, including increments, leave loading, carry-over effect of new positions and an increase in award rates granted during 1977-78. Provision has also been made for additional staff to cater for the implementation of the community service order system within the new Treatment of Offenders Act. These people will not be appointed until later in the financial year, so the impact of their salaries is not very great. It is anticipated that there will be seven probation and parole officers, one co-ordinator of community service orders and an office assistant to implement that scheme. I am looking forward to this scheme, because I believe that the Probation and Parole Branch provides a much more effective way of correction than does putting people into prison. Unfortunately, in some cases there is no alternative to putting people into prison, but it is a very expensive way of dealing with a problem, and I do not think it is a very effective way in most cases. At a Ministers' conference a couple of months ago some figures were given, and a fairly uniform figure for Australia is about \$200 a week for each prisoner in gaol. It is over \$400 a week for a female prisoner. The cost of probation averages out at about \$7 a week per probationer or parolee, so it is at least a much more economical way of dealing with the problem, and I believe it is a more rehabilitative way. Community service orders will expand the range of sentencing alternatives available to the courts and will provide a more effective and economical way of dealing with that problem.

The second question deals with the ratio of staff to parolees. Some figures for 1976-77 were quoted in the annual report of the Correctional Services Department which was tabled on about 13 July. I obtained some information today because I was concerned about an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* on Saturday last regarding the probation and parole service in which it was claimed that the average case load for each probation officer was 155. I hope that was only an unfortunate typographical error, because the correct figure is about 55. About 45 people are actually supervising the parolees; the total number on the staff is about 70. The actual number involved in supervising people on probation or parole is about 45. Multiplying 45 by 55 gives a figure of about 2 500 people.

**Mr. Wilson:** How much of the increase for motor vehicle purchase is for the parole branch itself?

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** As I do not have that

information I will get it for the honourable member.

Line passed.

Chief Secretary, Miscellaneous, \$2 486 000.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Although \$23 973 was provided last year for the Sea Rescue Squadron, can the Minister explain why there is no allocation this year?

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** Last year's allocation was to cover the cost of the installation of radar—a "once only" item. This year the Sea Rescue Squadron requested about \$11 500 for a vehicle to move a boat; that request was referred to the Police Department, which indicated that probably a more economical way of dealing with the problem was to use the Police Department's tractor. The department was prepared to discuss the matter with the squadron. Given the financial stringencies, that item was cut out, as was a request for finance for minor equipment.

**Mr. WOTTON:** The grant to Offenders Aid and Rehabilitation Services of South Australia has been increased to \$100 000. However, that organisation states that in times of economic difficulty increasing numbers of people are seeking its help and stretching its resources to the limit. The organisation has opened the present financial year with a record overdraft of more than \$46 000. In 1976-77, OARS provided 9 185 client services at an average cost of 28c, and in 1977-78 it provided 12 001 services at the same average cost. The organisation's staff members (25 full-time workers and 10 part-time workers) are dedicated to their task and regularly work long hours, including evenings and weekends, without overtime pay. Despite the association's achievements, the South Australian Government is unable to meet its request for \$147 000 this year. The association's dependence on bank overdraft finance has reached an undesirable limit. All members would realise how important the association's services are.

I am disappointed that only \$100 000 is being provided when this organisation is in desperate need of \$147 000 to get itself out of its present trouble.

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** I am very disappointed also that the Government was not able to provide more money to assist the Offenders Aid and Rehabilitation Services in their very valuable work. It is recognised as being a most useful, valuable and dedicated organisation, but unfortunately this is a bad year to be asking for

additional grants. A formula was arrived at some years ago to fund a certain number of positions within the organisation. On that basis some \$84 000 was made available last year and, allowing for inflation, it would have come up to over \$90 000. In addition, the organisation was getting from the Community Welfare Department, a grant which that department thought was not appropriate because the activities of OARS were mainly dealing with adult prisoners. Therefore, we have put them together in this one particular line. There is no increase in real terms. For that I am very sorry indeed, but I am afraid it was forced on us by the general budgetary position.

**Mr. RODDA:** I refer to the South Australian Fire Brigades Board, for which \$1 681 000 is allocated. Regarding the levy which policy holders now have to pay in addition to premiums and which I understand is to be disbursed between the Fire Brigades Board and the Country Fire Services, I should like to know how much is proposed to be raised from this levy across the State. I do not expect the Minister to have that information now, but I should be grateful if it could be supplied.

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** That figure would amount to about \$9 500 000, because under the formula 75 per cent is provided by the levy on insurance premiums, 12½ per cent by local government and 12½ per cent by the State Government. The State Government has accepted a slightly higher share than 12½ per cent because it subsidises a part of the contribution made by Port Adelaide and Port Pirie, and also the marine fire-fighting provision. The actual sum of \$1 681 000, which has already been determined on the basis of the formula, would include about \$1 600 000, which would normally be one-eighth of the total cost. The amount paid by policy holders would be 75 per cent, or six times that amount, so it would amount to about \$9 500 000.

Line passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 11.5 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 11 October at 2 p.m.