

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 11 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*.

PRAWN FISHING

In reply to **Mr. CHAPMAN** (15 August).

The **Hon. J. D. WRIGHT**: The honourable member's contention that the prawn fishing industry had not been consulted on the proposed fee increases is completely untrue. The Assistant Director (Fisheries) raised the matter with the executive of A.F.I.C. over a period of more than 12 months.

The honourable member's comparison between old and proposed fees is completely specious. The old fees represent exploration permits for a new and untried fishery. The new fees are the first to be established on the basis of a proven record of profitability and stability. The Minister of Fisheries has proposed to A.F.I.C. an interim fee increase for 1978-79, and two options for a final fee determination for 1979-80. These options are still being discussed by A.F.I.C.

SEED

In reply to **Mr. NANKIVELL** (23 August).

The **Hon. J. D. WRIGHT**: A proposal has been put to the South Australian Seedgrowers Co-operative as contract growers for WL318 under relaxed quarantine. The Director of Agriculture and Fisheries has however, insisted that the seed industry put together a consortium to handle the variety, otherwise the Agriculture and Fisheries Department will be asked by rival seed merchants to allow similar relaxed entry of other varieties with similar characteristics. This would be a waste of scarce resources when, obviously, the best course for the industry is to concentrate on the rapid multiplication of a few suitable varieties rather than scatter its resource on many varieties that are virtually identical.

OTTOWAY WORKSHOP

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

The **Hon. J. D. WRIGHT**: The amount was utilised to offset the reduction in demand for castings which occurred as a result of the severe down-turn in the house building industry and thus reduction of subdivisional development. This reduction in demand meant that productivity of the foundry was reduced to below the level of fixed costs, and the \$450 000 was used to maintain employment until the economic situation stabilises.

BURBRIDGE ROAD

In reply to the **Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL** (20 September).

The **Hon. G. T. VIRGO**: The section of Burbridge Road referred to is a temporary roadway connecting the western approach to the West Terrace intersection with the existing alignment of Burbridge Road which will be abandoned when the Hilton Bridge is ultimately replaced. There are no current proposals to replace the bridge. The location in question is under the care, control and management of the Adelaide City Council. It has been ascertained that the narrowing of the carriageway from three lanes to two lanes is signposted on both sides of the carriageway and that the distance available for the merging manoeuvres is within acceptable standards. However, officers of the Adelaide City Council and the Road Traffic Board will review the location to determine whether any improvements can be made.

CIRCLE LINE BUS SERVICE

In reply to the **Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL** (11 October).

The **Hon. G. T. VIRGO**: No additional patronage surveys on the Circle Line have been undertaken since the surveys in March 1978 which indicated that 5 000 passengers a day used the service. Periodic checks by the S.T.A.'s inspectors indicate that much of the late running experienced in the early stages of the service has been overcome since the introduction of a revised time-table in March of this year.

BUS SHELTERS

In reply to **Mrs. BYRNE** (20 September).

The **Hon. G. T. VIRGO**: The State Transport Authority, in association with local councils and with financial assistance from the Commonwealth Government under the States Grants (Urban Public Transport) Act, 1974, has installed 500 bus shelters in the metropolitan area in the four years to 30 June 1978.

The provision of the shelters was financed on the basis of the Commonwealth Government meeting two-thirds of the cost involved, with the remaining one-third of the cost being met jointly by the authority and the local councils concerned. The present cost for the supply and installation of each shelter is about \$600. As the demand for shelters far exceeds supply, they are allocated on a priority of needs basis, with first preference being given to the more heavily patronised bus stops at which no other shelter is available. Site selection is agreed between the authority and the council concerned.

QUORN HIGHWAY

In reply to **Mr. KENEALLY** (28 September).

The **Hon. G. T. VIRGO**: The Highways Department is to install concrete floodways at the Saltia Creek crossings on the Port Augusta to Quorn road. This work is planned to be carried out in the latter half of this financial year.

MARINELAND CARAVAN PARK

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

The **Hon. G. T. VIRGO**: The answer given on 1 August 1978 in reply to Question on Notice 387, was correct. The question asked "What is the estimated total cost of building the *en suite* caravan park site at West Beach?" The reply given was "\$870 000". This was the building cost only, comprising earthworks, modular constructions for

toilet facilities, and other facilities, including the manager's residence. It did not include the cost of caravans. Forty existing caravans, at book value, have been transferred from the West Beach Caravan Park to the new village, and the trust intends to purchase, from its own resources, a further 56 new caravans, all of which will be delivered by the end of this year. The total value of the 96 caravans is \$240 000, which when added to the building costs of \$870 000, gives a total cost of \$1 100 000, for the project.

ETHNIC AFFAIRS BRANCH

In reply to Mrs. ADAMSON (27 September, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Ethnic Affairs Adviser, clerical staff as well as the community interpreter staff are presently located in leased premises at 25 Peel Street, Adelaide. The personnel referred to provide a service to the Government, the State Public Service, and the members of various ethnic communities living in South Australia. During 1978-79 it is proposed to locate an ethnic information service at 25 Peel Street, Adelaide, and establish branch offices at Campbelltown and Whyalla. Part of the increase is due to the fact that a full year's salary will be needed for staff who served only a part of last year.

ETHNIC FESTIVALS

In reply to Mrs. ADAMSON (28 September, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The members of the Ethnic Festivals Grants Advisory Committee are: Mr. H. Siliakus (Chairman), Mr. K. Conlon, Mr. F. Schaffer, and Ms. S. Roux.

PREMIER'S DEPARTMENT VEHICLES

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Log-books are kept for all motor vehicles other than those used by the Ombudsman and the Agent-General's Office. All motor vehicles to be purchased by the Premier's Department during 1978-79 are available for departmental use.

FLEXITIME REVIEWS

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Since its inception in February 1974 three investigations of the operation of flexitime have been conducted and reports received by the board: the first time in May 1974, the second in May 1975, and the third in February 1977. In response to a request from the Secretary of Labour and Industry, a three-month pilot study of flexitime was established in his department and evaluated by a Joint Consultative Council. Although this evaluation was inconclusive, the report was sufficiently encouraging to justify extension of the scheme on a trial basis across a larger sample of departments and occupation groups.

In October 1974 flexitime trials began in 28 departments covering about 3 500 people. Throughout the first six months of the trial period the scheme was constantly subjected to reviews conducted by P.A. Consulting Services Pty. Ltd. and the Public Service Board. This

evaluation revealed a significant drop in single-day absenteeism and paid overtime and an increase in output. It also showed that public transport and road usage could benefit by extension of the scheme throughout the central business district, through the greater spread of arrival and departure times. On the other side of the coin, staff unavailability was seen as being a major disadvantage but what with effective management the problem could be minimised.

In the review conducted in January 1977 the problem of unavailability of staff due to flexitime was raised by senior management as an occasional source of annoyance. No-one, however, stated that flexitime was prejudicing the effective operation of the department. Some abuses have been detected and dealt with accordingly. Most require little more than counselling to overcome, while some have necessitated suspension of the flexitime privilege. Only two people have been charged with offences under the Public Service Act. Flexitime appears to be working well, with the advantages far outweighing the disadvantages.

Given that about two-thirds of the Public Service Act staff are working under the flexitime scheme, minor difficulties are bound to occur. In the board's opinion, they are not sufficient to justify a full-scale review at this stage. A project of the scale of that conducted in 1974-75 would cost today about \$45 000. Commonwealth Government financial support was obtained in 1974, but a repetition of this is unlikely. If a study of the matters raised by the member for Hanson were undertaken, the total cost would be unlikely to exceed \$5 000. A special appropriation or reallocation would be necessary, however, as such a study was not envisaged as being an initiative to be undertaken in this financial year.

ART GALLERY WAREHOUSE

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: During the current building programme the major portion of the gallery's collection is held in the Art Gallery's new store, which is full to capacity. For this reason, and because of future needs, it was essential to protect the store with a highly efficient burglar alarm with full after-hours back up similar to that installed in the main gallery building. The alarm system originally installed did not meet these standards and modifications were therefore necessary. The design and installation of the burglar alarm systems were undertaken by the Public Buildings Department.

WOMEN'S INFORMATION SWITCHBOARD

In reply to Mr. DEAN BROWN (27 September, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of the allocation of \$67 800 an amount of \$13 456 is provided for the Women's Information Switchboard. The total cost of operating the Women's Information Switchboard is estimated to be \$87 000 (rounded).

VANTAGE ADVERTISING REVENUE

In reply to Mr. DEAN BROWN (27 September, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The total advertising revenue of *Vantage* in its first year of production was \$10 229.

JUDGE DAUGHERTY

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Details of actual terminal leave payments for 1977-78 are:

Date	Name	Location	Amount \$
24 August 1977	J. R. Keig	Immigration	5 499.30
21 September 1977	A. N. Deane	Agent-General	25 192.85
	A. S. Gant	Publicity and Design Services	4 554.90
	J. A. Jolley	Planning Appeal Board	1 647.90
8 March 1978	J. B. Greaves	Justice Division	546.78
16 June 1978	M. Whiley	Immigration	928.93
29 June 1978	R. Yeales	Publicity and Design Services	3 977.08
30 June 1978	A. T. Gun	Justice Division	15 458.87
	R. J. Daugherty	Parliamentary Counsel	25 466.34
	G. Fernandez	Planning Appeal Board	1 635.27
		Total	\$84 908.22

PARLIAMENTARY COUNSEL VEHICLE

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A motor vehicle was acquired for the use of the Parliamentary Counsel's Office in 1976. The acquisition of a motor vehicle arose out of the need for frequent communication between the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel and Parliament House while Parliament is sitting, particularly at night, and between the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel and departmental offices, whether Parliament is sitting or not. The vehicle is available for use by any officer of the Parliamentary Counsel's Office while acting in the course of his official duties. It is also available for use by other branches of the Premier's Department when it is not being used for the purposes of the Parliamentary Counsel's Office.

AGENT-GENERAL'S VISIT

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (27 September, Appropriation Bill):

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The provision of \$8 400 against the Agent-General's line, visit of officer to South Australia, includes expenditure for the Agent-General's wife.

ARTS DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The proposed increase of \$35 000 (rounded) for salaries in 1978-79 for the Arts Development Division is required to cover the following: a full year's salary for a senior project officer (C. Winzer) appointed on 20 March 1978; the salary of a contract officer (P. Henderson) appointed as Co-ordinator of Regional Cultural Centre Trusts as from 3 July 1978; a full year's affect of national wage and sundry other salary increases applied during 1977-78; and automatic salary increments arising during 1978-79.

TERMINAL LEAVE PAYMENTS

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Details of anticipated terminal leave payments for 1978-79 are:

Policy	Amount \$
H. Turner (Resignation)	1 397
Parliamentary Counsel	
D. Ankor (Resignation)	1 915
Publicity and Design Services	
W. St. C. Johnson (Retirement)	5 600
J. Warner (Retirement)	9 600
Justice Division	
V. C. Matison (Retirement)	11 000
D. F. Wilson (Retirement)	26 100
R. F. Stokes (Retirement)	6 000
Planning Appeal Board	
K. V. Bleeney (Retirement)	3 500
Immigration	
S. G. Adams (Retirement)	6 857
Agent-General's Office	
F. Hubbard (Redundancy)	2 031
P. B. Smith (Retirement)	11 000
Total	\$85 000

VANTAGE

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The quarterly magazine for which \$63 000 is proposed on the 1978-79 Estimates for the Premier's Department refers to the magazine entitled *Vantage*. No cost-benefit study was done on the publication of *Vantage*. It is expected that, of the \$63 000 proposed for the publication of *Vantage*, a sum of \$20 000 will be recovered comprising subscriptions, \$8 000, and advertising space sales, \$12 000.

PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

Petitions signed by 1 568 electors of South Australia praying that the House would pass legislation to provide for Ministerial responsibility adequately to control pornographic material were presented by Mrs. Adamson and Messrs. Allison, Bannon, Blacker, Drury, Groth, Mathwin, McRae, Nankivell, Russack, Slater, and Wells.
Petitions received.

PETITION: CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

A petition signed by 40 electors of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to tighten up the legislation regarding child pornography to ensure that the Classification of Publications Board lawfully made child pornography unacceptable in any form in this State was presented by Mr. Klunder.
Petition received.

PETITIONS: VIOLENT OFFENCES

Petitions signed by 412 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 Mrs. Adamson and Messrs. Blacker and Russack.
Petitions received.

PETITION: MASSAGE

A petition signed by 89 residents of South Australia praying that the House would pass legislation to restrict the use of the words "massage", "masseurs", and "masseuses" to those who genuinely practised the art of massage within the provisions of the Physiotherapists Act, 1945-1973, was presented by Mrs. Adamson.
Petition received.

PETITION: MARIJUANA

A petition signed by 30 residents of South Australia praying that the House would not pass legislation seeking to legalise marijuana was presented by Mr. Nankivell.
Petition received.

PETITION: VOLUNTARY WORKERS

A petition signed by 25 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 was presented by Mr. Mathwin.
Petition received.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Richmond Primary School (Replacement),
Sheidow Park Primary School.

Ordered that reports be printed.

QUESTION TIME**Mr. MUIRHEAD**

Mr. TONKIN: Will the Premier say whether Mr. Dennis Muirhead, presently counsel assisting the Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs, is the same person whom visitors to the United Kingdom from South Australia were invited by the A.L.P. to contact for electoral guidance and literature during a previous State election campaign and, if so, how many times has he acted in this way on behalf of the A.L.P. in the United Kingdom?

The question is being asked in this House and outside in the community as to why Mr. Muirhead was appointed to this position, rather than a legal practitioner from South Australia, or from Australia, who is more readily available. If Mr. Muirhead is the person who has assisted the A.L.P. in the United Kingdom during State election campaigns, that could well provide the answer being sought by many people in South Australia.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know. Before he went to England—and that was many years ago—Mr. Muirhead was certainly a member of the Labor Party in my district.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: And a very good one, too.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A very good one. As the honourable member said in this House yesterday, Mr. Muirhead is highly qualified (those were the words he used) in respect of this particular inquiry. Whether Mr. Muirhead was involved in operations for the Labor Party in England, I personally do not know; he may have been.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Members of the legal profession and the Liberal Party—

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If one looks back on appointments made under Liberal Governments in the law area, one can only reflect that the honourable member has different standards in suggesting that there is some impropriety in an instance where someone with the same political persuasion as the Government is appointed to any legal position, but apparently it is perfectly proper for Liberal Governments to appoint Liberals exclusively in that area.

Mr. Tonkin: It's a remarkable situation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The policy that obtained under Liberal Governments in this State is certainly not the policy being followed by the present Government in that regard. We have appointed people on merit, and the fact that Mr. Muirhead may have been involved in England in collecting postal votes for the Labor Party (and I do not know whether he was or not; he may have been) has absolutely nothing to do with his appointment in this instance. His appointment was because of qualifications, which were set forth in detail to this House and the Opposition yesterday.

ADNAMATHNA DICTIONARY

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Minister of Education investigate the possibility of compiling a dictionary of the Adnamathna language? An elder of the Adnamathna people has asked that I take up this matter with the Government. I understand a similar dictionary has been compiled in the Pitjantjatjara language. The Adnamathna people are indigenous to the Flinders Range, and as such the language is no longer in common usage, except amongst older people of the tribe.

Unless action is taken, a language which has been part of our history for thousands of years will disappear. I have some work that has been done by the Aboriginal Resource Centre of the Further Education Department, at Port Augusta, and I will make it available to the Minister if he wishes to peruse it.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I thank the honourable member for his suggestion, which I will certainly take up with officers in my department and in the Further Education Department. It may be something in which the Torrens College of Advanced Education (to give it its still official name before I introduce legislation to change it) might also be interested, because there has been at that college for some time a considerable and lively interest in the Pitjantjatjara language. Although I understand that the two languages are quite different, nonetheless the same people might be interested in being part of this same process. I will examine all of the possibilities, including costs that might be involved, and I thank the honourable member for his offer of the material he has.

LIBEL CASE

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say whether the Government is meeting all or any part of the Attorney-General's liability for damages and/or legal costs arising from an action for libel brought against him recently by Mrs. Elizabeth Pooley and, if so, why? Despite the puzzlement on the Premier's face, members would be aware that damages of \$1 000 were awarded against the Attorney-General in a recent libel case, and it would be wrong for taxpayers of South Australia to foot the bill.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: No.

STUDENT DRIVING

Mr. KLUNDER: Will the Minister of Education give some indication of the availability of driver education courses in South Australian Education Department schools? I refer to a report in the *News* of 25 September in which the member for Alexandra expressed the view that driving should be a school course. As I am aware that students at the schools at which I taught were given driving instruction, I should be pleased if the Minister would elucidate the matter for the House.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I thank the honourable member for his question. Having also seen the report and anticipating that there would be a question at some time from one side or the other, I have some detail in which members may be interested. As the honourable member has said, there is much driver education instruction in schools: at present, 23 metropolitan high schools, 28 country secondary schools, and one independent school are involved. The scheme involves the training of teachers at the Oaklands Park instruction centre so that they can conduct courses in schools.

Since 1974, 130 teachers have qualified at Oaklands Park, and 68 teachers are conducting these courses in schools. The schools offer the courses in one of two ways: either in school hours as part of the normal elective programme of the school, or else out of school hours instruction. The students are asked to pay fees of up to \$5 to cover the cost of petrol, etc. The Education Department covers comprehensive and personal accident insurance, and General Motors-Holden's provides 39 dual-controlled Holden vehicles on loan for the programme. In the May and September holidays and in

the last two weeks of the third term of each year, courses are conducted specifically at Oaklands Park that are rather different from those to which I have been referring. Much activity is being undertaken at schools at present, but I wonder whether the member for Alexandra was aware of this fact.

From time to time we have calls from people in the community and in the House to include this or that or something else in the school curriculum, and often such questions raise further questions that they answer. Are the people referring to an elective course, or something that should be examinable or something that should be included in the Matriculation course, and that is controlled by the Public Examinations Board?

I certainly do not think that a course such as this need be examinable in that formal sense, or should lead to a matriculation examination or anything like that. With all of the sorts of demand that are made on the schools, I think people need to spell out a little more carefully exactly what they are calling for when they ask that a certain course be included in the curriculum. I would say the schools are very much off and running so far as this aspect of training for life experience is concerned.

GOVERNMENT TELEPHONES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I want to ask a question of the Premier, and it is not about the Royal Commission or about—

The SPEAKER: Order! I want the honourable member to ask his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thought that Government members wanted to—

The SPEAKER: Order! I want the honourable member to ask his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier say what further information, if any, the Government is willing to give to the House about payment of private telephone accounts of public servants by the Government? On 19 September, I received an answer to a Question on Notice. The question was as follows:

How many public servants are entitled to have their private telephone accounts paid in whole or in part by the Government, and in which departments are they?

The answer was that 1 342 public servants have their telephone accounts paid, and that in 1977-78 the cost to the Government of those accounts was \$156 789. When that information was made public there was much reaction in the community. I was surprised, and I put four further questions on the Notice Paper to seek further information as to which accounts were paid in full, which were paid in part, who had the rental paid and not the calls, and so on. Yesterday, I received an answer to my question. It was, if I may say, rather insulting, because I got the same answer to the four questions. I will read the answer to two of them, although the effect was the same in all:

The work involved in answering question 477—the one I referred to—

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.

I did get an answer to a question I asked orally in the House, saying that the last review of persons eligible for the payment of private telephone rentals and official calls was carried out in July 1977 and was currently under consideration. Obviously, I prompted some further consideration of the matter. This matter has caused widespread comment in the community and, from the

answers I got yesterday, it looks as though the Government is covering up. I point up that this is not a political—

The SPEAKER: Order! On several occasions during the course of asking his question the honourable member has said the same thing. Now he is debating the question. If he continues in that vein, I will take away his leave.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This is not a political matter, as are the questions of the Royal Commission and the arts. If it is a scandal, as I suspect it is, it is an administrative matter. There are no Party politics in it at all and I think the Government ought to come clean. Having failed to get any information from my Question on Notice I ask what information, if any, the Government is prepared to give.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows perfectly well that there is no scandal in this matter and that there is no change in the policy of the present Government as compared to that of the Government of which he was a member.

Mr. Millhouse: What is the policy?

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The policy was, and it obtained in his own departments at the time he was a Minister and if he did not know that he was incompetent, that where officers of the department were required to be available by telephone out of working hours the Government paid an appropriate part of their telephone costs. That situation obtained in the honourable member's department in those days. There has been no change in policy by the present Government. The honourable member asked questions on this score and he ought to know, having been a Minister, that records of this kind are not kept by the Public Service Board centrally, but are kept separately in a series of dockets relating to each officer in each department. A lot of work, involving very many man-hours at considerable expense to the State, was undertaken in achieving the previous answer for the honourable member. He then comes back and asks for the whole work to be done all over again. The answer is that he will not get any more information on this score. I do not propose to ask the officers to proceed further on the matter.

Mr. Millhouse: It's a real cover-up.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order, and I call him to order.

NOVAR GARDENS LAND

Mr. GROOM: In view of the recent purchase by the State Government of a further 5.38 hectares of land at Novar Gardens, owned by Lightburn and Company, can the Chief Secretary ensure that residents of Novar Gardens are given maximum possible protection from any adverse commercial activity on the land? I understand from a newspaper report that the land is to be used by the police to overcome overcrowding at the Thebarton Police Barracks. Some residential areas abut the land on the western boundary, and a new housing development will take place on the northern boundary. Will every consideration be given to protect the privacy of homes which abut and which will abut the land?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Yes, I am happy to give such an assurance to the honourable member. That land, which covers an area of more than five hectares, is more than adequate for the short-term needs of the Police Department. Initially, the motor vehicle workshops at the Thebarton Barracks will be transferred to these new premises, occupying buildings currently being used for

industrial purposes by Lightburn. Those buildings are a considerable distance away from the boundaries of the property, and it will be unnecessary to go outside those buildings for some considerable time, if at all. It will provide a valuable area to relieve the overcrowding at Thebarton, something that has already required the Police Department to rent extra premises outside, and it will make possible further expansion on, I imagine, the Morphett Road side of the site, where in due course a new building will almost certainly be built. Houses to the west of the site and houses that may be erected on the northern side will not be subject to anywhere near the same annoyance as applies at present.

Mr. MUIRHEAD

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Since entering Parliament has the Attorney-General, during visits to London, ever dined or stayed with Mr. Dennis Muirhead, before his appointment to the Royal Commission? On what basis does the Attorney-General know Mr. Muirhead? In addition, does the Attorney-General know of a personal friendship between Mr. Muirhead and any other A.L.P. members of Parliament?

The SPEAKER: Order! I have spoken to the honourable member on several occasions. On one day he asked nine questions at once, yesterday he asked four, and now today he has asked four again. I hope that he does not continue in that vein.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: And it is right at the bottom of the barrel, too.

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

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Notwithstanding the fact that the honourable member's question is about as low as you could possibly get into the gutter—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It's in the sewer.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Just where—

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable Minister of Transport and the honourable Minister of Labour and Industry to order.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I would not want to miss the opportunity to answer this question and lay to rest the sort of smears and allegations that members opposite have been attempting to promote in this matter. I hope that the press, in reporting this matter and the answer I am about to give, will give sufficient coverage to make up for the damage that it did to my reputation in reporting the matter on the front page this morning.

Mr. Muirhead was not known to be prior to his appointment as a counsel assisting this commission. That is the fact. I knew that he was a member of the profession here. He left university before I began at the University of Adelaide. He went to London in I think 1967, when I was still at university. My association with Mr. Muirhead arose after his appointment. In my opinion, he was undoubtedly the most qualified South Australian to undertake this particular task, and the sort of smear that the Opposition has gone in for in this matter is reminiscent of the sort of things it has done on past occasions. I could list a number of names of people who are good, honest, hard-working citizens in this State, who are experts in their field and whose names have been smeared by Opposition members, including the member for Mitcham, who is about to slink out of the Chamber. He is now slinking in. Whichever way he went he would be unable to do otherwise than slink.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I was standing by the door. I would have gone out earlier if it had not been for the question asked.

The SPEAKER: Order! I want the honourable member to state his point of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My point of order is that the Attorney-General cast an absolutely unwarranted slur on me. It was completely unfair because from where I was standing, I could not even rebut it, either with or without the protection on Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On a further point of order, I express the hope that the Attorney will not proceed in that vein.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Mitcham that I will take the necessary action if he continues in this vein.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Every dog has his day, and we know which dog is having his day today.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable Attorney-General will answer the question.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Certainly; there are only a couple of further matters I want to raise. To make the record absolutely precise and correct, I had best deny that I have ever had a meal with Mr. Muirhead. If I do not do that, I will find myself in the situation where some scurrilous person will be making that sort of smear and allegation. The matter of fact is, as I have said, that until the commission commenced its proceedings I had not known Mr. Muirhead.

SOUTHERN SUBURBS WATER SUPPLY

Mr. DRURY: Can the Minister of Works say what has caused discolouration in domestic water supplies in the southern suburbs, and what action is being taken to improve the colour of the water? I have been approached by a number of constituents who are concerned at the colour of their water, not only for drinking but also for other domestic uses; it is a bit dirty.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the honourable member was good enough to tell me of his concern about this matter, I have the following report from the department:

It is the policy of the Engineering and Water Supply Department to advise of any major changes in water quality which could affect consumers over a wide area. In mid-August last when the source of water supply to the southern areas was changed from the Happy Valley Reservoir to the Myponga Reservoir, turbidities present in both catchments were identical and, as it was considered that no major visual change would be apparent to consumers, the public was not notified. In accordance with normal practice large consumers, such as the meat works and the oil refinery, were informed of the change, as the chemical quality of the water affects their processing procedures.

It has become apparent from complaints immediately following the changeover that the reversal of flows in the mains did cause some local disturbances. On present indications it will be necessary to change back the method of supply to the southern area later this month, as there is a marked variance in colour, with Myponga Reservoir showing the higher figures, there is a strong possibility of local disturbances due again to the reversal of flow in the mains. In an endeavour to minimise any inconvenience which may be experienced in the future, I have arranged for the issue of a press release which will give adequate notice to consumers whenever a changeover of the source of water supply is proposed.

I can do nothing to change the colour of the water. I have taken action through alum dosing to remove most of the

sediment from the water, but I cannot change the colour. Because of the heavy rains experienced during the winter months there has been a high run-off. After three dry years, there is much rotting foliage and vegetation, and the colour from this source causes the problem referred to by the honourable member.

COAL

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say why South Australia was not included in an agreement made by the Federal Government, New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria and the West German Government for a \$3 600 000 feasibility study into converting coal to liquid fuel? A report in today's *Advertiser* was headed "\$3 600 000 Australian study into coal fuel". I understand we do have considerable reserves of coal in South Australia, although they may not be easily mined. Why was South Australia not given an opportunity of being involved in this study?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: All States were given the opportunity to be involved in this study but in order to be involved they had to contribute \$500 000 towards the cost of the study. In our judgment there is no way that the study would have led to the development of a proposal for hydrogenation of coal in South Australia. Any coals that could be economically treated in this way in order to produce gasoline and distillate would have been coals from Queensland, New South Wales or Victoria, the States involved in the study, and, in other words, the States that considered it worth while to contribute \$500 000 towards the overall cost.

We will be able to monitor the results of the study and learn from those results, but at this stage there is no likely coal deposit in South Australia that could form the basis of a successful project following from the study. Although the deposit of coal at Balaklava is large, it is a poor quality brown coal, and possible problems are associated with its extraction owing to the high sodium content and the problem in that area that exists in relation to water.

The Lake Phillipson deposit, a large one, is very remote, and the cost of getting that coal to a point where it could be used in a hydrogenation plant would be large indeed. Again, there would be no economic likelihood of such a development occurring. Those would be the two main coal deposits that conceivably could have been used, and in neither case would it have been possible for coal to be made available from a South Australian source to a hydrogenation plant at anything like the price at which coal would have been available in Victoria, New South Wales, or Queensland. For that reason the Mines and Energy Department did not even bother recommending to the Cabinet that consideration should be given to this question. We shall, however, be monitoring the results of the study, and we shall observe it with some degree of interest.

I think that people generally should be warned that the liquefaction of coal is not likely to provide the solution, or even a very significant part of the solution, of Australia's liquid fuel problems. For example, in order to supply Australia's liquid fuel requirements purely from hydrogenation of coal, we would need to use up probably 250 000 000 tonnes of coal each year. Quite apart from the huge capital investment that would be involved in such a development, we would rapidly eat into our coal reserves—a billion tonnes every four years just for that purpose. Our average production at present from Leigh Creek is 2 000 000 tonnes, and we would be talking about, if we were to supply all of Australia's liquid fuel

requirements from hydrogenation of coal, a number of projects which in total would be about 125 times the size of the Leigh Creek operation.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MARALINGA WASTE

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Today, the following telex has been sent to the Prime Minister, followed by a letter which I have signed:

Dear Mr. Fraser,

In the past week, considerable public attention and concern has been directed to the issue of the existence of plutonium and other radioactive substances at or in the vicinity of Maralinga in South Australia. A number of the questions which have been raised in this connection give rise to serious concern to the Government and people of this State.

As you will be aware, some information was made available to my Government approximately a year ago. It is clear, however, that there is additional information of direct relevance to the Maralinga situation of which the South Australian Government was not then apprised.

On a matter of such fundamental significance to public health and safety as the proper disposal of plutonium and other high level radioactive wastes, it is essential that the fullest information on security and other precautions should be assembled. The South Australian Government therefore urgently requests that you establish, without delay, a full public inquiry into all aspects of the disposal of plutonium and other radioactive substances at or near Maralinga, whether those substances are derived from the nuclear tests carried out in that area or otherwise.

My Government believes that a searching public inquiry of this nature is essential if full and effective information is to be gathered and the quite understandable fears of the public at large are to be allayed. I seek your urgent attention to this matter and a response as soon as possible. I should be glad to discuss these matters with you directly or to make available senior officers to pursue matters of detail.

Yours sincerely,

Don Dunstan

COOPER BASIN

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy inform the House whether there has been any further advance in investigations of possible alternative uses for the liquid petroleum gas of the Cooper Basin in the event that its use for the Redcliff project does not proceed because of Loan Council rejection? The point was last put to the House on 22 March 1978 (pages 2457-8 of *Hansard*). On that occasion the Minister said:

Ever since I have been Minister in charge of this matter I have insisted that not only the petro-chemical scheme but also what is now known as the modified liquid scheme (or a C3-plus scheme) be studied.

It is on the basis of the knowledge that some action has been taken in respect of alternatives that I seek information on whether there has been any further advance or any other activity in this area that would give an alternative use for our l.p.g. in the event that Loan Council does not see fit to proceed.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: First, I am amazed at this stage that an Opposition member should be canvassing the

kind of possibility the member for Light has just canvassed.

Dr. Eastick: Read *Hansard* of yesterday.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Apparently he did it yesterday, also: that makes me even more amazed. I would have expected that we would be getting some degree of support from the honourable member for our case to Loan Council.

Dr. Eastick: That I gave you yesterday.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: However, I will come to that later. The submission made to the Commonwealth Government with respect to the Redcliff petro-chemical proposal canvassed in great detail the alternative, namely, a modified liquids scheme, leaving the ethane in the town gas and just developing the propane, butanes, and the higher fractions. It was demonstrated, using the detailed figures supplied by the producers on a confidential basis, that such a scheme would not be commercially viable for the producers even if the infra-structure required were supplied by Government.

In other words, the rate of return on the scheme, even with Government infra-structure, would be less than that necessary in order to make the project a possible project. It is worth noting that our studies have indicated that a modified liquids scheme, based on the so-called Brisbane operation, would involve a rate of return for the producers lower than that of a modified liquids scheme based on Port Stanvac. If the Port Stanvac scheme is not viable, certainly the Brisbane operation, which was talked about in a report prepared for the Queensland Government by E.M.A., is not viable, either.

The relevant thing, I think, that has been ignored in the E.M.A. report and in a number of the other studies that have looked at this question of a modified liquids scheme has been that, under a modified liquids scheme, the degree of capital investment by the Cooper Basin producers is almost as high as the degree of investment they have to carry out under a full petro-chemical scheme, but the returns are substantially reduced because, instead of getting the full value for ethane when ethane is a feedstock into a petro-chemical process, they get only a town gas value for ethane. The capital expenditure by the producers is only slightly reduced (it is well over \$150 000 000 for a modified liquids scheme) but the revenue return is substantially reduced.

All of the studies that have been undertaken have been submitted to the Commonwealth and demonstrated to the Commonwealth's interdepartmental committee, and the figures supplied to that committee have never been challenged by the Commonwealth, to my knowledge. All of those exercises have demonstrated that the only scheme which can be viable is a full petro-chemical scheme, using the ethane as a feedstock for the petro-chemical plant, and with that petro-chemical scheme having the infra-structure supported by Government financing. Government financing of infra-structure has two basic advantages: it lowers the rate of interest, but it also enables longer-term depreciation of the capital assets involved.

If infra-structure items such as the pipelines have to be supplied by commercial sources, the depreciation period is significantly less than the life of the pipeline; it is reduced substantially, and the costs to the producers and Dow in the initial years of the project are sufficiently higher to make the project economical. This has been the basis of our application to the Commonwealth for assistance from the Loan Council. It has been supported by the most detailed argument of, I think, any submission ever made to the Commonwealth Government.

In this case, the confidential figures of the Cooper Basin producers and Dow have been supplied. The position is

this: if the Loan Council refuses approval for the borrowing necessary to provide the infra-structure for Redcliff on a Government borrowing basis, it is likely that the liquids of the Cooper Basin will be flared and wasted, because the liquids in the Cooper Basin have to be produced once the gas from the wetter fields is required for Adelaide and Sydney. The liquids (propane, butanes, and so on) are produced as a by-product of the production of gas. If there is no commercial use for those liquids, storage of them will not be viable, because about 30 per cent of the liquids would be lost by storing, and if they cannot be used commercially when they are available to be stored the likely commercial viability of those liquids after they have been stored will be even less.

Mr. Tonkin: There have been some interesting developments overseas on that question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There is certainly no interesting development overseas that enables the storage of liquids without some loss. The point that needs to be made and recognised by everyone is that, if liquids are being produced and there is no commercial use for them so they are put back in the ground (and money must be spent to do that), when one wants to recover them from the ground again a percentage is lost. The likelihood of having a viable enterprise at the end of that period of storage is even less, so money will not be spent to store them.

The consequence of not having Redcliff is that those liquids will be wasted, so there will be the loss of a valuable energy source for Australia. Furthermore, the consequence of not achieving Redcliff will be a loss to Australia's balance of payments of more than \$200 000 000 per annum. The Redcliff petro-chemical proposal has a favourable impact on Australia's balance of payments which we have estimated is worth about \$218 000 000 per annum in exports and replaced imports. Those figures have not been disputed. When the Loan Council meets in a few weeks it will have an important decision to reach in respect to the Redcliff proposal. Does it intend to support a proposal which enables the exploitation of a valuable and scarce energy resource and which will have a significant impact on Australia's balance of payments, quite apart from any benefits that it will have on the South Australian economy?

We know that a number of Commonwealth Ministers support the Redcliff project: they have said so. The Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Anthony), the Minister for Industry and Commerce (Mr. Lynch) and the Minister for National Development (Mr. Newman) have all come out publicly in support of Redcliff. Our problem with the Federal Government at the present time relates to the attitudes of Federal Treasury officers, the Prime Minister and the Treasurer.

I believe that this week there is a report in Laurie Oakes's weekly report that the attitude of the Federal Treasury will be to recommend to the Federal Government that the only infra-structure projects that should be supported are those which are fully commercially viable. If they are not commercially viable without Government borrowing, they will not be supported at all. If Federal Treasury officers take that attitude, they are asking the Federal Government to adopt policies which are not in the national interests of this country. It is vital for people in our community in South Australia, and nationally, to point out to the Federal Government that the Redcliff project has two important national consequences: one on our energy resources and the other on our balance of payments. These cannot be ignored.

The proposition that has been put to the Federal Government does not affect the Commonwealth Government's deficit, but is simply asking the Commonwealth

Government for an additional borrowing authority for the Electricity Trust of South Australia to build a power station, and for the Pipelines Authority of South Australia to build a gas pipeline and a liquids pipeline. An additional borrowing authority is all that is being asked for, and borrowing by those authorities will have no impact on the Commonwealth Government's Budget. We are willing to co-operate fully with the Federal Government and the Commonwealth Treasury in the way we borrow those funds, and we will not borrow them from overseas if they do not want us to. The impact that those borrowings will have on the money supply in Australia is, and will be, entirely under the control of the Commonwealth Government. In those circumstances it is absolutely vital for everyone, including the Commonwealth Government, to recognise what is involved in this and that the Redcliff project is the only effectively way for the exploitation of those liquid resources.

CULTURAL TRUST

Mr. MAX BROWN: When the Minister of Community Development visits the city of Whyalla in the near future, will he examine the new theatre complex installed within the extensions of the College of Further Education to determine the possibility for its use in the field of cultural activities in Whyalla? The Minister would be aware that the Government has formulated a cultural trust in Whyalla to assist, as I understand it, the establishment of performing arts within Whyalla. I can assure the Minister that the trust has come under unfair criticism lately because of the supposed cost that may or may not be incurred. With the right use, the new college theatre will go a long way to assist the establishment of a cultural venture in Whyalla.

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: I hope the brevity of my answer will not be seen as a reflection on the importance of the question in view of the previous answer. The Regional Centre Cultural Trust is an extremely important part of the arts development policy that has been undertaken by the Government throughout South Australia; three are currently set up, and one is, of course, at Whyalla.

As the honourable member has suggested, I am hoping to visit the city of Whyalla in the near future to address the Community Council for Social Development. While there I hope to go out and look at the theatre complex at the college, as he suggested I should do. As I see it, one of the main functions of the new department will be to aid in the rational and co-ordinated use of community resources and facilities. Part of the thrust of the Government's activities in this area is to ensure that, where facilities exist, they are used to the maximum possible. For instance, I am aware that the Minister of Education has actively been pursuing a policy within his department where school facilities are opened up for the use of the general community; this has been very successful and has contributed greatly to the resources available in those communities. One would hope that the same sort of thing can happen in a wide range of regional, local and community centres. Therefore, I would be very pleased and keen to visit the complex to look at it and discuss with the Regional Centre Cultural Trust what co-ordinated activity could take place.

KADINA HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: Would the Minister of Education bring down a reply tomorrow concerning Kadina High School requirements? About a fortnight or three weeks ago I gave

the Minister a letter that I had received from my nominee on the school council regarding two temporary class-rooms that Kadina people had put to good use as a music room and for some other purpose. They believe that those two rooms will be moved from Kadina. Could the Minister finalise the investigation and bring me a reply?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I may have the reply for the honourable member this afternoon.

WOMEN'S SHELTERS

Mr. HEMMINGS: Can the Minister of Community Welfare throw any light on the matters raised in a letter to the Editor of the *Advertiser* this morning on child-care funding for women's shelters? The letter stated in part:

Senator Guilfoyle stated that in the Australian Capital Territory and the Northern Territory, the Canberra women's refuge and the Darwin refuge received sums each totalling \$7 000. This was for child care and is the Senator's contribution to that service which shelters attempt to provide. South Australia also received a contribution—\$10 000—to be shared among the 10 such refuges in the State.

On the facts stated it appears that there is a discrepancy in the amounts paid to the Northern Territory and to the Australian Capital Territory when compared to the allocation made to South Australia. As child-care facilities are an obvious need of women's shelters, can the Minister clarify the situation and say whether anything can be done about it?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I read the letter to which the honourable member refers in the *Advertiser* this morning. I had some checking done. It seems that the funding to which the letter refers was announced and arose out of a question that was asked of Senator Guilfoyle in the Senate on 28 September. In reply, she announced that she had just made block grants to the States for child care in women's shelters. As I understand it, the Minister announced that \$10 000 grants would be made to each of the States and a \$5 000 grant would be made to the Northern Territory and the Australian Capital Territory. However, she also announced a \$2 000 grant for the Australian Capital Territory to provide capital facilities at a particular shelter.

The grants have been made direct to State Treasuries from the Office of Child Care in Canberra, and it is obvious that a flat allocation has been made to each State, rather than relating the grants to the needs or to the number of shelters in each State. I can certainly understand the sentiments of this morning's letter writer that \$10 000 will not go far amongst this State's 10 shelters, but in Victoria and New South Wales that position would be exacerbated even more because of their larger populations. I will take up the matter with Senator Guilfoyle to see whether a more equitable basis can be found for future child care funding.

BIRTH DEFORMITIES

Mrs. ADAMSON: Can the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, say whether in South Australia there is a register of congenital birth deformities and, if there is, how long it has been operating? If there is not, will the Government ensure that such a register is established? The Senate Standing Committee, which recommended an examination by the Federal Minister of Health into procedures for reporting and investigating possible effects of the use of agricultural

chemicals, stated that procedures in Australia for reporting and investigating possible long-term or obscure effects of the use of agricultural chemicals appeared to be weak.

The only comprehensive project of which I am aware is the pregnancy environment programme being conducted by the Queen Elizabeth Research Foundation. This foundation is conducting a study among other studies into the incidence of Potter's syndrome in new-born babies, yet the study cannot proceed because of the lack of \$3 000 needed for rats cages to enable experiments to be conducted. In view of widespread community concern about the chemicals 245T and 24D, and in view of the lack of organised research into extra-genetic-caused birth defects, it would seem that Governments which fail to monitor congenital deformities or to provide funds for testing could be accused of neglect.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I do not have any direct knowledge of the topic raised by the honourable member but I imagine that there may be a register. I will take up the matter with my colleague in another place and see what information I can obtain.

VIETNAMESE REFUGEES

Mr. WHITTEN: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Health whether the Federal Government is now providing health certificates for Vietnamese migrants when they arrive in South Australia? An article in the *Sunday Mail* of 1 October 1978 states:

19 Viets with TB in S.A. Hospital.

Nineteen Vietnamese refugees with infectious tuberculosis have been admitted to the TB section of Kalyra Hospital in recent weeks. Other Vietnamese migrants including children, who are known TB sufferers but are unlikely to infect others, are being treated with injections and tablets by health authorities.

The article also states:

Vital medical documentation by Commonwealth Health officers at Darwin, or at the Asian departure point (Bangkok) of the Vietnamese intake did not accompany the people who had been screened in those places as they continued their flight from their former homeland into Australia.

Parents of children attending Pennington school are concerned about Vietnamese children from the Pennington Hostel who may be suffering from TB. I would appreciate an answer from the Minister of Health.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Yes, I will take up the matter with my colleague.

IRRIGATION

Mr. ARNOLD: My question is to the Minister of Works and, in view of his problems with his throat, I will be happy to receive a written reply tomorrow. Will the Government grant an additional 10 per cent to the diversion licences of River Murray irrigators in South Australia this summer? Considerable assistance has been provided by the Government recently by giving an additional 10 per cent water allocation to Murray River divertees wherever possible. Since there is a good flow in the river this year (and it seems that it will be sustained during the major part of the summer), it is considered by many that to impose heavy penalties on irrigators, who are already suffering serious problems as a result of the industry in which they are involved, for using quantities in excess of their water diversion licences could not be

justified. In those circumstances, I appeal to the Government to grant an additional 10 per cent water entitlement to diverters in South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to confer with the Director and Engineer-in-Chief and let the honourable member have a reply by tomorrow.

TREE PLANTING

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Can the Minister for Planning say what plans the State Planning Authority has for future tree plantings on its reserves? My question flows from a report I read in the State Planning Authority's newsletter which indicated that the authority had planted 8 600 trees over an area of five hectares each on seven of its reserves. It would seem that, because of the slow growth period of the trees planted by the authority, it will have plans to extend its plantings annually or to other reserves. I would appreciate the Minister's getting a report for me on this subject.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will get a report for the honourable member.

ROAD TAX

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Transport say what progress has been made in the preparation of reciprocal legislation to combat the "straw" company problem associated with road maintenance contributions, and what is the attitude of the other States in this matter? Yesterday, the Highways Department report was laid on the table on this House, and it stated that the revenue collected from road maintenance contributions was \$4 825 000, that outstandings increased from a known figure of \$473 000 to \$771 000, and that the majority of the increase may be attributed to estimations of amounts outstanding by "straw" companies against which legal action has been taken.

In conjunction with other members of the Australian Transport Advisory Council, South Australia has continued investigations into alternatives to the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act—road pricing and road funding methods, etc. The introduction of reciprocal legislation to combat the "straw" company problem is under consideration. I have been prompted to ask the question on behalf of those road transport operators, many of whom are in my district, who are doing the right thing.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The State Government has always been guided by the legal opinions that have been provided to us on this matter, and, until quite recently, the opinion that we have been given is that any legislation to provide for "straw" companies would not hold up legally if tested. The matter has been discussed at ATAX level many times, and the general view has been expressed that, if other States agree to introduce legislation and in fact do introduce legislation, uniform action would be taken. Where I refer to "the other States" I am referring to the Commonwealth. To date the Commonwealth has done nothing and, unless it does something, any action by any of the States, if one assumes that all of the States legislate uniformly upon it, will have no standing unless the Commonwealth can be motivated to do likewise. It has said it will, but to date we have not seen any action from it.

The second point to bear in mind is that great emphasis has been placed on the fact that the "straw" company anomaly is depriving road authorities of funds that they otherwise should obtain. I do not think there is much

doubt about that, but I stress to this House, as I have done to ATAC, that the evasion attributable to the "straw" companies is nothing short of the tip of the iceberg. The whole taxing system is wrong, and South Australia has consistently put forward the view that the tax should be replaced by an excise tax on fuel. This would have equal application across the whole board, and it would not apply an additional charge to private motorists because with the application of an excise tax there would be a corresponding adjustment and reduction of the registration fees payable by private motorists.

We put forward a good scheme which received much support but, of course, like all of these things, it must not only have unanimous support but it must also have Commonwealth support. Peter Nixon has thrown it out of court, and he went to New Zealand to tell the Australian people why. He did not have the courage to say it in Australia.

At 3.10 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. BECKER (Hanson) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1935-1978. Read a first time.

Mr. BECKER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Robbery and stealing from the person, assault with intent to rob, robbery with violence, demanding money, etc., with menaces or by force are essentially violent crimes, with the risk of injury or death to innocent persons. To most of us such crimes are heinous and, whilst I acknowledge that armed robberies of banks are a serious concern to bank officers and to law enforcement officers, the community at large is gravely concerned at the increase of such crimes against persons handling money and goods that are easily negotiable.

Bank officers, Totalizator Agency Board employees, cashiers, pay-roll officers, retailers, in fact any persons required to handle money or goods today have every reason for concern; so much so that in a few short weeks over 40 000 signatures to petitions calling for support of this Bill will have been presented to this Parliament. I am assured more are to come.

The community is now looking to this Parliament for a lead to dispel the thought that court sentences are light and bail is easy to obtain. The Victorian Employees Federation issued a get-tough call in its August newsletter. A report in the *News* of 15 August 1978, states:

Easy bail and light gaol sentences are helping armed bandits at the expense of the police and community, according to an employer group.

Court bail should be boosted to more than the value of goods stolen and sentences should be more realistic, the group says. The get-tough call is made in the latest newsletter published by the Victorian Employers' Federation. "In looking for solutions to this frightening problem . . . the first group to be examined is our law enforcement agencies, our Police Force," the newsletter says.

"But there is little room for criticism. Generally speaking our Police Force is doing a good job in apprehending these thugs. But it would appear they are being let down and the community is being let down by the easy bail requirements

and the light sentences imposed by our court system. All too often we see alleged offenders, sometimes with long criminal records, let out on bail only to commit another series of offences."

The newsletter said in the first seven months of this year [1978] there were 230 armed holdups reported in Victoria—only 18 fewer than all armed robberies in 1976. It claimed some bandits lodged part of the money they stole as "bail insurance" with a friend in case they were caught.

The Australian Bank Employees Union newsletter No. 7 of 11 September 1978 reported that one in 17 bank branches had been attacked so far this year in New South Wales. The article went on to state, "It seems that the armed hold-up scene has been transferred to Sydney banks during 1978, with the number of bank hold-ups presently resting at 77. That number is already an all-time high for any Australian city."

Statistics obtained to date from the Parliamentary Library Research Service indicate 32 reported offences for robbery under arms in South Australia for the 15 months to September 1978. From 1972 to 1977, the figures are as follows:

Year ended 30 June	Number of offences reported
1972.....	14
1973.....	14
1974.....	3
1975.....	17
1976.....	39
1977.....	33
September 1978.....	32

Regrettably, there was another this morning. Statistics available for armed robberies in other States are as follows:

New South Wales:

Year ended 31 December	Reports accepted
1975.....	305
1976.....	286
1977.....	Not available

Victoria:

Year ended 31 December	Offences
1975.....	223
1976.....	142
1977.....	432

(Source: Victorian Police Department, Annual Report (various issues)).

Queensland:

Year ended 31 December	Offences
1976.....	43
1977.....	48
1978 to date.....	52

(Source: Queensland Police Department)

Tasmania:

It is believed that only five or six robberies in the past 18 months would have been armed hold-ups. Separate statistics are not kept.

Western Australia:

The number of armed hold-ups in the year ended 30 June 1977 was 37; in the year ended 30 June 1976 there were 62 armed hold-ups.

(Source: Police Department Annual Report, 1976-77) We certainly do not want to experience the high incidence of armed hold-ups in this State compared with Victoria. Some statistics given me recently concerning bank robbery in America are worrying; nevertheless we should heed overseas experiences and not allow the situation to develop here. The information is as follows:

During the federal fiscal year of 1976, 32 persons were killed, 183 injured, and 83 hostages were taken during robberies of financial institutions. During the first six months of 1977, 15 deaths occurred, 58 persons were injured, and 43 hostages were taken. Bank robbery is indeed a serious crime. Additionally, bank robberies have resulted in direct losses to financial institutions ranging between \$20 000 000 and \$30 000 000 per year over the past few years. Nationwide, robbery trends from 1972-1976 disclose that bank robbery has increased at a much greater rate than other robbery crimes, as reported by the F.B.I. Here are the figures:

NATIONWIDE ROBBERY TRENDS—1972-76

Type of robbery	Trend per cent
All robberies.....	+ 12
Street Robbery.....	+ 6
Commercial establishments.....	+ 6
Gas stations.....	+ 11
Private residences.....	+ 16
Chain stores.....	+ 50
Banks.....	+ 74

The adverse trend for banks can be reversed but it will require much more co-operation and co-ordination between financial institutions, regulatory agencies, and law enforcement agencies.

Further disturbing information is contained in a report in *Savings Weekly*, the staff paper of bank officers employed in the State Savings Bank of Victoria. Dated 13 October 1977, and dealing with the situation in Victoria, the report states:

Bank hold-ups have developed an unenviable capacity for achieving the headlines in the media. Not so, however; the criminals who have perpetrated these crimes once they have been captured, tried and convicted. All this latter appears to be regarded as very much a matter of course and merely copy for a small paragraph in an insignificant spot in the daily news. Here we may read that a bank robber was sentenced to the maximum term for his crime with an order that he should serve a minimum of so many years in gaol.

In our naivety, we presume that the bank robber will serve at least the minimum sentence period nominated. Recently, however, we discovered there is often a wide disparity between what is publicised and the actual situation as far as time spent in gaol is concerned. These figures make interesting, indeed illuminating, reading. The following examples illustrate our point:

Case No. 1:—A bandit who was involved in 11 armed hold-ups was convicted in October 1975 and sentenced to a maximum term of 20 years gaol with a minimum period of 14 years. Estimated release date—January 1985.

Case No. 2:—Bandit held up three banks. Convicted April 1977 and sentenced to 14 years gaol with a minimum to serve of 11 years. Expected date of release—May 1986.

Case No 3:—Bank robber sentenced to a maximum of 15 years in December 1970 after conviction for involvement in three armed hold-ups. Anticipated release date, June 1981.

Case No. 4:—Another instance where three banks were robbed at gunpoint. Bandit convicted and sentenced during April 1977 to a maximum term of 15 years with a minimum period of 12 years to be served. Estimated release date, February 1985.

There are many other similar instances we could quote, but the point we wish to make, and which is graphically illustrated in the cases cited, is that there is a considerable disparity between the sentences handed down by the courts and those actually served by the bank robbers involved. It is true that there are various remissions for good behaviour, but the extent of these is rarely revealed.

Similarly, although the Government has acted to increase the maximum sentence for armed robbery, when one

compares the reality with the theory we are forced to wonder just how much of a deterrent is involved and what impact this would have on criminals.

The South Australian concern certainly lies with penalties and non-parole periods. The Australian Bankers Association Research Directorate, Sydney, made a submission to associated banks (Tasmania) in October 1975 with copies of letters that had been sent to the Deputy Premier and Chief Secretary and to the Secretary of the Department of Labour and Chairman of the committee. Part of the submission read:

Sentences imposed on convicted bandits:—Although this particular aspect of bank security may not yet be of major concern in Tasmania, this is not necessarily true of the future, because of the increasing mobility of criminal elements. Accordingly, the banks seek your co-operation in ensuring that protection available through sentences imposed on convicted criminals must be sufficiently severe to strengthen this deterrent to armed robbery of banks. There are three major areas where there is cause for the deepest of concern:

(a) Penalties imposed—This lies particularly in respect of short minimum non-parole periods, that have little relation to the nature of the offence committed nor to the apparent severity of the nominal maximum sentence. The cause for concern in this respect is revealed partly by statistics, which show that, in New South Wales during 1974, for instance, the average nominal sentence imposed for armed robbery of a bank was 10 years, yet the minimum non-parole period was only five years. Within this low average, however, are some alarming examples, such as, five cases where the non-parole period was less than three years. In one case, an offender received an effective minimum non-parole period of only 11 months, for armed robbery of three banks involving an aggregate of \$11 600. His nominal sentence was 10 years.

(b) Parole—The ease with which parole, after minimum periods, is gained and the violence of crimes committed by parolees also causes grave concern.

It is relevant that the murder of the Sydney bank teller that ignited the present public controversy was, in fact, alleged to have been committed by a parolee. The infamous exploits, while on parole, of Darcy Dugan need no further description. At present, according to the South Australian *Government Gazette* dated 28 September 1978, 13 persons are on bail for armed robbery or robbery with violence, and two persons for robbery with violence, assault occasioning bodily harm, and larceny. So, it is easy to see that there could be a valid reason for concern.

Therefore, when we read articles such as appeared in the *Advertiser* on 6 October 1978 headed, "Bank Union to act on violence", I believe we must take heed of warnings from those who represent persons who are at risk. The article states:

Bank union to act on violence

The Australian Bank Employees Union will act to prevent Adelaide becoming a "centre of violence". The union's 12-member Federal executive ended a two-day meeting in Adelaide yesterday by endorsing a South Australian branch campaign for stiffer sentences for armed robbery.

The ABEU assistant Federal secretary, Mr. K. H. Salter, said Adelaide had an excellent opportunity to introduce deterrents to prevent a looming "wave of crime".

The 67 000-member ABEU advocated a series of deterrents to combat armed hold-ups and to protect bank tellers. These included:

- A minimum non-parole sentence of five years for armed hold-ups.

- Denial of bail to people charged with armed robbery.
- An education campaign to get people to report suspicious activity around banks.

Such deterrents had been fairly successful in helping cut armed hold-ups in Melbourne, but more work was needed in Sydney, where there had been more than 80 such robberies this year.

"Adelaide has got to act now," Mr. Salter said. "I would regard New South Wales and Victoria as being up the creek without a paddle as far as social preventive measures are concerned. The big cities are so impersonalised that people just don't want to get involved if they see something suspicious happening around a bank." He said crime had become more prevalent and more violent all around the world, "and it's going to catch up to us if we don't take preventive measures to stop it".

To achieve the aim that is required of us, I believe the time has come when we must consider establishing a penalty commensurate with the crime and, in particular, establish a minimum penalty for robbery with violence. I know that the legal profession will not agree with me in attempting to instruct the Judiciary, but under the Motor Vehicles Act there are set penalties for offences under the Road Traffic Act. That is, if one is convicted of a violation, a set number of demerit points is carried by the offence.

As all motorists know, the loss of 12 demerit points leads to an automatic disqualification of a driver's licence if the points are accumulated within three years. In the preamble of his article *Criminal Sentencing in the United States; A Historical and Conceptual Overview*, Alan M. Dershowitz states:

Abstract:—The criminal sentence seeks to reduce the frequency and severity of crimes by employing the following mechanisms;

- (a) isolating the convicted criminal from the rest of the population, so that he is unable to commit crimes during the period of his enforced isolation;
- (b) punishing the convicted prisoner, so that he—and others contemplating crime—will be deterred by the prospect of a painful response if convicted;
- (c) rehabilitating of the convicted criminal, so that his desire or need to commit future crimes will be diminished. During different periods of our history, the power to determine the duration of a convicted criminal's sentence has been allocated to different agencies: first to the Legislature; then to the Judiciary; and now—under indeterminate sentencing—to the parole board. The locus of sentencing authority has a considerable effect on such factors as the length of sentences, the degree of discretion, and the disparity among sentences. The century-long trend in the direction of indeterminacy seems to be ending. It is likely that the coming decades will witness a return to more legislatively-fixed sentences.

Those who have been unfortunate to be victims of armed hold-ups or other related crimes covered by this Bill are now keen to see their Parliament take tough action. In the past 18 months or so, one T.A.B. agency has been held up twice in my electorate. Also in my electorate two employees of a supermarket were held up and the weekend takings stolen prior to the entry of their bank. In June this year a bank at Plympton was held up, and another bank at West Beach was held up in August. As far as I know, the offenders have not been caught, yet the police in this State have quite a good record.

It was disappointing to me to read today's *News* and see that there had been a pay-roll grab of about \$145 000. The *News* report, under the heading "Shots fired in wild Adelaide chase", states:

Three bandits fired shots as they made a wild getaway from a \$145 000 pay-roll smash at a Bowden electrical firm today. They fired three shots outside the building and a further six at a company employee who chased them in his car after the daring hold-up.

Dr. Eastick: That "today" is today.

Mr. BECKER: That is today. The fear we all have is that we are starting to follow the pattern set in other States, particularly in the Eastern States and, regrettably, the activity that has taken place in the United States of America where so many people have lost their lives and many others have been held captive in the course of the robberies.

The psychological damage and the frightening experience (more so to those who have suffered injuries of violent crimes) lead me to believe that we must now legislate to make penalties for these crimes a deterrent. I have always been concerned with "plea bargaining" and propose to increase the maximum penalty in areas considered that could be used. Accordingly, I commend to members the amendments proposed.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 seeks to amend section 155 of the principal Act by increasing the maximum penalty for any term not exceeding 14 years to life for robbery and stealing from the person. Clause 3 seeks to amend section 156 by increasing the penalty for any term not exceeding three years to life imprisonment for assault with intent to rob. Clause 4 seeks to amend section 158, dealing with robbery with violence, by adding a new subclause that no person who is imprisoned under subsection (1) of this section shall be released on licence or parole until he has served at least five years imprisonment.

Clause 5 seeks to amend section 160 of the principal Act by increasing the maximum penalty for demanding money, etc., with menaces or by force from three years to a term not exceeding life imprisonment.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

Mr. RUSSACK (Goyder): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill is designed to make less rigid the requirements for voting in local government elections, and to bring the Local Government Act in line with the Electoral Act in this respect. Both Acts lay down certain requirements for voters to follow when casting their votes. For example, under the Electoral Act voters must indicate the order of their preferences for the candidates, and under the Local Government Act a cross must be placed against the name of the candidate of their choice.

In section 123 (1) of the Electoral Act the rules are laid down whereby a vote shall be considered informal. Nevertheless, section 123 (2) provides:

A ballot-paper shall not be informal for any reason other than the reasons specified in this section, but shall be given effect to according to the voter's intention so far as his intention is clear.

This subsection allows a returning officer to regard a ballot-paper as formal if he considers that the voter's intention is clear, even though the ballot-paper may not be strictly in accordance with the Act. This is subject, of course, to any objection which may be made by scrutineers. The best-known occasion on which a returning officer made use of this subsection was in the count for the electorate of Millicent in 1968. The actions of the returning officer on that occasion were subsequently

supported by the Court of Disputed Returns.

The Local Government Act has no such provision. Section 120, paragraph 7, provides that no other matter or thing except as are required by the Act shall be inserted on the voting paper. Paragraph 8 of the same section lays down that the voter shall indicate the candidate of his choice by placing a cross, having its point of intersection within the square opposite the name of the candidate. Section 127, paragraph 2, subparagraph (c) requires that the returning officer shall reject any vote which does not comply with these requirements. There is no provision for a returning officer to exercise his judgment as to whether the voter's intention is clear.

In a recent very close local government election, on one vote the voter had "doodled" on the ballot-paper. The marks in no way identified the voter: a cross was quite clearly in a square opposite a candidate's name but, because of the requirement that no other matter or thing shall be inserted on a voting paper, the returning officer had no choice but to reject it. In the same election two or three votes had ticks instead of crosses. They were quite clearly within a square, the voter's intention was quite clear, but, because the Local Government Act does not have a section similar to that referred to in the Electoral Act, the votes were ruled informal. This Bill seeks to correct that anomaly.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that a voting paper shall be given effect to so far as the voter's intention is clear. I commend the Bill to the House.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 September. Page 1038.)

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): I oppose this Bill. It has come to this House from another place, where it was introduced by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. I think this is the second time that this Bill has been introduced into the Parliament. It is, as I understand, identical to the Bill previously introduced. I understand the measure has been based on legislation passed by both Houses of the New South Wales Parliament following the long drawn-out constitutional struggle that occurred in that State to achieve the long overdue reform of the Upper House.

The Bill originally introduced by the Wran Government in New South Wales was a quite different measure from this Bill. That Bill was based on legislation which presently exists in South Australia to deal with elections for the Legislative Council. With the gerrymandered electorate for the Upper House in New South Wales (and, accordingly, the Liberal majority in that House), it was not possible for the Wran Government to achieve the sort of electoral reform that we have been able to achieve in South Australia, or the sort of democratic structure that we now have in the Upper House. Accordingly, a compromise arrangement was necessary in order to achieve any sort of improvement in the system that existed.

Mr. Wilson: Yes, and Wran took the credit for the compromise.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: He took the credit for having, at last, after so many years achieved the almost impossible and unattainable position of having a democratic system of sorts introduced into the Upper Chamber in that State. It is quite right that he should have

taken some credit for that. That does not mean, however, that the system he was able to introduce as a compromise was as good a system as that applying in South Australia, which he originally favoured.

The Labor Government in New South Wales accepted the compromise legislation as the only reform it was able to achieve, because of the obstruction of the Liberals in the Upper House. The original legislation intended by the New South Wales Government was to have a system similar to that which we have here. It was never intended that there would be a system similar to the one proposed by Mr. DeGaris, who in his very brief second reading speech in another place referred to what he saw as "two serious deficiencies in the existing South Australian legislation". He first claimed the system used did not guarantee that each vote cast would have an equal value, his other objection related to the list system itself. The first objection was more than adequately answered by the Hon. Mr. Blevins, who said that Mr. DeGaris's objection to the existing legislation on the grounds that each vote did not have an equal value was "very rich indeed". I cannot think of a better way of describing it.

The transformation of Mr. DeGaris's thinking on this matter has been amazing. There was a time when he told the people of South Australia that he believed in the permanent will of the people to be achieved by the continuation of an undemocratic, unrepresentative Upper House based on a property franchise, when he believed that no reform of the Chamber was necessary. After a great campaign led by the Premier of this State we eventually reached the situation where the Liberals in the Upper House knew that their number was up for the sort of corrupt electoral system under which they had been flourishing for so many years. The result was that eventually Mr. DeGaris and his cronies in another place were very reluctantly forced to support the legislation which introduced the democratic structure we now have for Upper House elections in this State.

It is indeed strange to find Mr. DeGaris has now suddenly become the champion of equality of votes, of one vote value. My, my, how things have changed and how the leopard has changed his spots! It is difficult to understand why this change has occurred, and I can only suppose Mr. DeGaris was self-seeking at the time and realised that the Liberals, under the old system that applied in South Australia, would have a permanent majority and were therefore in a situation where they could afford to resist the strong pressures from the people of this State for a democratic electoral system in the Upper House. Once he had been brought to the barrier, so to speak, and had to accept, apply and support the new system, he has now decided that he had better look around and find some other system which, through quirks in its operations, can be used, moulded and twisted to suit the Liberal Party and ensure that that Party, under some sort of charade of democracy, will be able to gain a significant majority in the Upper House. This is notwithstanding the fact that over so many years that Party has been unable to obtain a majority of the votes in this State.

Mr. Wilson: Isn't it just the Senate system he's trying to bring in?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: It is not just the Senate system and, even if it were, there are quite a number of undesirable things about the Senate system. The honourable member would be aware that a comparison between the informal votes cast for our Upper House and those cast for the Senate clearly shows that people in this country, or in this State at the very least, are not particularly anxious to have very complicated ballot-papers where they may have to cast any number of votes.

As I recall, there was an election for the Senate in New South Wales not so long ago, where I believe there were more than 50 names on the ballot-paper. This meant that the simple art of casting a ballot required a person to undertake, in effect, a numeracy test, because one had to be able to count from one to 50 to cast a valid vote. That is an appalling system that could well do with review and reform. I suggest to the honourable member that the Senate system is one that we can do without in this State, because for the Upper House we now have a system which is clear and simple and which ensures that there is a minimum of informal votes.

Mr. Tonkin: What about the votes wasted?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Very few votes are wasted as informal votes. The member for Torrens sought to inject into this debate comparisons with the Senate, and that is what I have been trying to do. It is said that the list system precludes a vote, within the list, for a group of candidates of one's own choosing. This argument completely neglects the reality of voting patterns in multiple seat elections in Australia. As an example, the record shows that in the 1975 double dissolution election more than 99 per cent of the people in Australia who wished to vote for the Liberal group in the Senate voted for the No. 1 man in the Liberal group. Similarly, the Labor Party voters, almost without exception, voted for the man at the head of the Party ticket. It is just bunkum to suggest that a person is casting an enlightened vote and that he knows each and every individual on the ballot-paper. If we were honest with ourselves we would admit that people in this country vote for a political Party. They vote for a Party list, they have been used to doing this for a very long time, and it appears to suit them very well; I believe they will continue to do it.

The present South Australian system is simple and works quite well, as was demonstrated at the 1975 Legislative Council elections. At that election no serious problems were encountered, and the electors obviously found the voting system easier, because the percentage of informal votes recorded was only 4.54 per cent compared with the 1973 Upper House election, at which the percentage of informal votes was 7.58 per cent. It is obvious that people prefer the new system. Our present system is simple, it is easily followed by electors, and it is a fair and just system. For that reason the Government believes the system should not be changed and that this Bill should not be passed by this Chamber, and there should be no more nonsense from the Hon. Mr. DeGaris spruiking his new-found conversion to democracy, which is very late in coming. I reject the Bill and hope that the House will do likewise.

Mr. MATHWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

URANIUM

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Tonkin:

That this House believes it is safe to mine and treat uranium in South Australia, rescinds its decision taken on 30 March 1977, and urges the Government to proceed with plans for the development and treatment of the State's uranium resources as soon as possible.

(Continued from 27 September. Page 1213.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I oppose this motion. I have looked with care at the speech of the Leader of the Opposition in introducing it to the House. It was very noticeable that the Leader spent almost the whole of his speech imputing ill motive and political

chicanery to the people who were opposed to him on this matter.

He did not deal with the basis of argument on which the original motion for which he voted (and which he now seeks to rescind in one of his political somersaults) was introduced to the House. It is easy to see why. An analysis of the Leader's speech shows that he does not want to talk about the merits of this issue, and he gave little attention to those merits indeed. All he did was talk about the fact that at one stage I, as Premier of the State, had published the first report of the Uranium Enrichment Committee, that I had urged my Party that in fact there was a real problem about energy supplies to our customer countries, particularly Japan, and that at that stage it appeared that atomic energy would be required to bridge the gap between the running out of hydrocarbon fuels and the achievement of an alternative fuel source, such as solar energy.

The Leader did not deal with any of the things that I said when I introduced that motion to the House, a motion for which he voted, after I had spoken and explained the basis on which the motion was introduced. Its basis was very clear, and that was that the Government had examined the protests which had been raised by various conservation groups about the supply of uranium to a customer country. We were satisfied that in the mining of uranium in South Australia and the enrichment of uranium in this State there would be no undue environmental hazards; indeed, an enrichment plant would provide less environmental hazard than would a chemical plant such as I.C.I.'s plant at Port Adelaide.

However, on examination of the position about high-level atomic wastes, the evidence was very clear, that there were then, as there are now, no safe proven methods of disposal of high-level atomic wastes in use; there were no international arrangements which could enforce the use of effective technologies, should they be developed, for the disposal of high-level atomic wastes; and there were no international arrangements which would provide adequately for the thousands of years of guarding and monitoring of disposed high-level atomic wastes, should they be disposed of in accordance with newly developed technologies. In these circumstances, the dangers to mankind of the provision of uranium to customer countries, which would then have high-level atomic wastes to be disposed of, were too great to be borne. It was not safe in those circumstances to provide atomic wastes through the supply of uranium to customer countries, and until the technologies and the arrangements had been made, the conclusion was that this State should not proceed to the mining or enrichment of uranium. That was very clearly stated at the time. The evidence was clear and it remains clear. There is no change in that situation.

The Leader very carefully glossed over that whole situation. He merely said that the arrangements that were made with customer countries now were in accordance with the provision of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the International Atomic Energy Agency's requirements. Those are not satisfactory, and there is no way or ensuring what is to happen to high-level atomic wastes from any of the customer countries with which arrangements have been made by the Federal Government.

Let us turn to the sole pronouncement of the Federal Government on the subject of the disposal of high-level atomic wastes. It comes in one line: the Federal Minister said that new technologies had been developed and it was possible now safely to dispose of high-level atomic wastes through vitrification, that is vitrifying the waste and then burying it in stable salt deposits. That has been put

forward as a technique, but it has not been proven over a period, as is required. This technique has been bitterly criticised by scientists in this area.

I refer members to the recent publication by Professor Ringwood. He proposed an alternative method of disposal of high-level atomic wastes, that is, that the high-level atomic wastes be in fact provided in stone in stable geological formations which had been proven stable over many thousands of years. In his work on this new process, which he has put forward as a means of effective and safe disposal of high-level atomic wastes (yet to be proven in practice, but certainly argued well by Professor Ringwood), he was very critical of the vitrification process and said that it was quite unsafe, that in fact the whole process would deteriorate, and that it could not be held to be maintained stable for more than about eight years. In those circumstances, where is the evidence that customer countries, to whom we can provide uranium, have a means of safe disposal of high-level atomic waste? We have no such evidence. None has been put forward by any of the technical people in this area.

The second point is that, even if there were such a technique available (and at the moment there is no proven technique available), where are the arrangements to ensure that any customer country will provide that method of disposal of high-level atomic wastes? The Leader did not point to anything in the published agreements, and he cannot do so, because there is nothing there that provides it. Under the arrangements made by the Federal Government, there is no way of our saying at the moment to a customer country, "Where are you going to dispose of this atomic waste and by what method?" There are no sanctions to ensure that such an arrangement, were it to be in the agreement, could be carried out and enforced, and there are no provisions for long-term monitoring and guarding.

We have right here on our doorstep at the moment a prime example of the care which has been taken by countries who at present are talking about dealing with high-level atomic wastes. Look at the care that was taken on our own doorstep at Maralinga. What evidence have we that the British have changed their attitude? They are supposed to be the safest in this area, but the statements of the past two days can hardly give us any confidence in their attitude about the matter. What evidence is there that Great Britain at the moment is providing for the safe disposal of high-level atomic wastes? We do not have any; I have not been able to get any. We have asked the Federal Government for evidence on this score and for information from the Atomic Energy Agency. We have had none. I have asked URENCO to provide me with information as to how this could be achieved. To this date we have none. That is the situation that we are facing and it is the same situation that led to the Government's introducing the motion to this House last year, a motion for which all members opposite voted.

That position, which I have stated this afternoon, was stated then in this House and it was the basis on which the Government took the action it took. It was not a question of some trade union secretary coming to me and twisting my arm. If I do not believe a thing is right, the twisting of an arm by a trade union secretary does not get me to alter my view. Members at least ought to pay me the compliment of remembering that there have been numbers of times when I have stood up publicly and said to trade union submissions which were made, "No, that is no good; we don't believe that is the proper basis on which a Government should proceed." For the Leader to carry on as he has done and suggest that this was simply that I was run over in some way by political forces is the kind of

imputation, of insincerity and opportunism, which he makes of other people regularly, but it was without basis on this occasion as it has been without basis on others.

The Leader gave no reasons whatever in his speech why we should at this stage change the policy which was unanimously adopted in this House. When the Leader can come forward, or when anyone can come forward, and show that there is a safe proven technology for the disposal of high-level atomic waste, that there are adequate international agreements which will provide for that to be used by a customer country, that there are sanctions to enforce it, and that there are provisions for long-term monitoring and guarding, then there will be a case for this House to change its attitude. Until then I do not believe there is such a case. That evidence is not there at the moment and until that evidence is there this State ought to stand firm.

It is not enough for members to come here and say that other countries are prepared to dispose of the future of mankind for a little short-term gain. I do not believe that we should be in an operation of that kind. We have to stand on principle for what we do. I should very much like it to be possible for South Australia to make use of any of the resources that it has for additional employment and development within the State, but that must be on the basis of principle, justice and good sense, and principle, justice and good sense at this time require us to stand by the decision of this House, and the policy of the Government, and to stand that way until the evidence, which has certainly not come forward to date is to hand that would lead us to change our view.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): If there has ever been a question that involves the fundamental future of the human race, it is the question of whether or not South Australia, Australia and other countries and in total, the world, should become nuclear, should take on the nuclear age in full flight. I believe that if ever there has been an issue which has been fundamental to the future of the human race it is this issue. If ever there has been a time when I have been delighted to support the policy of the Government of this State (because I believe that it is a policy that will inevitably be proved by history to be the correct policy, a policy which we have to some extent taken on ahead of public opinion throughout the world), it is on this occasion.

I am amazed to be speaking in this House today on this issue, when not so long ago the House endorsed unanimously a policy, which was, in effect, for a moratorium on the mining, development, export and enrichment of uranium from this State until it was proved safe to supply to a customer country. As everyone knows the details of the resolution, I do not need to go into it fully. I am amazed to find that so soon after this House passed that resolution the Leader of the Opposition, on behalf of his Party, has moved in this Parliament to rescind that motion. In other words, in that short time the Opposition has changed its mind. It is not a case of just one member of the Opposition changing his mind on the matter; apparently each and every one of the members opposite, with the notable exception of the member for Mitcham, has apparently changed his mind on this matter in favour of the mining, development, export and enrichment of uranium in this State.

That might lead one to question why members opposite have changed their minds. What significant development has occurred since this matter was initially debated (March 1977) that could possibly lead members opposite to have changed their minds to the extent they have done? What possibly could have occurred to cause this tremendous transformation over an issue which undoubtedly is one of

the most fundamental issues confronting the human race at the present time? From a study of the speech given in support of his motion by the Leader of the Opposition I could find not one thing to indicate that there had been any significant change throughout the world. Where was the suggestion in his speech that there had been a fundamental change in technology which had made the position safer? Where was the suggestion that it was now safe to supply a customer country? Where was there any suggestion that the problems associated with terrorism, which goodness only knows has been raised so dramatically in the past week by his Federal colleague the Minister for Defence (Mr. Killen), have been solved? Where was a suggestion anywhere in his speech that anything had changed fundamentally that the whole of his Party should desert the stand it had taken before, a stand which I stood in this House and described as principled?

What has changed? One has to ask that question. When it comes to the nitty-gritty of it, the only thing that has changed is the fact that their Federal colleagues, for purely political motives, motives based on the interest of their supporters in the business community, have changed their policy. The Federal Liberal Party has changed its policy and accordingly Opposition members in this Parliament have, like sheep, followed in this change. I must express my extreme concern and disappointment that not one member of the Liberal Party, or the Country Party member, has apparently had the guts to stand up and be counted on this attitude, instead of simply falling into line with the dictates of the Party federally.

I do not want to waste time talking about the Liberals' lack of principle on this question, because their lack of principle on most issues is known widely. I thought it might be of some value this afternoon if I was to set out to the House from press reports in my files some of the details of problems that have developed in nuclear plants, in nuclear mining, in reactor development, and in enrichment throughout the world over the past four or five years.

It is certainly a staggering chronicle of the way in which the nuclear industry is far from free from accidents and from the sort of dangers which we have been trying to convince members opposite are so obviously prevalent. The most appropriate place to start might be a quotation from the *Wall Street Journal*, hardly a Labor or trade union rag, one might say. A report in the journal of May 1973 states:

The most dependable feature of nuclear power plants is their unreliability.

Members opposite may well suggest that, from that time on, the reliability of nuclear plants has improved to such an extent that it is now safe to export uranium to customer countries, and to have Australia enter on the nuclear fuel cycle and all that is associated with it.

To make sure that we have the record straight, I should like to quote from some other newspapers and publications around the world, to indicate just how unreliable nuclear plants and associated facilities are and have been since then. A report in the *Advertiser* of 12 August 1974, date-lined Christchurch, states:

New Zealand scientists are investigating the possibility that there was an accidental release of a substantial and harmful amount of radioactive material from the U.S. nuclear power station at McMurdo Sound, Antarctica, two years ago. Late last year the station was closed, dismantled and shipped back to the U.S. Scientists quoted by the *Christchurch Star* claim there was a possibility of fluoride stress cracking the reactor pressure vessel and primary coolant piping. Scientists who are working for the Environmental Defence Society fear cracks in the reactors might have resulted in a release of

radioactive material some time in 1972. A report released last year revealed the station had not been operated since September 1973 because of a "fault".

That is the only report I have been able to find about the fault in the McMurdo Sound nuclear reactor in Antarctica, presumably because, like all developments and all matters that occur in the nuclear area, there seems to be a blanket of silence over it. Only in the past few days, we have seen in South Australia how, for nearly 20 years, we have been reassured that everything is fine at Maralinga, that everything is under control, but suddenly we have found that the Federal Government has been given a report by the British Government which previously has not been made available to the Australian Government or the Australian people. Here again, we find this secrecy. I have been unable to find any further reports of the McMurdo Sound incident, so-called.

The *Advertiser* of 12 July 1974 tells the story of a Japanese scientist by the name of Hiroshi Ogawa, who was adjusting the release of radioactive rays used for the production of radio-isotopes in the National Institute of Radiological Science Cyclotron Building outside Tokyo. The exposure-measuring film attached to the front of Ogawa's white tunic did not reveal any radioactive leakage, but two weeks later the thumb and first finger of his right hand began to burn. "The symptoms are getting worse. My fingers hurt so badly I cannot hold a pencil", the report stated. It continued:

Doctors are debating whether it will be safer to have his red and blistered fingers amputated now. Tests have shown that for several seconds Ogawa's hands were exposed to proton rays which leaked 30 000-40 000 rems of radioactivity in that moment through a faulty shutter.

A report in the *Advertiser* of 3 September 1974, from Tokyo, states:

Japan's first nuclear-powered ship, the *Mutsu* has suspended her reactor tests in the North Pacific after radioactive leakage. Radiation comparable to the amount to be released when the reactor is working at full capacity was observed yesterday when the output was still almost nil, but was not strong enough to affect the crew.

The last paragraph says that she had been tied up for 22 months because of opposition from local fishermen, who said she contaminated the sea with radioactivity. I understand that that ship is still in port and has not been commissioned. The *Guardian* of 8 February 1975 contains a report which states:

Nearly half the commercial nuclear power stations operating in the United States have been ordered to shut down for emergency inspections. The problem this time, as with four months ago, is cracked pipes. Five small cracks have been discovered in a stainless steel pipe in a reactor outside Chicago and there are suspicions that 23 similar designed power stations may be suffering from the same dangerous defects. The power station is the Edison Dresden No. 2 Pressurised Water Reactor near Chicago.

From a Campaign Against Nuclear Energy newsletter of March 1976, we discover the now famous Brown's Ferry incident in the United States, in which the use of a candle flame by electrical technicians to check air leaks in the control room caused a flare-up which in turn could have caused a disastrous melt-down of the nuclear core. It was described by one observer as a "mere fluke" that a melt-down did not occur. What this incident shows us is that a major danger from nuclear energy is human fallibility. The Brown's Ferry nuclear reactor incident was hardly reported in the Australian press, little reference to it appearing in any of the major dailies. Only months after were there minor references to it.

In 1943, the United States Government opened a

nuclear waste storage facility at Hanford Reservation, in the south-eastern corner of Washington State. On 20 April 1973, technicians were pumping liquid wastes into 30-year-old 533 000-gallon tanks. Pumping stopped on 25 April 1973, and in that period between 20 and 25 April the level of liquid in the tanks had dropped by nearly 3ft, and monitors buried in the ground near the tanks recorded extremely high levels of radiation. Not until 8 June did officials at the site realise what was happening. By that time 115 000 gallons of high level waste had circulated into the ground. If the leak had been detected at the earliest possible moment the American Atomic Energy Commission later calculated the seepage could have been restricted to 26 000 gallons, but even that would have been an enormous leakage.

I shall quote now an extract from a document called "Nuclear power, boon or bane", an article prepared by the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, as follows:

A well regarded group of conservationist lawyers has called on the A.E.C. to cease all dumping of this type. The lawyers argue that isotopes from the dumped material are finding their way into the ground water beneath Hanford and that they might in time reach the Columbia River, which flows within a few miles of the disposal cribs. The A.E.C. agrees that the ground water had been contaminated, but contends that it will never reach the river. A succession of fires, explosions, reactor accidents and contamination incidents at Hanford have long drawn comments from members of the Environmental Protection Agency and the National Academy of Sciences, as well as the national press. The most important charges centre around the dumping of 300 kilograms (about 660 lbs) of plutonium directly into 14 deep trenches. About 100 kilograms (enough to make 13 Nagasaki size bombs) have ended up in a trench numbered Z9. A recent A.E.C. study concludes that "due to the quantity of plutonium contained in the soil of Z9, it is possible to conceive conditions which could result in a nuclear chain reaction."

I suggest that that has special relevance for people in South Australia, where we have this unmonitored and basically unknown quantity of plutonium which has been dumped underground at Maralinga. The report continues:

According to Environmental Protection Agency experts who have studied the data, such a chain could cause the trench to explode, venting lethal plutonium into the Hanford area. Understandably, the vision of nuclear garbage spontaneously erupting in the A.E.C.'s face has prompted the agency to come up with an astonishing solution.

I invite members opposite to listen very carefully to this solution, which seems to have great relevance to us in South Australia at the moment, confronted as we are with the Maralinga problem.

Because plutonium is a man-made substance, not found in nature, the A.E.C. is now designing the world's first plutonium mine to exhume the worrisome 100 kilograms from Z9. If all goes according to schedule, it will begin operations in 1975. The prospect of the A.E.C. mining its own nuclear garbage has Washington's inner sanctum rolling in the aisles.

I do not quote that with any favour, as regards the last point, but it has particular relevance to the situation in which we now find ourselves in this State, and it is indeed a worrying situation.

I have a large number of other matters to which I could refer, but I specifically bring this matter right back to the present situation in South Australia. To Opposition members and those in the community who are concerned only with the fact that a few wealthy people and large corporations (principally international corporations) will make a lot of money out of the mining, enrichment and

exporting of uranium, I say that the question of whether we mine and export uranium from South Australia is not simply for us to decide, because the decisions we make in this country and in this State will be part of the total decision made by mankind. There is no doubt that it is possible even at this stage that public pressure throughout the world could develop to the point where the embryonic nuclear age, the spectre of which we are now looking at, could be stopped.

These arguments have been put before in the House. The reason is simply that the world is not in the situation in which we have to depend on nuclear fuel. I thought it was interesting that Mr. Andrews, in his comments the other day at the Loxton show, seemed to be under a complete misapprehension as to the nature of the power produced by atomic energy. I have never heard any suggestion that atomic power will provide any type of mobile fuel or that it will provide any sort of method by which people could be motivated along the ground or in the air. Atomic power will not provide any sort of stop-gap method of conserving significant amounts of oil that could not be supplied in that short-term period by the burning of coal; that is an established scientific fact.

I believe that it is a sad reflection on the Opposition that it seems to be completely committed to supporting its Federal policy, simply because many people believe that they will make large sums out of this project. It was not surprising to see how the Stock Exchange reacted to the recent turmoil over the signing of the Ranger agreement by the Northern Land Council. There is no doubt that, as reflected on the Stock Exchange when the Fraser Government was elected to power, the people with money in Australia believe that there is considerable money to be made out of the mining and export of uranium.

I will now deal particularly with the situation at Maralinga, because that brings home to us as well as anything could the reason why we should act responsibly in this matter in the interests of the whole of the human race. Maralinga is a good example of the way in which in future people will forget their responsibilities. Initially, an agreement was drawn up between the Australian and British Governments providing for all kinds of safeguards for the nuclear waste dump at Maralinga, for cleaning up of the site, for continual inspection of the site, and for some degree of security at the site. It seems that either that agreement was not strong enough (and I believe that to be the case) or, alternatively, the British Government did not tell the Australian Government exactly what it was doing with the plutonium waste on that site. If a foreign power (in this case the British Government), on our own soil in this State, could dupe us into believing that we had a safe situation, what sort of control would we possibly have over a foreign power on its own soil as regards the way in which it handles nuclear fuel that we might supply to it if we were to support the policy proposed by the Opposition?

Several questions about Maralinga need to be answered. They are important questions on most serious matters, and I pose some of them. What we need to know about Maralinga is who will pay for the safety measures over the next hundreds of years while this plutonium is potentially recoverable, I remind the Opposition, by terrorists. They are not the words of any person in the Labor Party; they are the words of the Liberal Federal Minister for Defence (Mr. Killen), who believes that the material there may be recoverable by sufficiently desperate terrorists. If anyone thinks that terrorists do not get desperate enough, I refer him to the shipload of 100 tonnes of uranium that was hijacked, apparently by the Israeli Government. Undoubtedly, people seeking to get this kind of material will go to any lengths to obtain it.

I believe it is tremendously important first that we should know what is there. Secondly, we should be given all available information as to what sort of security is proposed over the next hundreds of years to ensure that this dump is maintained safe from terrorists. We need to know how much this will cost. I predict that it will cost hundreds of millions of dollars to defend Maralinga from terrorist attacks over a long period; certainly, it will be a multi-million dollar figure. I do not think that this is an issue to which the people of Australia have yet turned their minds. We now have a legacy in this State that will be a continuing burden on the Australian taxpayers for generations to come. By entering the nuclear fuel cycle we will be assisting in committing the whole of the world and future generations of mankind to this commitment; we need to have this quantified to some extent before that happens.

The third thing we ought to know about the Maralinga situation is more about the allegations that have been made about cancer and radiation sickness suffered by people who have been involved in and associated with Maralinga over a long period, dating back to the time when it was an atomic test site. I do not believe that anything like sufficient follow-up by health authorities in this country has occurred in this matter. From speaking to the widows of a couple of men who have worked there and who have died of cancer, I gather that they believe that people have not spoken out, because there exists, Federally, security legislation that makes it an offence for any person who has been employed in a security capacity to speak in any way about what has happened at a supposedly secure place. A number of people who have previously worked at Maralinga have died either from radiation sickness, cancer subsequently, or tumours—all found to be associated with radiation, and all most certainly known to be associated with the effects of plutonium.

Anyone who thinks that it is a far-fetched story to suggest that the plutonium at Maralinga (acknowledged by Mr. Killen as being potentially obtainable by terrorists) could be obtained ought to turn his mind to the fact that it is only necessary to obtain that quantity of plutonium. That plutonium does not, for terrorist purposes, have to be converted into any sort of atomic weapon.

Plutonium could be used to terrorise a city simply by its presence because, as most members of the House would know, plutonium is so toxic that its mere presence in an area can have serious effects on human beings and lead to their developing cancer, radiation sickness and the like. I believe that as a Parliament we have a grave responsibility in this matter to the people of South Australia and their future. There is no point in arguing about who was right or wrong in the 1950's and the 1960's. That is an argument of the past, an argument which, regrettably, has been lost. The future is what we ought to be concerning ourselves with now. We ought to be finding answers to the matters I have put before the House this afternoon. I believe it is the most fundamental issue that is confronting the people of South Australia, Australia and the World. I believe we, as a Parliament, would be completely remiss in our responsibility to the people of this State if we were to do anything but thoroughly reject the motion moved by the Leader and reaffirm our support for the principles contained in the motion moved by the Premier in this House some time ago.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

Adjourned debate on motion of Dr. Eastick:

That the regulations under the Planning and Development Act, 1929-1976, relating to Rural Land, made on 6 April 1978 and laid on the table of this House on 13 July 1978, be disallowed.

(Continued from 13 September. Page 869.)

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister for Planning): I oppose this motion. The first general point I make is that the regulations of which the honourable member seeks disallowance are regulations that have been introduced as the best measures currently available to try to preserve prime agricultural and viticultural land which is under the threat of some form of semi-urbanisation. I think members from rural areas would be aware that this is a growing problem throughout the State, more particularly in areas close to metropolitan Adelaide such as the Adelaide Hills, the Barossa Valley and some country areas such as Kangaroo Island, where there is a premium on land for some types of holiday purpose.

I make it quite clear that the Government believes it is necessary to designate areas which are suitable for rural living purposes. Some action has already been taken in order to commence that process. For example, the Sandy Creek area of the District Council of Barossa is an area which it is now agreed between the council and State Planning Authority should be available for subdivision into rural living areas. The State Planning Authority has recently accepted an area at Ackland Hill Road in the District Council of Meadows as appropriate for a rural living zone of allotments of an average size of four hectares.

In rural living areas the provision of regulation 70A, which is the subject of this disallowance motion, would not apply. I think the fundamental point that we have to recognise is that, if we get excessive subdivision of land where land is available for agricultural, viticultural or horticultural purposes, the effect of such subdivision and the sale of small allotments is to push up the value of land and rates and taxes payable on the land by those farmers who wish to continue with agricultural pursuits.

Mr. Tonkin: It doesn't necessarily have to follow, does it?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It does follow almost inevitably.

Mr. Tonkin: That is a deficiency in the law.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is a deficiency in the law that applies if extensive subdivision of prime agricultural land, the sale of that land and the use of it for other than agricultural purposes are ever permitted.

Mr. Tonkin: In other words, you are looking at this for the benefit of the Government for taxes?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Not in the least.

Mr. Tonkin: You must admit it is one reason.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I wish the Leader would contain himself for a moment, because he might learn something. If the land value is pushed up through excessive subdivision, rates and taxes go up and the Government starts collecting land tax where it may not have collected land tax previously. What the Government is saying is that that sort of increase in revenue to local councils, or to the State Government, is not appropriate, because it leads to developments which result in the conversion of prime agricultural land to other uses. That is the point we are concerned about.

For example, in the McLaren Vale and Willunga area there is prime land for certain agricultural and viticultural purposes. We need to preserve that land for those purposes. If we permit subdivision into, for example, 10-acre allotments in the Willunga area, the sale of those 10-

acre allotments and the use of them for hobby farms increases the value of all land in that area and raises rates and taxes against those who desire to keep on with primary production.

Dr. Eastick: It depends upon your total policy.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The facts are clear and speak for themselves. In all parts of the State close to the metropolitan area or in places such as Kangaroo Island, where this sort of excessive subdivision has taken place, the value of land becomes completely out of line with its value for agricultural purposes and, because its value is different from its value for agricultural purposes, agricultural uses tend to be phased out. That is happening to the detriment of the future of the State in a number of situations, and that is recognised.

Dr. Eastick: That is because you forced so many 30-plus-hectare allotments.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the honourable member will only keep quiet for a moment, I will deal with him effectively. I paid him the courtesy of listening to his speech, which was spread over two days.

Dr. Eastick: And which was not provocative.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member could at least pay me the same courtesy. The Primary Producers Committee of the State Planning Authority, which is a committee comprised of representatives of various primary producer organisations (the United Farmers and Graziers, the Stockowners Association of South Australia, the South Australian Dairymen's Association, the South Australian Fruitgrowers and Market Gardeners Association, and the Wine and Grape Growers Council of South Australia), has indicated that it is most concerned with the impact of the hobby farmer on primary industry, and particularly with the division of prime producing land into small and often uneconomic holdings causing a resultant rise in land values. That is the fundamental problem we have to face, whether honourable members like it or not. It is simply not possible to sustain the kind of argument put up by the member for Light in relation to this matter.

The member for Light raised the question of no control over subdivisions into areas greater than 30 hectares. Where an area of 30 hectares is not a viable holding for agricultural purposes, if a whole series of 30 hectare allotments is created and sold off there is exactly the same effect. It was for that reason that legislation has been introduced to amend the Planning and Development Act to bring all rural subdivisions under control, so that we are in a position to refuse unsuitable subdivisions of land into areas greater than 30 hectares. The points made by the honourable member in relation to regulation 70a, on the grounds that there was no control over subdivisions into areas greater than 30 hectares, and are covered effectively by the amendments to the Planning and Development Act which I have introduced.

Dr. Eastick: Subsequent to my contribution.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: They were in preparation. I was not going to tell anybody that I was going to introduce that type of amendment before it was introduced. The honourable member for Light, and even the Leader of the Opposition, should be able to work out why no advance notice was given to that piece of legislation. That legislation does not mean that no subdivision into areas in excess of 30 hectares will be permitted, but it means that it does have to be a legitimate form of subdivision and not the kind which occurred recently near Flinders Chase on Kangaroo Island where some 2 400 hectares of land was cut up into 30 hectare subdivisions.

Mr. Chapman: You are not criticising that action, are

you?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, most definitely, and so is the District Council of Kingscote, which has written to me complaining about the impact of that type of subdivision on its own position and responsibilities. Quite apart from the impact that it would have on the value of rural land, and the possibility of forcing good agricultural or pastoral land out into other uses, the District Council of Kingscote has made it quite clear that with that type of subdivision occurring it is not able to provide services for that sort of subdivision.

Mr. Chapman: The council made no criticism of that subdivision.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is not true; it is simply not the case. That subdivision and the action taken by the District Council of Kingscote, together with another subdivision in the Strathalbyn area, were the immediate prime reasons for introducing the amendments to the Planning and Development Act.

Mr. Chapman: Which gave you the platform on which to act.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Well, I refer to those things so that it can be recognised that this is an issue which many rural people are concerned about. As honourable members on the other side understand, what must be faced is that one cannot retain prime agricultural land as agricultural land and also retain the right to divide it up into small allotments to be sold off; the two processes are inconsistent and will lead to an increase in the value of land. Once the hobby farmers or holiday residents come in, the impact will gradually be to turn that land away from agricultural production. That is the inevitable consequence of this situation. Typically, in our type of community in Australia, we do not have, and have never had, effective control over this type of situation. In England, the position is completely controlled, not by land subdivision controls (because there are none), but simply by very tight controls on the use of land and the buildings put on the land. In England, land defined as agricultural land can be divided up as one wishes, but no buildings not related to agricultural production can be put on that land.

Mr. Tonkin: Unless the Government wants to put a power house on it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I cannot see the relevance of that remark to this debate. That is the sort of irrelevant nonsense we should be able to do without.

In England generally, there is no control of land subdivision, but there is very tight control on land use. Any honourable member familiar with the English countryside will know that that situation has led to a very sharp definition between town or village and the surrounding rural community. The wholesale semi-rural type of activity, in basically agricultural areas in this country, does not occur in England.

Mr. Mathwin: But they are a bit tight for space there.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister has the floor.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: At this stage, in this community, until our rural councils have effective rural zoning, there will be a problem in ensuring that agricultural land is retained as agricultural land, or that viticultural land is retained as viticultural land. Once these areas are appropriately zoned, an area will be set aside as viticultural or rural land. If one wants to use it for a rural living purpose or a hobby farm situation, one will not be able to do so. Other areas will be zoned for hobby farm purposes, and that land will be generally, the poorer quality agricultural land, where people will have the right to divide it up into smaller allotments and have a hobby farm type situation. Surely, members opposite would

agree that we do not want to see prime agricultural and viticultural land converted into hobby farms. If we are to have hobby farms, and people should have the right to have them, they should take place on land that is somewhat less suitable for agricultural and viticultural purposes, because we do not want hobby farms in prime agricultural and viticultural areas. At the present time we are not in a position to enforce this situation properly, because the district councils do not have effective rural zoning. Once they have effective rural zoning, we will not have the problem we have today which has forced the introduction of this type of regulation.

This regulation came about when the courts held that certain legislation meant something different from what the Government and Parliament thought it meant. Members would be aware that in November 1972 the Government introduced section 52(1)(ea) of the Planning and Development Act, which provided that a subdivision could be refused by the Director of Planning if it would not form "a compact, continuous, orderly and economic extension of a township". That is an actual provision in the Planning and Development Act—that the Director of Planning could refuse any subdivision that did not meet that requirement. When that amendment to the Act was introduced, a rural policy was also introduced to meet the requirements of the rural community, and the Government undertook to approve subdivisions in accordance with that rural policy. That worked satisfactorily, and it was agreed to by Parliament—that if one wanted to subdivide land for living purposes it should be as extensions to existing townships.

However, the courts determined that that amendment to the Planning and Development Act was applicable only where land to be subdivided was in fact an extension of the township. How they reached that conclusion, I do not really know, but nevertheless they did. The consequence of that decision by the courts was that in areas that were away from an existing town or township someone could come along with a subdivision plan and we could not use that section of the Planning and Development Act to refuse it, even though on any possible ground it ought to be refused.

Regulation 70A was introduced as a holding operation in that situation until we rewrite the Planning and Development Act and all local district councils are in a position to have their rural areas effectively zoned so that they have control over this situation.

The fundamental point we have to face is that in the rural areas of the State we have tried, in so far as we have tried to control anything, to do it by land subdivision instead of by land use controls, but, as district councils move to land use controls, subdivision control will not matter. The more we move to the English type situation the more we can ensure that the good agricultural, viticultural, and horticultural land is available permanently for these purposes. That is the kind of situation that we need to move towards, but at the moment, until we have got rural zoning available for district councils and effectively adopted, and until we have got our new Planning and Development Act, we are stuck with intermediate situations. That is what this regulation is all about.

Obviously, this regulation says that, if one divides up rural land, one must divide it into areas that are economically viable. Everyone knows that the definition of economic viability is difficult, and of course it varies over time, depending on what agricultural product prices are, for example. This regulation was introduced as the best solution we had immediately available to us to prevent the situation from getting further out of hand. If

we are not careful we will get prime areas of the Barossa Valley cut up for hobby farms and land values will rise to such an extent that traditional land uses will be forced to be discontinued. That is not a desirable long-term situation.

What happens with respect to the application of this regulation is that the Agriculture and Fisheries Department tenders advice on what appears to be a normal level of capability, effort and expected return of the pursuits involved. There will always be arguments about the nature of that advice, but in current circumstances the only way we could have a holding position is to operate in this kind of way.

The honourable member quoted from certain legal cases, pointing out the difficulty of defining economic viability. In fact, he quoted from pages 7 and 8 of the judgment in the matter of D. W. and D. M. Gordon. That passage comments on the difficulties that may arise from the wording of the regulation. However, the member for Light failed to include in the quotation the next few lines from the judgment, as follows:

It is possible that all of these things may be able to be worked out with regard to any particular case.

In other words, while there are theoretical difficulties in determining precisely what economic viability means, in particular cases the concept will be able to be applied effectively in a way that can be adjudicated by the courts.

Dr. Eastick: Weren't the key words you used "may be"?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, but we have yet to find a situation where the particular application of this definition cannot be applied by the courts. The member for Light also raised a question relating to the right of an owner of an existing non-viable property to be able to sell off small allotments to provide capital to enable the land to be retained and its viability to be improved. That was part of the honourable member's argument. I put to him that that argument is wrong and that the process that he suggests is entirely self-defeating. Once one starts living off small allotments, unless one has effective zoning that divides hobby farm areas from agricultural areas, one gets an automatic increase in land values, particularly in the Barossa Valley, particularly in the Adelaide Hills, and particularly where there is some kind of urban shadow that could be reflected over the price of that land. Once that occurs, one has not got effective land zoning, and general values throughout that area rise. The effect is to put up people's rates and taxes and gradually to push people away from primary production into an alternative use of that land.

That is the fundamental problem, and the member for Light did not in any way suggest solutions to that problem. I would have thought that members opposite would be as concerned as the basic primary producer organisations about the impact that hobby farms are having on turning land away from its more appropriate use. There is a fundamental conflict in this situation. If I own land that I plan to keep on using for agricultural purposes for the next 20 years, I do not want anyone in that neighbourhood selling off land for other than agricultural purposes, putting up the value and putting up my costs, rates and taxes.

But, on the other hand, if I think I might quit that land, I might want to retain the right to subdivide so I can get the capital gain involved. This is the fundamental conflict that we have in rural communities. The people who want to leave that rural community and sell out want the maximum right to subdivide because that will help them to get a higher value for their land. The people who want to retain their agricultural production and live there

permanently do not want to see progress take place, and as a community we simply have to face up to the fact that we cannot satisfy both sets of desires.

Dr. Eastick: You should be able to.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: One cannot satisfy the desire of the person who wants the maximum capital gain by selling out and the desire of the person who wants to minimise his rates and taxes by conducting agricultural production in that same area. It is simply not possible to resolve that conflict. One has to come down on one side or the other, either by saying, "We will permit the turning off of good agricultural land into other uses," or by saying, "We will retain that land as prime agricultural land and take action to prevent an excessive appreciation in value that would result from the introduction of other uses and would thereby eliminate agricultural uses."

It is absolutely vital that honourable members, particularly those representing rural areas, do understand this conflict and understand that as representatives in Parliament we have a responsibility for saying, "We cannot satisfy both needs; we have to make up our minds as to the direction we are going." The direction in which I believe we should go (and our policy is directed towards this, as is this regulation) is saying that there are certain areas in this State, particularly close to metropolitan Adelaide, of prime land for agricultural, viticultural and horticultural usage, which we should retain and therefore prevent changes of land use in those areas into urban type uses. We should therefore move the hobby farming situation into less productive land—land which is not prime land. This is the policy we are attempting to follow. We do not have the necessary powers, and local government does not have the necessary powers, to implement it effectively at this stage.

Mr. Wotton: Do you intend introducing zoning?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, and this process is continuing. Work has been progressing on model country zoning regulations for district councils to use, and of course there are many difficulties with this and it will take time to introduce. That is the objective to which we and country councils are moving. When we have that situation we will not have to worry as much about land subdivision control because, if land is zoned for agricultural purposes only, and someone wants to come on and cut it up for hobby farms, that is out. The owner could divide the land but he would not be able to sell it for hobby farming. Until we reach that situation we are stuck with the half-way house situation we have now.

I appeal to members opposite not to be led into believing, as the member for Light would have them believe, that we can have the best of both worlds, that we can allow the landowners who want to do so to get the maximum capital gain when they move out, that we can permit as much land subdivision as we like, and at the same time protect the good agricultural land of this State from being turned into other uses. We cannot have both things and, as responsible members of Parliament, it is beholden on us, including the member for Light, to decide which way to move. I oppose the motion.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second reading.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill will make Government-employed lawyers in the Public and Consumer Affairs Department responsible for

advice they give, as applies to lawyers in private practice. I seek leave to have the rest of my second reading explanation incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The 1970 amendment to the Prices Act provided that the commissioner could institute or defend proceedings in certain circumstances on behalf of a consumer. This power has since been extended further, and an attempt to extend it last year was only partly acceptable to the Parliament. It should be noted that the power is a power to act "on behalf of" the consumer. The right to act for other persons in civil proceedings had hitherto generally been reserved for the legal profession.

Section 49A of the principal Act, enacted by the 1970 amending Bill, relieved the commissioner and any authorised officer and the Crown from liability in the course of administration of the Act or the performance of duties or functions thereunder, provided that the acts were in good faith. It is often necessary for the Crown to have immunity when it acts simply in the general public interest, but it is difficult to see why it should have immunity when it acts on behalf of an individual consumer in the same way as a legal practitioner in private practice does, when one considers that the private legal practitioner would be liable for any negligence.

When the 1970 amending Bill was before the Legislative Council, the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill had difficulty in seeing the justification for this clause. He said, as reported at page 2916 of 1970-71 *Hansard*:

This to me is a rather curious clause. I do not know how one would go about proving that an act was done in good faith: I think it would be almost impossible. So it would mean that the Commissioner would have complete protection in respect of anything he did. I do not appreciate the need for this clause. Perhaps the Chief Secretary in his reply will be good enough to indicate to me exactly why that clause is deemed necessary.

The only explanation given by the then Chief Secretary (Hon. A. J. Shard) was that there was a similar provision in New South Wales. Perhaps in 1970 it was not contemplated that this power to advise and act on behalf of consumers would be as widely exercised as it now is. Solicitors seconded to the Consumer Affairs Branch act in competition with practitioners in private practice, with the important advantage that their services are free to the consumer and there is no liability for negligent action or advice.

I do not necessarily oppose the Crown, in proper circumstances, entering into competition with the private sector even when its services are gratis, but it should do so on the same conditions as apply to the private sector. More importantly, its clients are just as much entitled to protection from a negligent act carried out by an officer of, or one seconded to, the branch whether he is an admitted legal practitioner or not as are the clients of a practitioner in private practice.

Generally, claims undertaken or defended by the commissioner on behalf of consumers are relatively small claims. The amount of damage done by negligent action or advice is therefore relatively small but it is important to the consumer. In matters of this kind where a practitioner in private practice causes damage through negligent action, he is likely simply to pay compensation for his negligence or that of his employees.

I will give an example of the kind of negligence which

can occur, and I add that I in no way allege that negligence on the part of the branch is common, but it can occur and when it does the branch should be responsible. A party to a civil action sought assistance from the branch. He was called on by the other party to give particulars of his pleadings. He was advised to refuse the request and acted on that advice. The other party took out an interlocutory summons for particulars and the party in question was ordered to give particulars and pay the costs of the application. The advice given him by the branch was clearly negligent but the consumer had no recourse against the branch. Had a practitioner in private practice been guilty of similar negligence, he would almost certainly simply have paid the costs.

The problem is exacerbated because the branch widely advertises its services at the public expense but does not warn its potential clients that if it acts negligently they will have no redress.

I hope the Government will support this Bill. In the Legal Services Commission Act passed last year, it clearly and spontaneously expressly provided that salaried legal practitioners employed by the commission should be subject to the rules of professional ethics and liable to actions in negligence. It appears to me therefore that the Government very properly acknowledges the principle that, when a legal practitioner employed by the Government or a Government agency acts for an individual, it should be responsible in negligence in the same way as a private practitioner is. I trust therefore that the Government will support the Bill.

The measure merely repeals section 49A. This seems to be the simplest and most effective way of achieving my object. I do not think that it endangers the Crown in any other way not connected with negligence in advice or actions on behalf of consumers. Should any question of tort arise, the Crown could not be liable if it was acting without negligence and with statutory authority. Clause 1 is formal, and clause 2 repeals section 49A of the principal Act.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 20 September. Page 1038.)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government): The recognition of local government in the Constitutions of the States and the Commonwealth is the "in" thing at the moment. In this regard I am pleased that the member for Goyder has introduced a Bill designed to achieve that objective in the South Australian State Constitution. Although he did not mention it in his second reading speech, I think the House would be fully aware of the fact that, in April this year, before I went to the Local Government Ministers' conference in Tasmania, I announced publicly that the Government had considered the suggestion that local government ought to be part of the State Constitution and had agreed with that recommendation.

Again, on 10 August in reply to a question from the member for Napier, I said that the State Government had considered the matter and that we had affirmed our view that the Constitution of South Australia should contain a reference recognising local government, provided all other States and the Commonwealth did likewise. Every member in this House is fully aware of Government policy. I am delighted that the member for Goyder has

received the concurrence of his Party to support the Government's policy in this regard. The member for Torrens thinks that is amusing, but that is a fact.

Mr. Wilson: You're amusing.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Maybe I am.

Mr. Venning: I'll say you are. You're a No. 1 joke.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: When we talk about jokes in Rocky River I think we are getting into a troubled area, and I do not think we ought to continue because really it has nothing to do with this Bill. I can talk to the member for Rocky River at some later stage, telling him about some of the jokes in his area and about himself if he wishes. I think it is important for the House to compare the situation with what it was with regard to the relationship between State Governments and local government and between the Commonwealth Government and local government. I am sure that no member of this House should need reminding that, before 1972, the Federal Government did not want to know local government.

Mr. Mathwin: Ha, ha!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Glenelg can laugh, but before then he was the Mayor of Brighton, and I challenge him to tell this House how much money the Federal Government gave to the Corporation of the City of Brighton before the Whitlam Government days—not one brass cent and the member for Glenelg knows that. The Whitlam Government first recognised local government and forced the present Government to continue that recognition. No member opposite could possibly deny it and be truthful.

Mr. Mathwin interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Local government recognition has been a matter of consideration by Local Government Ministers' conferences for a considerable time. Before this it was also the subject of consideration by the steering committee into the Constitution.

I am sure all members will recognise that it was the Whitlam Government that set up the Constitutional Convention and the Whitlam Government, despite opposition from the Liberals, that gave recognition of local government's being there in its own right. This is the Government we hear members opposite berating time and time again, whenever they get half a chance, but then we find a complete reversal of attitude when they want to get on the band wagon that was started because Gough Whitlam insisted that the third tier of government in Australia should rank as a partner in a three-tier system.

No-one in the Federal arena went to the local government conference. The first time that a Federal Minister ever attended an annual conference of Local Government Ministers was in 1973 or 1974, the conference held in the Barossa Valley in South Australia. Tom Uren, the then Minister, attended the conference with a good deal of trepidation, because he was not sure what the other Local Government Ministers would say or how they would react to the presence, for the first time, of a Federal Minister. It is to the credit of all those Ministers that they readily and gladly accepted his presence. Since then, the presence of a Federal Minister at Local Government Ministers' Conferences is a regular and accepted feature; indeed, we get not one Minister from Canberra now, but two. At the last meeting in Hobart, we had the Hon. Ray Groom, the Minister principally concerned with local government to the extent that Canberra is interested.

Mr. Wotton: A good Minister, too.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not arguing his merits or demerits. We also had Senator Carrick.

Mr. Wilson: You admire him too, don't you?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I should like to buy him at my price and sell him at his, and I should be a millionaire.

Mr. Arnold: That's not being very nice.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is not meant to be nice. It was Senator Carrick who heard and responded appropriately to the unanimous pleas of Local Government Ministers for the implementation of the promise of the Fraser Government to increase revenue to local government to be phased in over this three-year period. It was Senator Carrick who then went away and forgot the voice of the Local Government Ministers and also, I suspect, forgot the unanimous voice of the State Premiers at the Premiers' Conference.

Let us not forget for one moment when we are concerning ourselves with the well-being of local government that the Whitlam Government first introduced payments to local government from the Treasury purse. Whilst it has been claimed in the past and perhaps will be claimed again in the future that the amounts made available to local government by the Whitlam Government in its two years in office were vastly increased when the Fraser Government came into power, it is conveniently ignored that, concurrently with that action, indirect untied grants were cut out completely. The net result is that local government as a whole has lost dramatically from the change inflicted on the States by the present Government in the provision of funds to local government.

In 1974-75, the Whitlam Government provided \$56 000 000 for local government, and in 1975-76 it provided \$80 000 000. This was increased to \$140 000 000, for the interest of the shadow Minister of Local Government, if he is interested, but at the same time local government lost the benefit of hundreds of millions of dollars in other grants. Local government at first did not realise the three-card trick that had been put over it, but it has realised the position since it has seen the savage reduction in available finance.

There is no doubt, when one looks at the record, who has had the concern of local government uppermost in mind. There is no doubt who has produced the goods, without talking. At this moment, local government is losing out badly. I am sure the member for Goyder will recall the annual meeting of the Local Government Association held two years ago at the nurses centre, at Kent Town, where I drew attention to the shocking provisions that were intended in the pending Federal legislation. Fortunately, the Australian council was able to wield enough muscle power on the Federal Government to water down dramatically the requirement of approvals that were then intended by Canberra; in other words, Canberra was then attempting to centralise the whole of local government activity within its realm. Fortunately, that effort was thwarted, and I give full recognition and pay high regard to the Australian council for the part it played.

We all know that the principal problem with any activity, including local government, is being able to obtain the necessary finance to carry out the task. What is the record of the Liberal Party in this regard? I have dealt with what it did when the Liberal Government came into power, and how it refused the sum made available by the Whitlam Government.

Mr. Russack: It was \$75 000 000 in 1973 and \$179 000 000 this year.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That shows the narrowness of the honourable member and many of his Liberal colleagues. He is ignoring the untied grants that have been removed, withdrawn. Hundreds of millions of dollars were withdrawn when the Fraser Government increased the

amounts in the 1976-77 financial year from \$80 000 000 to \$140 000 000. The Federal authorities said they had increased the sum by this mammoth amount, and said what good fellows they were. However, they forgot to say that at the same time they were reducing the funds that had been made available for all the other schemes funded by the Commonwealth to local government through the States—sewerage schemes, development schemes, and all the schemes in which South Australia suffered in the same way as did other States.

Mr. Russack: They were winding down in 1975.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member knows that is not the case. Local government got a better deal in 1975-76 than it did in 1974-75, and it has never got as good a deal since: 1975-76 is the best year financially that local government has ever had in the way of Federal financial assistance from Canberra. The honourable member cannot refute that, and he knows it. His attitude is typified by the attitude that he and, I presume, probably all of his Opposition colleagues took on 18 May 1974. When the Whitlam Government tried to amend the Constitution to give local government proper recognition, where were Liberal Party members then? They were not as silent as they are now.

If one looks (and I think that it is worth doing) at the subdivision of Goyder, one will find that the honourable member was probably there handing out how to vote cards urging people to defeat the referendum that was going to give recognition in the Commonwealth Constitution to local government. Yet, today, we have the Opposition saying that it wants to recognise local government in the State Constitution. Let us have a look at the figures. In Goyder, 6 462 of the electors voted against the proposal, whereas 2 480 voted for it. The honourable member was fairly active and successful in his campaigning against local government. I think we now have a hypocritical attitude coming out. The member for Glenelg might like to laugh, too, but let us look at his figures. I doubt whether he did very much better.

In the subdivision of Glenelg, he was not as successful as was his colleague from Goyder, because he could encourage only 8 470 people to vote against it, whereas 6 594 saw through him and voted in favour of giving recognition to local government. He is a former Mayor. I wonder what the member for Light, also a former Mayor, did. I cannot find the Gawler result in the book, but I am sure that it was little different. A report at the time states, "The Federal Government wants to introduce a large, serious imbalance among electorates, the Liberal front-bencher, Mr. J. M. Fraser, said yesterday. Liberals urge 'No' vote." It is a negative Party. Regrettably, we now have a negative Prime Minister.

This all goes to show that the Liberal Party is really not very consistent. I said earlier that the Commonwealth Constitution committee dealing with this matter had urged that there should be amendments to all of the Constitutions. That proposal went to the most recent Local Government Ministers' conference, and all the Ministers, with the exception of the Queensland Minister, indicated that they agreed with the proposal. What has happened since? The architect of the whole of this proposal is the Hon. Alan Hunt, from Victoria, who has gained a great deal of notoriety recently. What he said, and I commend him for doing it (and I remind members that Alan Hunt is a lawyer and, I believe, a competent person in that field), in his second reading speech makes great sense, and it is a move that I not only support but propose to follow today. In introducing his Bill, he said:

The Government seeks and will welcome constructive comment on the proposal to provide for constitutional

recognition of local government in the Victorian Constitution. Accordingly, it is the intention to follow the recent practice with Bills providing for substantial amendments to the Local Government Act. This practice is to introduce the legislation and let it lie until the next session of Parliament. This promotes discussion, provides time for consideration of the proposal, and allows consultation with people and organisations affected by the legislation. The practice, which has found general acceptance in the House, is all the more appropriate to a Bill which seeks to amend the constitution and, as such, affects every citizen of the State.

That is a very wise way of going about this problem. I am certainly far from convinced of what would happen if the proposed legislation became law. I am far from certain (I do not know whether the honourable member could enlighten the House, but he did not do so in his second reading speech) what is meant by the words, "There shall be a system of local government for South Australia which shall provide for the constitution of an elected body with such powers as the Parliament deems necessary for the peace, order and good government of the district in respect of which the body has been constituted".

I am aware that similar words were proposed for the Australian Constitution when the Australian council put forward a proposition to amend the Commonwealth Constitution. The words "peace, order and good government" were substituted for "good rule and government". The lawyers have had a preliminary look at this matter and have come up with all kinds of ideas about what it means. Perhaps one could pose the question: what is required? Does this mean that local government will accept a broader base for its operations in maintaining peace, order and good government?

Does the maintenance of peace require local government to assume the responsibility for the Police Force in its area? Does it mean that orderly conduct within its area must be maintained by local government and not by the State? I think all of these are matters which certainly need careful consideration. I do not think that we ought ever to embark on amendments to the South Australian Constitution without knowing exactly what is going to happen as a result of the words that we are adding. I do not think that anyone can tell us that at this stage. Certainly, it is my intention to ask the Crown Law Office to study the proposal carefully to ascertain whether it does anything at all, or whether it does more than is desired. I think the intention of the Government in this matter is abundantly clear. I said earlier in my speech that the Government's attitude was made plain at the last conference of Ministers of Local Government. It was made plain prior to my going to that conference, and it has been made plain since. The Government believes that local government has a part to play in our society and that we should do all in our power to ensure that it continues to play that part. We have been able, in the period that we have been in Government, to vest in local government a great deal of authority which it previously did not have.

I believe a sound relationship exists now between local government as a whole, its representative organisation (the Local Government Association) and the Government. I would not want to do anything that would injure that relationship. Certainly, I would not want to see an amendment to the State Constitution which could possibly injure that position. I do not know what the Local Government Association would have to say about this proposal.

Mr. Russack: It is in the report.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It might be in the report but I think the Local Government Association would want to come and discuss the matter with me in due course. I think

that local government as a whole would want to discuss the matter. I think that it ought to be a matter that is placed before all areas of local government. It seems to me that, with the annual general meeting of the Local Government Association being held shortly, it is a matter that ought to be thrown in. Perhaps it is a matter that ought to be discussed by the region. I think that each individual local government body ought to be given the opportunity to express its views. First and foremost, it should be given the opportunity to realise exactly what obligations are contained in the adoption of the proposal that we have before us. Because of the number of imponderables there are, I believe that what Victoria did was sound and wise, and I propose that we should do the same: that is, that the matter should rest and, if the honourable member wishes to raise the matter again in the next session of Parliament in the knowledge of any advice I am able to give him, I would certainly be pleased then to add a further contribution to this debate.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): Local government did indicate at the Perth conference of the Australian Constitution Convention its approval of the measure my colleague has outlined. I take it that the attitude expressed by the Minister this afternoon has been one of sincerity and not of procrastination. We will accept it in that way. Certainly it is a matter which needs public discussion. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

POLICE REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 September. Page 870.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill. I reject the arguments used by the Chief Secretary when he opposed this measure and referred to statements recorded by the Royal Commission into the Salisbury affair. I will make further comment about this later. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SALES OF CIGARETTES) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 September. Page 867.)

The Hon. R G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare): I oppose this Bill. The member for Coles, when introducing this measure, stated:

Many retailers and purchasers of tobacco appear to be unaware of the law, and until this matter was raised earlier this year in this House I think it is fair to say that few South Australians knew that there was such a law prohibiting the sale of tobacco to children under the age of 16 years.

The honourable member went on to say that the intention behind the Bill was to bring this matter to greater public notice, presumably by the increased penalties suggested for offences under the Act, to achieve a reduction in the number of juveniles smoking in South Australia. I suppose that it would be fair to examine the statement the honourable member made. I remind the House of her words that many retailers and purchasers appear to be unaware of the law. I checked with the South Australian Mixed Business Association, which represents many cigarette and tobacco retailers. I was informed by that body that in its journal, the South Australian Mixed

Business Association Journal, which is published regularly, the requirements of the law in this matter are regularly drawn to the attention of members of that association. Therefore, it seems that retailers, through their journal, are kept informed of the requirements of the law in this matter. I also checked with the tobacco licensing body through the Stamp Duties Office and was informed that they do not require applicants for licence to declare that they have knowledge of the existing law in that area.

I suggest (and I have taken preliminary steps to work this out with the Minister concerned) that it might be a requirement in future (when a licence is issued) that it be brought to the attention of the persons applying for a licence so that they are aware of the law. As I see it, the manner in which the honourable member has approached the matter is an attempt, by getting a greater public awareness at the selling and buying end of the deal, to cause certain happenings to occur. On that basis I suppose it is reasonable to look at what happens with this law in other States and at the penalties and so on which apply to this offence. The research I have done has shown that in Tasmania, since 1900, retailers have been prohibited from selling cigarettes or tobacco to persons under the age of 16, which is what the honourable member is seeking to achieve in South Australia. In 1900 the penalty in Tasmania for this offence was £20. That sum converts to \$40 today, but obviously that is not a realistic translation, and £20 was a very heavy impost in those days if one should transgress. However, I do not believe the honourable member brought forward any evidence of any real effect from that penalty in Tasmania or that there had been any reduction in juvenile smoking, and I examined the honourable member's speech very carefully.

Since 1966 the penalty in Victoria has been \$20, which would be more equivalent to today's value, and for a second offence there is a penalty of \$50, but the honourable member does not seem to have brought forward any evidence to show that this has had any effect in Victoria.

The additional requirements that the honourable member is now bringing forward as necessary amendments to the law, that is, the displaying of a notice informing customers in the shop of the law and the penalty which applies, has been in the Tasmanian legislation since 1907. According to my notes, the penalty in 1964 was £5 for failure to display the notice. It is my understanding that the notices are fairly prominent in Tasmanian retail premises, but I have not been able to obtain evidence that that is all that is needed to change the smoking habits of juveniles. Inquiries I have made from the Tasmanian police department show that, despite the number of people who have gone into this type of shop in Tasmania since 1907 and who have been able to see that an offence is related to the supplying of tobacco to minors, only two prosecutions have resulted in the last 10 years. If that is what is behind the honourable member's efforts to try to achieve this desirable change in the behaviour of young people with respect to smoking (and I hope members have taken note that I am not opposed to the honourable member's proposal to change the smoking habits of juveniles), the results in Tasmania do not suggest that the method proposed in these amendments is likely to be any more successful than it has been in the 71-year period in Tasmania since 1907. Over the last 10 years there have only been two prosecutions, and I think I could safely say that the effect of the amendments (which would be similar to the provisions which have applied in Tasmania for a very long period) would be minimal.

As I said earlier, I appreciate the honourable member's

intentions in coming forward and dealing with other matters she proposes in the Act. I am basing my arguments on the Tasmanian experience, and that is a very valid and fair way of approaching the matter, because the type of requirement proposed here has been in force in Tasmania for a very long period, and there has been no evaluation of whether this is the correct way to go about this matter.

In her speech, the honourable member quoted from certain recommendations made by the Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare, and she went on to quote the following:

One of the recommendations [and that is what it was] was that laws which make the sale of tobacco products to minors illegal be strictly enforced and the penalties prescribed be increased.

Also in that report is quite an interesting study by the committee in relation to education in this matter—not education in that it ought to be an offence and that the penalties prescribed should be increased, but education as a method of changing the behaviour of young people who commence smoking to become non-smokers and also inducing young people who have not commenced smoking to continue to be non-smokers.

On page 101, under the heading "Education", is a very interesting discussion on the possible benefits of education. Reference is also made to an evaluation of three basic educational approaches—teacher led, group led, and individual programme. The groups receiving these three programmes were compared with a control group, which received no special educational approach. The study showed that the results from these three approaches led to different results among the groups concerned. I am advocating education as a better method of approaching this matter and pointing out that there is some research and experimentation in education in this area which has been documented and examined by the Senate committee, and some reasonably valid conclusions can be drawn and could be followed.

When the honourable member introduced the Bill, I had some discussions with the Minister of Education, on a general basis, and found that he held a similar view to mine on this matter. He felt that education in schools for young students would be worth while. I understand there are some programmes of this nature in schools, but this comes from the school initiative; it is not part of a programme organised by the department. I intend to follow this through with the Minister, notwithstanding the fate of this Bill.

In her speech, the honourable member referred to a question she had asked the Chief Secretary on this topic, and quoted from his reply, as follows:

It is difficult to enforce the law.

The question is whether the amendments proposed will change that situation. Will it be any easier to enforce the law if the penalty were increased, and if a sign were displayed as required by the amendments? In Tasmania, signs clearly stating that this is an offence have been exhibited in premises where tobacco and cigarettes are sold. Obviously, an opportunity has been available to enforce the law for 71 years in Tasmania, but, as I have said, in the past 10 years there have been only two prosecutions.

What does the honourable member have in mind with an increase in penalties and additional requirements? How will that make it easier to enforce the law? Does the honourable member feel that we will have a group of "shop dobbers" who, seeing a sign in premises, would immediately race off and report offences connected with the sale of cigarettes? Is she advocating that that is the way

in which the law should be enforced? I cannot see how it would work in South Australia, as it has not worked in Tasmania. Although Tasmanians argue that they are different from those of us on the mainland, I do not believe that they have such large differences from South Australians in these matters. I think that very likely they would believe, as they apparently have done until now, that this is not a matter in which they should intervene if they see what is apparently an offence being committed.

The argument has been advanced that, because penalties are increased and additional requirements are needed to make the law known, that will make the enforcement of the law change in some way. Certainly, the honourable member did not put anything forward in her speech to support that proposition. Has she stopped to consider the effect of the requirement with respect to labelling on packets of cigarettes? She mentioned a problem in other States. My understanding from Rothmans (admittedly secondhand, because I made no effort to contact cigarette manufacturers and distributors) is that about 80 per cent of cigarettes are made in the Eastern States. The requirement in this State that they be labelled in such a way presents great difficulties to manufacturers and distributors. There could be a problem regarding a conflict with section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution. The honourable member could argue that some move ought to be made by this State to take the lead. If that were the case, evidence should have been put forward by the honourable member of approaches to the other States for information, records and so on, and of the other States' attitudes to this requirement. For this matter to become law, several States would have to be of like mind before it would have any real bearing on a national basis.

It is sad that the honourable member's good intentions are so clear, but no real evidence or suggestion has been put forward for what she requires to happen. The requirement for the marking of vending machines could lead to considerable complications, because they are used in many different ways. There are unattended machines, and attended machines in club premises. One can imagine that there might be a case where arguments would proceed in court as to whether the machine or the attendant was liable, in certain circumstances.

Experience has shown in the past that what was intended in legislation is not always the way in which it is interpreted by the courts. I believe that the honourable member also had in mind that, if the law were more widely known, it would get a response from people. I looked up one or two other laws which it might be argued ought to be equally as well known because of immediate consequences on people's lives. Perhaps we should have signs pointing out those matters and these laws ought to be as well known. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

DEBTS REPAYMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENTS BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

LOCAL AND DISTRICT CRIMINAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

SHERIFF'S BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

BOATING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLES (HOURS OF DRIVING) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Commercial Motor Vehicles (Hours of Driving) Act, 1973. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its principal object is to clarify the intent of the provisions in the Act that relate to the keeping of log books by the drivers of commercial vehicles. The Act presently provides that drivers must forward the duplicate copies of log book pages to their employers every week, and employers are similarly obliged to obtain those duplicate pages from the drivers. The duplicate pages must be kept in chronological order at the premises from which the vehicle operates for at least three months. Doubts have been cast on the wording of these provisions, in that there may be difficulties in establishing at what time the pages must be obtained by employers, and also at what time the three-month period begins to run. The Bill accordingly seeks to clarify this matter by providing that employers must obtain the pages at least once in each month.

Representations have been made by several groups on the difficulties some drivers face in complying with the obligation to forward their duplicate pages to their employers on a weekly basis, particularly when interstate trips are involved. No harm is seen in extending the period to one month, so that both employers and employees operate under the same time constraint. As the remaining part of the explanation deals with clauses, I seek leave to have that part inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 makes some minor amendments of a statute revision nature, by substituting the word "mass" for the word "weight" wherever it appears. Clause 3 provides that a driver must send the duplicate pages of his log books to his employer at

intervals not exceeding one month. Clause 4 provides that an employer must obtain the duplicate log book pages from his drivers at intervals not exceeding one month. He must retain those pages for at least three months after the time at which he obtains them. A person who is both the owner and the driver of a commercial vehicle must retain his duplicate pages for at least three months after the time at which he is required by the Act to have completed them.

Mr. RUSSACK secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

In Committee.

(Continued from 10 October. Page 1345.)

Schedule.

Law, \$8 679 000.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am concerned about the item "Law costs". It is a funny thing to have in the provision for a Law Department and I wonder what it is. The sum is only small, although it is twice as much as last year.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): It relates to the briefing fund for counsel to appear on behalf of the Government in interstate High Court appeals and is to meet various other law costs associated with briefing out.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am pleased to know that. What is the policy of the Government on the general question of briefing out? Until the present Crown Solicitor, Mr. Prior, was appointed, it was common practice for the Crown to brief counsel in private practice, particularly in criminal matters, in both the Supreme Court and the District Criminal Court. That has almost entirely ceased, and the staff of what was called the Crown Law Department—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: It used to be called the Attorney-General's Department; it is now the Law Department.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Attorney-General is a little tense, I suppose.

Mr. Harrison: He was better on television tonight.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He was on television was he?

The CHAIRMAN: Do not reply to interjections which are, of course, out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I cannot even hear them, that is the trouble.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member is out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Instead of briefing out, the Government now employs more staff in the Crown Law Office (or whatever the current title is). What is the Government's policy regarding briefing out, particularly in criminal matters? Does the Government try to avoid it? Considering the modest amount of \$10 713 spent last year, especially when one thinks of what has been paid to Mr. Muirhead—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will not go back to that: I know it is a sore point.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think that the honourable member said it is a sore point—it is also against Standing Orders, which is the telling factor.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. What is the Government's policy regarding briefing out?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Government's policy is to try to contain costs to the greatest degree possible by handling all Government business within the office, where possible. We brief out certain matters where it becomes a practical impossibility to cover all the matters before the various courts with Government lawyers. Otherwise, the attempt is made to ensure that these expensive fees, to

which the honourable member has referred, are avoided where possible.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): What is the policy of the department (I am referring to the Crown Law Office) in assigning counsel to assist in inquiries into matters of public interest, such as the Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs? Is it possible that solicitors or employees of the Crown Law Office would be available to conduct the duties presently conducted by Mr. Muirhead? Has that practice been considered by the Government? Will it be considered in future? It seems to make sense to use someone already on the Government pay roll.

Mr. Millhouse: No. That would be wrong. Its never been done.

Mr. TONKIN: What is the policy?

The CHAIRMAN: The Leader can ask about the general policy, but to make specific reference to Mr. Muirhead would be against the ruling already given. I ask the Minister whether he wishes to reply.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The general policy of the Government in relation to Commissions of this sort (I am referring to Royal Commissions has always been to my knowledge (the member for Mitcham might know better than I, because he has been in the law for a longer time), that counsel assisting the Commission should be independent counsel.

Dr. EASTICK: I seek information regarding the conduct of courts. In recent times several courts that have been provided with prosecution assistance from the Police Force have had that assistance phased out and it has been replaced by permanent court officials. Is that to become a State-wide process, or will the police in certain areas still carry out prosecutions? What is the short-term, the medium-term and the long-term policy of the department in this area?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The honourable member seems to be confusing two functions that are performed from time to time by police officers. The first is that of police prosecutors and the other is that of clerk of court in various smaller country localities where it is not financially viable to have a Public Service clerk of court.

The Government's policy is that, in more difficult matters before the Magistrate's Court, we should have legally qualified and admitted practitioners undertaking prosecutions in contested cases. That is in line with the Mitchell Committee recommendations. We are trying to cover that policy and put the recommendations into effect, although they have not yet been put into effect entirely.

Regarding police officers acting as clerk of court, the Government intends to continue that policy in the more remote rural areas. When the level of business improves to the stage where it is desirable to employ a Public Service clerk, we do so. I think there have been two cases in the past 12 months (one was in Ceduna, but I cannot recall where the other was) where a full-time clerk of the court was appointed.

Dr. Eastick: Gawler.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes.

Mr. TONKIN: At this stage I pay a tribute to the staff of the Government Reporting Division, particularly *Hansard*. I do notice the purchase of office machines and equipment repeated, with considerable increases in the amounts allocated. What is involved in this re-equipment?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Concerning the Crown Law Office, the Government's solicitors, the provision deals with the purchase of office machines and equipment. The increase in payment last year resulted from expenditure incurred in the purchase of two electric typewriters and 35 dictating machines for use by typists

and solicitors. Funds have now been provided for the purchase of two word-processing machines during the current year.

Dr. EASTICK: Following the information given by the Minister regarding courts, can we be assured that it is not the department's intention in either the short-term or the long-term to close down courts in smaller areas, thereby transferring court cases to more central areas, to the disadvantage of local people, who will have much longer distances to travel?

This hypothetical question results from instances where people have been required to present themselves at a court far removed from their own home because the time allowed at the court near them was too short and the Magistrate was sitting the next day at a centre further removed. The person before the court was then required to follow the court to the new place of sitting. What policy does the Government intend to follow in this matter?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The honourable member has raised two distinct issues. Dealing with the second issue first, it is for the magistrate who is hearing the case (I assume the honourable member is referring to the lower courts) to handle the proceedings of a matter once it is before him. He may at his whim, within the law, adjourn a matter from time to time and place to place. That is not a question of Government policy. I understand the difficulty that the honourable member is referring to. From time to time magistrates do adjourn matters according to their convenience, and I sympathise with people who are inconvenienced as a result. However, a magistrate is often in some difficulty, and it becomes a question of either adjourning for a short period to a different place, or otherwise adjourning for a longer period to return to the place of sitting.

Regarding the first matter, I cannot give any undertaking that the Government will not close courts in smaller rural areas or court offices. However, the policy I have pursued is to close courts only where it would assist in the building up of the general services in a district. For example, in the Ceduna area, the court at Penong was closed completely, and the court at Streaky Bay had its office operations transferred to Ceduna, with the result that we could supply the Far West Coast area with a full-time clerk of court, who was able to provide not only court facilities but also other services normally provided by a clerk of court such as a registry of births, deaths, marriages and other associated matters.

I thought that in those circumstances it was desirable for the area that that should be done. However, this does not mean that the court will not sit at Streaky Bay: it means simply that the court office business is now being transacted at Ceduna.

Mr. RODDA: I refer to the item relating to courses of instruction for justices. Last year, \$4 000 was voted, although only \$84 was spent, and this year no allocation is being made. Is this practice of instructing justices being dispensed with, or is it covered by some other provision?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: These courses are now well established through the Further Education Department and are funded under that department.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to return to the matter of briefing out. In reply to my previous question, the Attorney said that this practice was being adopted (to use his own words) to "avoid these high or awful costs", or some other disparaging phrase, as if those to whom the briefs were being offered in the private profession charged high fees. Of course, that is not correct. Normally, these fees are fixed, as they should be and as is the convention of the profession, by the Crown Law Department when the brief is offered. It is up to that department to decide what

the fee will be.

The implication of the Attorney's reply seemed to be that it was cheaper to have practitioners on the staff on a full-time basis to do the Government's work rather than to brief out and pay a brief fee, refreshers, and so on. Would the Attorney be kind enough to let me have figures showing that the Government saves money by not briefing out but by employing more practitioners on staff, at, I understand, quite handsome salaries?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am willing to give the honourable member a comparison. It is intended in December to employ on a temporary basis for one month a solicitor who will act as counsel in a number of Supreme Court and Local and District Criminal Court trials. I shall be only too pleased to let the honourable member have a comparison between the cost of employing that person for a month and the cost of briefing out the matters that he will handle. A cost benefit analysis having been done, I know that it is favourable to employ a person for a month on this basis.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I shall be pleased to have those figures, but that is a special case involving the employment of a person for one month only. However, I make the point that, if there are on staff people not for one month but for, say, 12 months, 24 months, or more, a continuous salary is being paid, whether or not those people are in court and working.

As the Attorney-General must realise, there was a sudden change of policy at about the time that Mr. Prior took up his appointment. This is not meant to be a criticism of Mr. Prior, because he is the man who must make the decisions, and I believe that this was his decision. However, there was an abrupt change of policy, which must have occurred because of some cost benefit analysis (to use the Attorney's phrase). It is that matter, rather than the special case to which the Attorney referred and which is coming up in December, about which I am curious. Will the Attorney supply the material on which the change of policy was based some little time ago?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I know that the figures to which I have referred are available, although I am not aware of earlier figures. However, I will look into the matter and, if such figures are available, I do not see why the honourable member should not have them.

Line passed.

Corporate Affairs, \$842 000.

Mrs. ADAMSON: I seek information from the Minister on the items dealing with administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries; purchase of motor vehicles; and the purchase of office materials and equipment, for which there is a considerable increase from the \$497 302 actually paid last financial year and the \$842 000 allocated for this financial year. Earlier in the session I put some Questions on Notice to the Attorney-General regarding the functions of and costs incurred by this department, as a result of which I learnt that, six months after the department's establishment last November, its salaries bill was \$254 876. The department's total salaries bill from last November to 8 September 1978 was \$394 775 and, in addition, there are contingencies that will add up in the coming year to \$842 000.

That seems to be a steep price indeed to pay for a department that was created less than a year ago. In response to questions, the Attorney cannot give any evidence of whether investigations into the affairs of companies have revealed any illegal practices. What is this department doing, and why does it need such a vast sum of money for administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries, and why does it need to purchase office machines and equipment to the value of \$20 000?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: In reply to the honourable member's last question, upon the creation of the department, office machines consisting of two electric typewriters, two electric calculators and an additional cash register and other sundry office equipment were purchased. These have increased the department's efficiency and have resulted in a better standard of work. During the 1978-79 period the amount shown in the Estimates will be expended on word-processing machines and a pilot scheme for microfilming the documents of the department's Registration Section which is to be implemented. The implementation of these items will, in the case of the word-processing machines, eventually result in a saving of staff increases and, in the case of the microfilming project, give a more efficient and time saving service to the public when the project is completed.

Referring to the department generally, I thought that it was fairly well known that the Government intended to give high priority to the area of combating corporate crime. That is why there has been a modest increase in this department's allocation: simply because the Government is giving it much higher priority. The honourable member may not realise, for example, that, as a result of the work that this department has been doing, a major fraud case involving the directors of Flinders Trading Proprietary Limited (now in liquidation, I think) is before the Supreme Court. That matter involved an enormous amount of work by the department, including matters—

Mr. Evans: Isn't that *sub judice*?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I have not commented on the merits of the matter.

Mr. Evans: You said that it was a case of fraud. It has not been proven.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am sorry; it involves an allegation of fraud. This is the type of work that the department has been doing. Also, a large number of other investigations are under way at present. If the honourable member is interested in further details of the investigations that are being undertaken, I shall be willing to supply them to her in confidence, as some of the matters are obviously of a delicate nature.

Mr. EVANS: I have a note from the Minister of Works to the effect that electric typewriters are not necessary in the interests of efficiency or to keep up with the work load. Can the Attorney say why it is necessary to buy electric typewriters when the Minister of Works sees no necessity for them?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The typewriters are used for typing out company certificates of incorporation, and so on.

Mr. Mathwin: What about computers?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: We will be using that method in due course. In the short term, however, such work should be done on a typewriter of that nature which gives a clear certification and can give a better service to the public.

Mrs. ADAMSON: Is there any hard evidence (not talking of cases before the court) that justifies such an enormous increase in the amount to be provided to combat corporate crime when, in the view of the average South Australian, there has been no increase in corporate crime in this State that would warrant such a vast increase? What evidence resulted in the establishment of these 13 extra staff positions in addition to the seven transferred from the Legal Services Department and 28 from the Public and Consumer Affairs Department?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The significant backlog of uncompleted investigations at that time, which resulted from complaints from numerous members of the public and of the business community.

Line passed.

Public and Consumer Affairs, \$6 005 000.

Mr. WILSON: One of the functions of the Public Trustee Office, as set out on page 212 of the Auditor-General's Report, is to manage the estates of persons pursuant to the Mental Health Act. The Auditor-General's Report also contains at page 251, in relation to the South Australian Health Commission, the following comment:

Trust Funds

Established requirements for the management and use of trust funds have not been adhered to at psychiatric hospitals with particular reference to the treatment of interest on patients' trust fund moneys.

The department is reviewing the management of trust funds for the purpose of making firm recommendations regarding their control, including proposals concerning amounts of interest already accumulated.

If I interpret these two comments correctly, what action has been taken to correct what seems to be a serious breach of faith to patients in mental hospitals?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: As I am not fully familiar with the matters, I shall obtain a report for the honourable member. The difficulty was, I think, that the Public Trustee was not involved in the protection of these estates at the earliest possible time. Some delays were occurring. It was not a matter of great significance.

Mr. EVANS: Will the Attorney-General take up with the Adelaide City Council the matter of the provision of parking near Edmund Wright House, also using his own good offices in an attempt to improve the position? The lack of parking facilities embarrasses people who attend ceremonies at Edmund Wright House, and also caterers involved with those ceremonies.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I shall take up the matter.

Mrs. ADAMSON: A statement on page 214 of the Auditor-General's Report reveals that the Public Trustee has invested \$2 245 000 from trust funds for the purchase of the Public Trustee Building, in Franklin Street. What kind of investigation did the Public Trustee make to determine whether such an investment was a wise and proper use of trust funds and that the rents derived from the building would return a reasonable profit for the benefit of trusts and estates? The net return was \$63 000, representing a return on funds invested by trusts and estates of about 2.8 per cent, an incredibly low return. Why was the return so low? Who is managing the building? Is the Public Trustee paying a reasonable rent?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Public Trustee, no, and no. The Public Trustee, I understand, does not pay rent on its own building. The fact that it has no outgoing for rents mean a general saving, which is not shown. If the Public Trustee had to pay rent to the common fund the amount of \$63 000 would be very much greater.

Mrs. ADAMSON: Why is the return so low? Did the answer, "No and no" apply to that question?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes. The return is not so low. If the Public Trustee had to pay rent, that amount would be drawn from the common fund and would not be available for distribution. If the Public Trustee paid rent into the common fund, the amount of rent would have to be added to the \$63 000, and the return on the money would be very much greater. I refer the honourable member to the Trustee Act, which sets out the conditions under which the Public Trustee may invest funds. The Auditor General has a significant role to play in this: he must certify investments of this nature before they are made.

Mrs. ADAMSON: The profit in 1977 was \$130 669, whilst the loss in 1978 was \$109 678. Is it expected that this

loss will be financed from interest derived from the investment of trust funds, as provided for under the Administration of Probate Act?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes.

Mr. RUSSACK: A sum of \$15 600 is to be allocated for the purchase of motor vehicles for the Public Trustee Office. I understand that the department is involved in country work concerned with drafting of wills, and so on. Advertisements state that the making of a will is free, but it has been brought to my attention that, although that service is free, certain conditions are imposed when the administration of the will is undertaken.

It has been said that it would be reasonable if all the conditions were shown in the advertisement. Will the Attorney-General explain those conditions?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The honourable member is under an amazing misconception, which has been spread far and wide, through the community by people who consider themselves to be in competition with the Public Trustee. The Public Trustee's will-making service is free in its entirety. There is no requirement whatever that the Public Trustee should be appointed as the executor of an estate once a person dies.

Mr. RUSSACK: What expansion has taken place in country areas to assist those who require wills to be drawn up by the Public Trustee?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Public Trustee has established offices in Port Augusta and Mount Gambier. Representatives regularly visit Whyalla, Port Pirie and various towns in the North of the State. The Public Trustee is endeavouring to visit those towns in the North of the State that are not readily serviced by legal practitioners or private trustee companies. Similar visits have been made to towns in the area serviced by the Mount Gambier office.

Mr. EVANS: Will the Attorney-General inform me in writing of how many electric typewriters are used in his department? It amazes me that nearly every primary school and office throughout the State has an electric typewriter, yet I am unable to get one for my electoral office because the Minister of Works says a manual typewriter is sufficient. If the Attorney can give me this information, I will have a basis to assess whether the Minister of Works was accurate in his assessment of my need for this type of machine.

Is the department involved in any investigation into licensees of premises buying wine at cellar-door sales for about \$12 a dozen, thus avoiding the 8 per cent tax that comes to the Government? There is concern in the industry that hotel licensees are disadvantaged by cellar door sales made at these prices. Could the Attorney give me any information about this matter? Also, can the Licensing Court do anything about the matter or is the Minister considering any amendment to the Licensing Act to cover this situation?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am not aware of any such difficulty but I will examine the matter. The potential loss of a liquor licence is such that it would be a foolish publican who was prepared to put in jeopardy the considerable investment he had made in a liquor licence by undertaking that sort of transaction.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I would not have intervened in this debate had it not been for some remarks made by the Attorney-General about the Public Trustee. My firm advice to anybody wanting to make a will is not to go to the Public Trustee or to a trustee company but to go to a solicitor. A person will pay more in the long run to an executor company or the Public Trustee than he will by having his will drawn by a solicitor. The way the Public Trustee makes his money (and he would not stay in

business if it was not for this) is by charging commission on the administration of estates. It is all very well for the Attorney to laud the Public Trustee (and I have nothing against the Public Trustee, who is a nice bloke with a competent staff), but it is not correct to suggest that he does everything free, because of course he does not.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: I did not say that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: You did not, and that is the unfair part of the answer. This is typical of the Attorney-General; many times he gives one side of the story but does not complete it. The fact is that, if the Public Trustee administers an estate, he charges commission in the same way as anybody else charges, plus other charges, so people do not receive that service free of charge. It is not fair for the Attorney to leave that side of the story out. I understand that the charge is a set commission.

It is far more expensive to have an estate administered by the Public Trustee or an executor company rather than have a competent relative do the work. As I said, sometimes that is not possible. The ideal way to have an estate administered is to go to a solicitor, have a will drawn and pay for it. The solicitor looks after the will. A competent individual should be appointed as the executor instead of one of these corporations. People should make sure they avoid lengthy trusts, because they are what the executor companies like: they spin out an estate as long as they can, because the longer they administer it the more money they make. I do not say that that is what the Public Trustee does, but the Public Trustee does not do the work for free as the Attorney implied.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The member for Goyder's question simply referred to wills and not estates, and I replied on that basis.

Mr. Russack: I asked what the conditions were.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I explained that there were none. As honourable members know, the member for Mitcham usually tailors and relates his comments to the interests of the Law Society and he has done so again tonight, as he undertakes that role in this House quite frequently.

Mr. WILSON: Can the Minister say why there has been such a large increase in the provision for the purchase of motor vehicles in the Consumer Affairs Division?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: This will provide for replacement motor vehicles for the whole division, which now includes the Standards Branch.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Attorney knows that I do not represent the Law Society in this place. He, of course, is a member of the Council of the Law Society, *ex officio*.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: But I am not a member of the Law Society.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, he is not a member of the Law Society and is proud that he has not been forced to join a trade union, although he forces other people to join the appropriate trade unions. Frankly, I think the Law Society is glad not to have him and would certainly not demean itself by forcing him to join, as he and other members of his Party try to force other people to join trade unions. It is nearly 15 years since I practised as a solicitor and, even in those days, I could only make the simplest of wills. I make quite clear I have no axe to grind and that I do not represent the Law Society, but was giving good, gratuitous advice.

Mr. ALLISON: Does the Minister intend to continue importing inspectors for the Standards Branch from the United Kingdom, as was done last year, or will a training programme be instituted for Australian-born inspectors?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: It is intended to establish a training facility, but the difficulty is not so much a scarcity of trained people in Australia able to do this work but a

scarcity of trained people in Australia able and prepared to do this work at the salaries being offered.

Mrs. ADAMSON: Can the Minister say whether the increase of about \$8 000 in the provision for salaries in the Equal Opportunity Division is to cover an increase in staff or for an increase of the salaries of the existing members of the staff?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The honourable member will notice that about \$4 000 less was spent last year than was budgeted for. This was because Commissioner Beasley resigned and became a Commissioner of the Public Service Board, and it was some months before the new Commissioner was appointed so that a salary was not paid during that period. The increase is a modest increase of \$4 000 for this year and is intended to cover a full year's salary at the going rate. The Government recognises the need to have one additional officer in the Commission for Equal Opportunities office, but it does not propose to fill that under the existing manpower budget arrangements.

Line passed.

Supreme Court, \$945 000.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In the Address in Reply debate this year I referred to the lengthening of the criminal calendar in the Criminal Court, which is part of the Supreme Court. At that time, in July or August, I gave figures, and pointed out subsequently that the list was lengthening month by month because more people were being committed for trial than the courts were able to cope with. I also said that the real problem was not a shortage of judges but a shortage of courts equipped for jury trials. Only three courtrooms in the Supreme Court building can be used for criminal trials, only two of them have security and there are only two jury rooms in the whole building. Since that time the Government has appointed two acting Supreme Court judges: His Honour Mr. Acting Justice Newman and His Honour Mr. Acting Justice Williams. Their appointments are to cover the absence of Mr. Justice Sangster and Mr. Justice Walters. The talk in the profession is that these acting appointments are for only two months. If that is the position and this is meant to be a way of getting over the backlog of cases in the Supreme Court, it will fail lamentably.

I approached the Clerk of Arraigns about this matter and got some figures from him. I have not got them at hand now, but perhaps the two extra judges to take the place of those who are away may stop the list getting longer for the time of their appointment, but it is in no way a solution to the problem. It will go on and on until there is more accommodation. One of the things that the Government has done is to set up a criminal court in the Adelaide Magistrates Court, which started 100 years ago. I understand that about \$10 000 has been spent over there already on the accommodation.

The Hon. Peter Duncan interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was told that a considerable amount of money has been spent in the building getting ready a jury room and all this sort of thing. If I am wrong, okay, but that was the figure given to me. Unless there is to be some permanent use of that court room for a criminal court and a programme of building of criminal courts for these more serious matters (murder, robbery with violence, and so on), there will be no solution to the problem. The judges added do have not have accommodation, anyway. The last set of Chambers was got ready in anticipation of the appointment of Mr. Justice King and it all worked according to plan. There are no extra sets of chambers now for judges, but that is not what is wanted.

What we need for the Supreme Court is extra court rooms which can cope with jury trials and, unless we get them, the waiting time for trial will lengthen all the time,

because they are falling back month by month and the expedient of appointing two acting judges may simply stem the tide, but in no way will catch up the backlog. I have told the Attorney what is to be done, in my opinion and in the opinion of many others, but he is the bloke who makes the decisions now. I ask him what plans the Government has at the moment to get over this very serious backlog of cases in the criminal court.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Government's proposals are that we will continue to sit three criminal courts at least in the Supreme Court until such time as the backlog has been overcome. In fact, whilst the lists are not in an ideal situation, two very long trials came on to the list (I think it was last month), one being a murder trial and the other being the trial involving Flinders Trading. Aside from that, there is a potentially long rape trial under way at present, and numerous other smaller trials are in the lists. If those three larger trials are dispensed with—

Mr. Millhouse: Disposed of, you mean.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I do not seek any assistance from my learned junior in these sort of matters. If these matters are dealt with by the courts this month, next month should give a good opportunity to get the lists up to date when we have these two acting judges. Then I believe that if three criminal courts sit from time to time that should be quite sufficient to keep the lists up to date.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The backlog is now at about 70 trials waiting in the Supreme Court. If the Attorney thinks that by sitting three courts, from time to time they are going to get over three long matters and then the list will collapse, he is living in cloud cuckoo-land. The reality of the situation is that long trials, such as the ones he has mentioned, are always cropping up. There is a good deal of dissatisfaction in the profession on behalf of those who have to wait six months or more for trial on serious matters of murder, rape and so on.

On behalf of those people, there is a great deal of dissatisfaction, and it is obvious from what the Attorney has said that the Government is only playing at the problem and it will get worse and worse. Is it proposed to go on using the accommodation indefinitely in the Adelaide Magistrates Court for Supreme Court criminal trials?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: No.

Mr. RODDA: I have some fellow feeling for the member for Mitcham in this matter. A case of proving a will has come to my notice, and it is of some 4½ years standing. The solicitors handling this matter have investigated all the processes and are now waiting listing to have this proved by a judge. This does seem to bolster what the member for Mitcham is saying, that there is a bottle-neck in this area.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: If the honourable member will supply me with details I shall be happy to investigate and see what is the situation. The honourable member has raised a matter with which I have very considerable sympathy, and that is the whole question of the extraordinary procedures required to undertake any matter in the Supreme Court. I believe that they can be reduced very greatly, and to that end the Government is in the process of establishing a committee to advise how the procedures of the Supreme Court could be very significantly reduced and simplified.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am most interested in the last answer that the Attorney gave, and I would like to get some detail from him about this committee. What are its terms of reference, who are its members, when was it appointed, when is it likely to report, and will the report be made public?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I said the Government was in the process of setting it up and I will be able to supply

the honourable member with all the details in due course.

Line passed.

Attorney-General, and Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs, Miscellaneous, \$974 000.

Mr. WILSON: The amount allocated for criminal injuries compensation is double what was actually spent last year. Will the Attorney obtain for me a list of the type of payment that was made, matched with the type of criminal injury concerned, from the sum of \$71 000 spent last year? Is the Government's policy gradually to increase the sum of compensation, because it could get out of hand?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Earlier this year the Government amended the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act to provide that the amount payable in total is now \$10 000. That was in accordance with an election promise, and that is why the sum allocated this year has been tentatively set at \$141 000. I cannot give the honourable member details of every instance of payment, because these matters go through the courts and it would be a very significant search. I could give him the names, but the actual offence and details would be in the files.

Mr. RUSSACK: Regarding grants to consumer organisations, \$25 000, what are the organisations and the types of grant?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: We made an election promise that such grants would be made. When the Government was returned with a majority, we received requests for grants from three organisations. It is not proposed to meet all of the requests. We will call for applications for grants and make grants according to the merits of the applications received.

Mr. Russack: What types of organisation?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Consumers Association of South Australia, the Tenants Union and possibly the R.A.A., for special purposes.

Mr. TONKIN: What is the reason for this year's reduction to the grant to the Royal Association of Justices?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Government has provided the association with accommodation in a Government building, rent free. In effect, that is a grant and we have reduced the actual amount of contribution to the association.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Last year, \$17 000 was voted towards cost of the Constitutional Convention; \$5 035 was paid out. This year, \$19 000 is proposed. I presume that this sum has been proposed against the possibility of another session of the Constitutional Convention being held in Adelaide.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Yes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We will probably save our money, and I hope we do. On the last day of the Constitutional Convention in Perth, delegates were discussing the next session of the convention. Joh Bjelke-Petersen said, "Not on your Nellie; they're not coming to Queensland; I'm not going to invite them," and he said that even though it was Queensland's turn to hold the next session. The Queensland Government is realistic; it does not want delegates in that State talking about the Constitution. South Australia was then the only State left. We were to have a meeting here before, but at that time there was a squabble in Canberra about whether or not Steele Hall should get a berth as Liberal Movement Senator. Neither side would give way and the session of the Constitutional Convention to be held in Adelaide was called off at the last minute, even though everything had been arranged. The Premier has now been persuaded to invite the other States and the Commonwealth to South Australia for the next meeting.

In my view, the convention has been a failure. I say that with regret because I was one who thought the Constitutional Convention might be a way of tackling the task of amending the Constitution. It was perfectly obvious, particularly in Perth (and it has been growing more obvious all the time at every session of the convention) that Party politics and loyalties are stronger than the desire to get to any conclusion on the matters being discussed. One full day was spent in Perth debating the powers of the Senate, arising out of Sir John Kerr's sacking of the Whitlam Government. There were speeches on each side, all predictable. All the Liberal and Country Party members thought it was lovely; the Labor Party thought it was terrible. I was the only delegate who was heckled, because I told everyone to go to hell about it. Party politics had ruined any chance of getting the Constitutional Convention even to the starting point of taking any real action.

It is ironic that we have had referenda since the Constitutional Convention was established and one of the questions that was put and passed was directly contrary to a recommendation of the convention. This related to the replacement of Senators who, like Steele Hall, resigned in mid-term. The Constitutional Convention in Hobart considered the matter too hard to legislate on. Whitlam and Fraser went to Canberra and did the opposite; there was then a controversy last year about Senator Hall's vacancy. That exercise showed the futility of the Constitutional Convention.

I said publicly after the Perth session that the only chance for any amendment of the Constitution in any ordered way is by scrapping the present arrangement and having a popularly elected convention, which may, by chance, overcome the rigid Party loyalties which are exhibited session after session. This may not work but it is the only chance we have of overcoming this insane loyalty to Party rather than consideration of principles that are involved in trying to bring the Constitution of Australia up to date. If we do not do that, the only way in which there will be wholesale amendments will be by revolution, by somebody coming in and saying, "Out with all this, we are not going to do it that way in future".

It is tacitly agreed amongst all Australian State Governments that the Convention is a wash-out; however, this is not for public consumption. The chances of the convention being held in Adelaide are almost nil. Because it is futile, the convention is a waste of taxpayers' money, and I hope it does not go on.

Mr. EVANS: It would be very unlikely at a meeting of any people that an agreement on issues such as this would be reached. The member for Mitcham is inaccurate. At the convention, many delegates from both sides of politics voted against the Party view. An example is the member for Playford; I also went against my Party's views. The member for Mitcham was at this convention and saw this happen. This costs a lot of money, but I know of people who have employed lawyers who have spent days fighting a point of law, on a law that was written. Yet the member for Mitcham is complaining about one day's debate about one issue. There have been four referenda put to the people, since the Constitutional Convention was initiated; two were passed. That is a better percentage than ever occurred in the history of South Australia. Sensible amendments to the Constitution may take a long time, but they are in the long-term interests of the country.

We are not looking at large sums. Our contribution last time was \$5 000, and \$19 000 is involved if we host the convention here. The member for Mitcham is starting to show himself in typical form, because he enjoyed the opportunity to express his point of view. No-one agreed

with him totally, but he cannot expect to win all the time, nor can anyone expect that, on issues affecting the country as a whole.

The people can make the final judgment. Although I should like to see lay members of the community attend the convention, I do not see how that can be done without Party politics becoming involved.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Fisher always likes to drag in the law and lawyers when he is trying to rebut anything I have said. The fallacy in his comparison is that, if people go to law, they are risking their own money—

Mr. Evans: Not always—the Crown challenges individuals at times.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In civil proceedings, and that is what the honourable member was referring to, the litigant risks his own money unless he has legal assistance, which is carefully vetted. Here we are spending the taxpayers' money, and I believe we are wasting it in this case.

I tried to challenge by way of interjection, but the member for Fisher totally ignored me, not because it was against Standing Orders but because he did not have an answer. My challenge was for him to assert, if he could (and he could not), that the argument on that day about the powers of the Senate carried the matter one jot further. The answer was that it did not; everyone was of the same opinion, but we had spent a full day on that at God knows what expense. That is the futility of it.

Of course, I do not always expect to get my own way. I would like to, but I have been around long enough to know that you seldom get your own way. The reality is that the convention has failed. If we continue with it, I can only suspect that we (and the member for Fisher is a delegate to it) get much personal pleasure from the exercise. As it is not at our expense, but at someone else's, I do not think that is right.

Mr. BECKER: For what purpose is the payment of damages for unlawful imprisonment?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: It relates to two *ex gratia* payments authorised in cases where persons were wrongly imprisoned. I do not have details of the individuals concerned, but I will obtain them and the circumstances involved for the honourable member.

Mr. BECKER: A report on page 3 of today's *Advertiser*, under the heading "Mistaken identity victim, says man", states:

A Fulham man said last night he had been the victim of mistaken identity by police.

In obtaining information, will the Attorney examine the circumstances surrounding this report and advise whether there could be a possibility of a further claim?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I do not want to speculate about whether or not there will be a claim. Certainly, there will be an excess warrant if we need one arising from it. I saw the report in the paper this morning, and I was appalled at the circumstances. I have asked for a report on the matter.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The sum of \$100 000 is allocated for the preliminary cost of establishing the Legal Services Commission. Nothing much has been said about the commission, although we have passed a Bill and commissioners have been appointed. I take the point made by the Premier this afternoon in defending the appointment of Mr. Muirhead that, just because your politics happen to be the same as that of the Government, it does not mean that you are disqualified from a job, but I have noticed that a majority of members of the commission are committed Labor Party activists. Whilst that does not necessarily disqualify them, it has caused some comment in some quarters.

Mr. David Wilson is Chairman of the commission and is

a case in point. I know and like him; he is a good bloke, but he is a staunch Labor Party man on the left wing, and there are others on the commission. I refer to the lady in charge of the commission, whose name escapes me, but she, too, has come from outside—not from England, but from New South Wales. Whether that was necessary, is a matter of debate, and I do not intend to debate it. When will the—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Get on with it, you mug!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Works is getting a little testy, and wants to get this line through and get on to the next one.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You're right.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: At least he is honest. What progress has been made? When will the commission start its operations? Will, at the same time, the work of the A.L.A.O. and the Law Society automatically cease, or will there be a changeover period? What are the general administrative arrangements?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The course to be followed by the commission is the latter alternative advanced by the honourable member. The work of the commission is proceeding towards a position where, on a particular changeover day, it will be possible for the commission to commence providing legal aid, and for the Law Society and the Australian Legal Aid Office to cease providing legal aid on that day. On that day, the commission will take over the payment of salaries and directions of staff of both existing organisations.

We could, had the agreement been totally finalised, have taken the other course suggested by the honourable member by proceeding to set the commission in motion whilst the Law Society and the A.L.A.O. were still providing legal aid. As I gave the Law Society an undertaking long ago that we would not do that, we intend to keep to that undertaking. The commission should be operating early in December.

Mr. Millhouse: Has the date actually been fixed?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: No. There are still two minor matters concerning the agreement with the Commonwealth about which I will give the honourable member details if he wishes them. I expect that these two minor matters to which I have referred will be resolved next Monday.

Mr. Millhouse: You expect that it will be in December?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I think it will be early in December.

Mr. BECKER: In reply to my previous question about a report in today's *Advertiser*, the Attorney said that he would call for a report. Will he send a copy of it to me?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes.

Mr. BECKER: Will the Attorney say what is the reason for the allocation of \$4 000 for payments under fidelity bonds in relation to the Land and Business Agents Act? One sees from page 362 of the Auditor-General's Report that there is a surplus of \$240 000 for the year in the Land and Business Agents Act Consolidated Interest Fund, \$882 000 having been accumulated. I understand that payments from the fund on account of defaulting agents have totalled \$257 000 since the inception of the scheme to June 1978. What, therefore, is the reason for this allocation?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The fidelity fund operated under the old Land Agents Act, not under the new Land and Business Agents Act. Some years ago (I do not recall exactly when) the fidelity fund revenue was called in and paid into general revenue, and any minor liabilities that have arisen since then have been paid out of general revenue.

Line passed.

Treasury, \$3 816 000.

Mr. BECKER: I refer to the allocation of \$210 000 for operating expenses, minor equipment and sundries for the State Superannuation Office. Some weeks ago, I sought information from the Treasurer concerning future retirements from the Public Service of persons who would be entitled to superannuation, when I was assured that the information would be made available later. Has the Superannuation Fund's staff had time to obtain the information for me? I am concerned about the possibility of a large number of retirements from the Public Service and the extra work that will be involved in administering the fund should these superannuation payments have to be made. I notice that there has been a tremendous increase in the number of commutations made in the past 12 months. Will the Minister assure me that the Superannuation Fund has sufficient staff and that the fund is able to meet likely demands made on it in the next two or three years?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister for Planning): I will check that matter for the honourable member.

Dr. EASTICK: I refer to the allocation of \$210 000, compared to actual payments of \$162 628 last year, under the item relating to the operation, maintenance and development of automatic data processing systems. Having checked the Auditor-General's Report, I realise that this involves virtually a service charge by the Automatic Data Processing Centre Division to the various clients who use its facilities, and that sums of money are transferred from its various client departments to it. For example, I see from page 268 of the 1977 Auditor-General's Report that the divisions' principal users and the amounts they paid during that year were: Engineering and Water Supply Department, \$484 000; Motor Registration Division, \$329 000; Highways Department, \$324 000; Education Department, \$284 000; Public Buildings Department, \$191 000, Valuer-General's Office, \$168 000; and for Treasury, \$137 000 for the central processing of accounts, and a similar sum for the State Taxation Office.

If one examines the Auditor-General's Report, one finds that one of the major costs associated with the Automatic Data Processing Centre Division relates to system development, the salaries and related payments for which were \$388 218 in 1976; in 1977 they were \$464 636; and one sees from this year's Auditor-General's Report that this year system development is to cost \$530 566, a part of which is reflected in the line to which I have referred. I raise this matter because of the concern that has been expressed at Flinders University and in other areas regarding the massive losses that can be incurred in the development and use of computerised services. Indeed, one can go beyond the Government field and refer to the Totalizer Agency Board debacle several years ago, when the data-line arrangements collapsed. The racing industry is still suffering from the massive losses incurred as a result of that computer operation.

Has the Government instigated a review of all data processing in Government and semi-government institutions and, if it has, has this revealed any major losses to the State? Also, has the Government determined a policy that is expected to offset the type of losses which may have been incurred in the past and which have to be covered in future? Will the Minister also outline the Government's attitude on data processing and computerisation?

I am not suggesting that we should return to the pen and ink era, or that we should add up on our fingers. Although I recognise the importance of the whole computer system, I realise that this Government, other Governments, and private enterprise have incurred major losses from the

development of systems that have not provided the end result that was originally intended.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think the Premier has announced a general inquiry into Government computer development. I will obtain the reference to that so that the honourable member can examine it for himself.

Dr. Eastick: Has an interim report been made?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No. This is, of course, a complicated and technical matter. The line to which the honourable member has referred relates solely to the development of systems that are already operating.

Mr. TONKIN: I refer to the allocation for the Public Actuary, Deputy Public Actuary and clerical staff. Is the Public Actuary participating in the study being made into the State Superannuation Fund and the long-term projection of the effect of that fund on general revenue over the next five or 10 years? I am sure the Minister understands to what I am referring: the increased sums that will have to come from general revenue to meet necessary superannuation payments in the next two years. Obviously, this problem will not go away, and it has not yet been adequately assessed. Some authorities say it is likely to send the State bankrupt within 10 or 15 years, and others disagree, but it is an extremely important matter.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall see what report I can get for the Leader.

Line passed.

Treasurer, Miscellaneous, \$31 879 000.

Mr. TONKIN: On what is the \$183 000 for the Constitutional Museum Trust to be spent and how much money has the trust borrowed? Is the sum from general revenue to be applied for the repayment of interest, or what is it to be used for? Has there been any assessment of the need for the spending contemplated for the Pirie Regional Cultural Centre Trust and the Whyalla Regional Cultural Centre Trust? No amounts have been spent previously, and these are new allocations. Has there been an assessment, in this time of financial stringency, of the real need for such expenditure in the iron triangle area? Has any attempt been made to assess the opinion of the people of Whyalla and Port Pirie? Will the expenditure help create employment in the area, or could the money be better used in relieving the critical employment situation in those towns?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Each item deals with the interest and principal repayment expected for this year. One could assume, in the case of Pirie, that the expenditure would be of the order of \$1 000 000 borrowing. It is interest and some minor principal repayment, and perhaps the amount in connection with Whyalla would be larger, and much the same in relation to the Constitutional Museum Trust as in Whyalla.

Mr. TONKIN: How far has the cultural centre trust gone in each town?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I cannot report on Whyalla, but I was in Pirie last week. The project there is at the planning stage, but there are some determinations yet to be made. Whether they will get off the ground this year remains to be seen. This is a provision to enable that to happen and to enable some borrowing to take place this financial year. If the cost exceeds \$1 000 000, the semi-government borrowing of up to \$1 000 000 each year can be undertaken without having any impact on the Loan programme.

In Pirie, and I assume also in Whyalla, the project is strongly supported, not only because it will provide improved facilities in the town but also because, in the process of construction, it will provide employment. If \$1 500 000 worth of building goes on in Pirie associated with the provision of the facilities for the operation of the

trust, there will be an important impact on the town while the building is taking place, and it may act as a significant offset to reductions in any other form of building.

Although that may be less significant in Pirie, certainly that would be important in Whyalla, where the situation has led to a cutback in house construction, which in turn has had a multiplier effect on the town's situation. Other forms of building in Whyalla will be an important way of providing some impetus towards employment. We would get as much impact on employment in this way as in other ways, and in addition it provides an important facility for a large population.

Mr. TONKIN: Whilst I accept the Minister's argument as being one that we commonly hear, it is vitally important, particularly in the case of Whyalla, where there has been such a marked downturn in employment, that there should be a detailed examination on a cost benefit basis of whether or not this is the best way to help the community, and whether or not the \$163 000 could not be used in some sort of decentralisation scheme to maintain jobs in existing industries rather than constructing a cultural centre for what could otherwise be a declining population.

I think the latest subdivision in Whyalla was the Jennings subdivision, for which people were brought in from outside to do most of the building. That being so, this construction is unlikely to provide employment for those people at present out of work in Whyalla. For that reason, the Whyalla people could want the money spent in other ways. It could help keep small industries going, or perhaps it could be used for apprentice schemes, and so on, to stop the town from going down and to keep it ticking over until the employment prospects improve.

The centre is still at the planning stage, and it is not too late to look carefully at the situation. The Whyalla Development Trust could look at the matter to see what could be done alternatively with the money to provide better chances of employment in the town.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Four separate statutory authorities borrowing up to \$1 000 000 per annum can be undertaken without affecting the Loan programme, so that \$1 000 000 worth of building could, in principle, be done in Whyalla through the expenditure of a little over \$100 000 on recurrent account without affecting our ability to do any other work under our Loan programme. It is a matter of logic that, if we get a programme going in this way, so far as the current charge is concerned the \$100 000 produces a bigger impact than if it were necessary to pay for the whole building at this stage.

Any building project, once it gets going in a town such as Whyalla, even where there is quite significant unemployment, may, in one or two trade areas, involve some liquidation of labour. I could not comment on that, although I would imagine that that would not be very great. Even so, the expenditure that takes place on wages still affects the prosperity of the town, because a good part of the wages gets spent in the town while the labour is there. Even if labour has to be imported and is a relatively minor component, it still is of some benefit to the town. I do not think it is possible to say we can turn our back on a provision such as this when it can produce a significant benefit in terms of economic activity within the town when we are in a position to spend it.

Mr. EVANS: Statutory bodies which are set up in the main do not show a profit. They are lucky to balance their books and in most cases will lose money. Even if interest rates drop considerably, if they borrow \$1 000 000 a year for eight, nine or 10 years—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That won't happen.

Mr. EVANS: It is no good saying that will not happen. If

they get to that point they will have to borrow at least \$1 000 000 a year to service their loans.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Not if the provision for servicing the loan appears in the Revenue Budget.

Mr. EVANS: You have to find the money.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The bodies do not have to borrow in order to find the money, which is what the member for Fisher said, if the amounts are covered in the Revenue Budget.

Mr. MATHWIN: The amount voted for the Coast Protection Board was \$265 000 last year. The figure allowed for this year is \$400 000. What is the reason for that steep increase?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The increase relates to additional interest and principal repayments to be met by the Coast Protection Board. No doubt the board is involved in a further \$1 000 000 of borrowing. I will find out for the honourable member what the programme is.

Dr. EASTICK: The cash losses under "Miscellaneous" of \$894 for last year is not a significant amount but indicates some problem in the department. Where was that loss encountered? Further down an amount of \$850 000 is shown relating to Dartmouth Reservoir. What amounts are payable this year? I would like to know the projected payments for the reservoir over the next three years and any other details the Minister has relative to the State's commitment in respect of Dartmouth. I would also like to know when we can expect the first water from the dam?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The cash losses line provides for the reimbursement of cash losses sustained by departments throughout the Government. In this way revenue and other records are not distorted by cash thefts or losses. Where something has to be provided under that heading in any department it is provided for on this line in the Treasury. The usual provision is \$2 000 and \$894 was required last year.

The provision for the Dartmouth Reservoir relates purely to the payment of interest on special loans made by the Commonwealth Government towards the cost of construction. I am not sure of the exact ratio, but I think South Australia meets a quarter or a sixth of the cost. At this stage we are only paying interest on those loans. The advances made to the South Australian Government for this purpose do not require any principal repayment for the first 10 years. Once repayment of principal commences, repayments have to be made over 15 years. At this stage it seems as though the total amount of money borrowed is of the order of \$9 000 000. I will check that figure for the honourable member. I will also find out when the reservoir will be completed. The completion of the reservoir does not necessarily mean that South Australia gets any extra water entitlement. The Dartmouth Reservoir has to be declared effective, which means it has to have a certain amount of water in it, before South Australia's entitlement is affected.

Mr. WOTTON: I refer to the amount for "Contribution to the Electricity Trust of South Australia for subsidies in country areas". Is the Minister aware of the increasing concern expressed by people in country areas who rely heavily on the supply of electric power and are looking for increased subsidies? A motion moved by an association in my electorate was brought to my attention recently. It states:

That we view with grave concern the ever increasing costs of Electricity Trust of South Australia power, as applicable to irrigation along the River Murray, particularly when these increased costs are brought about by increased union demands, shorter working hours, etc., and that we are obliged to sell a portion of our produce on overseas markets,

in competition with countries, whose producers' fuel costs are subsidised in various ways.

I notice that there has been a decrease in the amount in this line. Can the Minister explain the Government's policy regarding an increase in the subsidy for the supply of power?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Subsidies are paid for establishing and extending electricity supplies in country areas. The recurrent electricity supply to the country receives subsidies to enable the tariff to remain within 10 per cent of the rate charged in the metropolitan area. That has been the situation for 20 years or more. The size of this line is dependent not just on that 10 per cent payment but also on the subsidy paid towards extensions of services. There are tending to be fewer extensions of services in country areas, so the amount of the subsidy is declining.

The rate of increase in the power costs is significantly less than the rate of increase in the price level. That should be recognised—that the tariff increases imposed by the Electricity Trust have gone up more slowly than the general level of prices. The second point to remember is that, even with the recent increase, tariffs in South Australia are on a par with those in Melbourne and Hobart, slightly above those in Sydney, below those in Brisbane and significantly below those in Perth. Tariff rates for country users of electricity in South Australia would be slightly above those in Melbourne and Hobart, on a par with those in Brisbane, and significantly below those in Perth.

A further point that needs to be made is that very little of any of the increases in tariffs that have occurred through the Electricity Trust in recent years have had anything to do with wage costs, union demands or shorter working hours. Most of the increases relate to the higher interest payments that occur each year by the Electricity Trust because of the borrowing that has to be undertaken to finance further capital development. Of the recent increase of 10 per cent, 6 per cent was a special capital levy quite unrelated to costs, and 4 per cent was related to cost changes over the past 14 months. The impact of shorter working hours on that 4 per cent was quite insignificant. The effect on wage costs of the reduction in working hours was minor and would not show up in any significant way in the trust's accounts.

The important aspects of the increase in costs have been increased interest and an increased price of gas that must be paid to the Cooper Basin producers. They are the two important sources of increased prices. The cost of providing new power stations is increasing much more quickly than the general consumer price index, and that has affected the situation.

Mrs. ADAMSON: The provision to service debts for the lines Adelaide Festival Centre Trust to the South Australian Film Corporation inclusive is \$3 900 000 in the current year. At page 37 of the Auditor-General's Report the total liability for the State for 1978 is shown as \$2 200 000 000, which is an increase of 23.6 per cent in the public debt between 1974 and 1978. Given present revenue and the continual substantial increases, what does the Government regard as an acceptable level of increase in the public debt annually, and for how long can these increases continue before the State ultimately becomes bankrupt?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have not done any exercise in the past couple of years but I believe that for some years now the weight of interest payments in the total Budget has declined, even though the total debt has been increasing. During the 1950's and 1960's there was a period when the repayment of interest went up but in recent years it has declined. As long as the proportion of

interest to total expenditure is not increasing significantly, the community can afford an increase in the size of the debt, because the debt is only a redistribution of the indebtedness within the community.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister indicate, having regard to the fact that \$13 905 000 was repaid through the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement last year, and this year we have \$15 530 000 budgeted, which is more than 10 per cent above last year, whether this is a repayment of the money? What monetary increases does the Minister see as necessary to pick up the backlog of housing need for welfare and low-income group housing, to meet the community demand between now and 1990?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This item deals with the repayment of principal under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement and does not mean that we have received more money.

Mr. Evans: We are paying 10 per cent more than last year.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This is at no cost to the State Treasury because that money, under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, is put out by the Housing Trust through the State Bank and there is an offset to this in the revenue of the Treasurer—

Mr. Evans: How much do we need each year?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: We need more than we are getting, and the reduced amount is one source of the reduction in the activity within the building industry. I could not give an estimate of the total backlog. I refer honourable members, and in particular the honourable member for Coles, to the document put out with the Financial Statement. Appendix 5 of the financial statement of the Premier and Treasurer, on page 8, under the heading "Debt services", shows that 10 years ago interest was \$65 000 000 out of total payments of \$335 000 000, which is nearly 20 per cent. This year interest is \$153 000 000 out of \$1 270 000 000, which is about 12 per cent. The weight of interest in our Budget payments has decreased significantly in the past 10 years.

Mr. Becker: That is not a fair calculation.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A relevant index to measure the weight of the debt is to look at interest payments as a percentage of total Budget payments, and on that basis the weight of interest is not increasing at present.

Mr. WOTTON: Will the Minister consider providing a special subsidy to producers who depend on power for irrigation along the Murray River? I ask that for reasons I have given earlier.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will take that matter up with the Electricity Trust.

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister say how much money the Coast Protection Board will be borrowing this year to finance its various projects? I am concerned that a piece of sand dune at West Beach which comes under the control of the West Beach Trust has no protection. Over the past four years, it has been conservatively estimated, this sand dune has receded about 70 feet. I checked the area last week and I estimate that the beach in front of the sand dune has dropped about another 6 feet. I am also concerned that the West Beach Trust is doing nothing to protect this sand dune and has made little effort over the years to replant natural grasses.

We have lost about 70 feet that we will never get back, and the work is urgent. When an area is under an authority such as the West Beach Trust, the position is extremely difficult. Will the Coast Protection Board borrow sufficient funds (and the provision is made under this line) so that the necessary protective work can be carried out?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will get the information for the honourable member.

Mr. WOTTON: There is an item regarding the Botanic Gardens Board, \$42 000, and another, the State Opera Company of South Australia, shows a massive increase up to \$245 000. Do both those items relate to the servicing of loans? Is any of the money for the State Opera Company required for renovations being carried out on the Opera Theatre?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Both are for the servicing of loans. The Botanic Gardens has a small semi-government borrowing. I think the State Opera figure relates to work now being done at the theatre, but I will get a detailed report for the honourable member on that.

Mr. BECKER: I seek information relating to the provision for the Industries Development Committee, fees and expenses. In 1977-78 an amount of \$12 000 was voted and actual payments were \$20 778. This year it is proposed to allocate \$35 000. I was a member of that committee and I am surprised that the fees and expenses are being increased so dramatically. I am sure that the members of this committee continue their very good work, but has there been a change in accounting? Have extra officers been employed to assist the committee and are they being paid direct from this provision? What is the real reason behind the increase?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I would have to get a report on that. I have no further information, other than that it is for fees and expenses for members of the committee.

Line passed.

Lands, \$14 061 000.

Mr. RUSSACK: I refer to the provision for administration, which is reduced by about \$2 000 000. I assume that that is taken up by the following two items, as there has been some alteration in office administration. The Auditor-General's Report (at page 158), comments as follows on the financial management of the Lands Department:

Last year, attention was drawn to weaknesses in the cost reporting and budgetary control of the survey division. Following examination of the procedures of other divisions, the department agreed that improved budgetary control was necessary. Development of a management information system has commenced.

Land Ownership and Tenure System

In 1975 work commenced on the development of a computerised system of land ownership and tenure information at an estimated cost of \$455 000 (revised in 1976 to \$641 000) to be expended over two years. Costs to date are estimated to exceed \$1 000 000 and significant deficiencies in the design and development of the system led to a complete review of objectives.

The need for more effective management and improved financial control has been recognised by the department. Approval has been given to proceed with the development of an enhanced system, estimated to cost \$2 200 000, for implementation in 1980.

What is the present situation? Three years ago the estimated cost of a computer system was \$455 000, and now the estimate is \$2 200 000 for that same system. I refer also to the provision for the Surveyor-General, Deputy Surveyor-General, and survey, drafting, clerical and general staff. Although I suppose that deals only with salaries, there is an increase of more than \$1 000 000. I am concerned about the system that has escalated so rapidly in cost in five years from \$455 000 to \$2 200 000. There is a considerable reduction in one item and a considerable increase in another.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I have not quite followed the honourable member in

relation to this matter. I will ask the Lands Department staff to look at the queries he has raised and I will get a report for him.

Mr. RODDA: The member for Goyder has referred to the overall increases in expenditure, and, following the Corbett report, there has been a rationalisation of the department. There have been transfers to other departments from management services. It could be that there has been an increase in expenditure for the items on which the honourable member has spoken. Is it proposed to regionalise this department as is being done in the Agricultural Department.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get the information for the member. The structure of the department has changed recently. For example the Irrigation Branch has been transferred to the Engineering and Water Supply Department and that has made a difference.

Mr. RODDA: The sum of \$500 has been proposed for contribution under clause 7, War Service Land Settlement Agreement Act. What input does this department still receive from the Department of Lands, bearing in mind that there has been the recent problem on Kangaroo Island of readjustment which was the subject of recent investigation by the Parliamentary Land Settlement Committee?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The \$500 will provide a contribution of two-fifths of the excess in acquiring and improving land over the sum of the valuations fixed on allotment of the holdings. Apart from Kangaroo Island and probably Eight Mile Creek, the contribution is required under the Act. Probably the line has been kept open in case there is some demand \$500 is a convenient figure.

Mr. WOTTON: For contribution to local government authorities towards drainage services and erosion control, \$2 500 has been proposed. Could the Minister provide a break-down of how this money is allocated?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This sum is for the planting of marram grass on Crown lands, and subsidy for expenditure on drain maintenance by the District Council at Millicent.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN moved:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Some people who are holding war service land leases, and who have no record of war service, are concerned because they are not war service men. Perhaps the Government may be considering issuing new leases, in which case this might constitute a change in land use in that it has been changed from a war service lease to an ordinary perpetual lease for farming purposes.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As far as I am aware, where a war service perpetual lease is transferred to a person other than an ex-serviceman, the conditions of that lease would obtain. With a war service perpetual lease, there is the right to freehold, irrespective of the Government's policy. That has obtained, and I know of no move on the part of the Government to change that. In the case of a perpetual lease, land use could be considered, but there has been no suggestion that that should happen to war service perpetual leases.

Mr. RUSSACK: Has there been any recent alteration in Government policy to freehold leasehold broad acres?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know whether the Minister has made any announcement, but Cabinet has certainly considered the matter, and it has been decided by the Government that no further freeholding of broad acres will be permitted.

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister say what revenue will be

raised from service charges that apply to all leases under the Lands Department?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain that information.

Line passed.

Minister of Lands and Minister of Repatriation, Miscellaneous, \$269 000.

Mr. WOTTON: Is a sum to be made available for the so-called zoo at Monarto included in the \$209 000 proposed for the grant to the Royal Zoological Society of South Australia?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This sum is allocated for the Royal Zoological Society of South Australia towards the running expenses and extraordinary repairs and maintenance expenses expected for 1978-79. I know of no proposed involvement of the society in Monarto.

Mr. Wotton: I thought the Royal Zoological Society was to be in charge of that zoo at Monarto.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will check that.

Mr. RUSSACK: The Surveyors' Board—payment to fund, \$1 000; what is the fund and its purpose?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Section 13 of the Surveyors Act provides for payments to the Surveyors' Board Trust Fund for administration costs.

Mr. RODDA: An amount of \$2 000 seems to be an extremely small sum for "Repatriation—advances for homes for returned service personnel—municipal and district council rates".

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Under the Advances for Homes Act the Crown is liable for council rates on soldiers' widows' homes as directed under the Act. We pay the rates.

Mr. BLACKER: Many of my constituents contribute \$2 or \$2.50 a year under the Dog Fence Act. The fence for which the payment is made has long since gone, and constituents have asked why the payment is still to be made. True, there is a dog fence further north that it is important to maintain, but fences further south have long since been phased out.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not aware of the specifics stated by the honourable member. I will have the matter checked out and obtain a report for him. The sum involved is a dollar for dollar subsidy for the amount expected to be collected as rates for the dog fence. No increase in the rate is expected this year.

Line passed.

Engineering and Water Supply, \$61 470 000.

Mr. EVANS: In his report (page 114) the Auditor-General states:

There was a net deficit of \$25 316 000 on Consolidated Revenue for the year which was a retrogression of \$6 817 000 compared with the previous year.

We have had about a 30 per cent increased loss by the Engineering and Water Supply Department in one year. The community cannot accept such an increase in the department's deficit. The Auditor-General continues:

Receipts for rates increased by \$10 900 000, mainly due to higher additional rates of \$5 800 000 which were attributable to increased price of water and continuing dry seasonal conditions.

Regarding other payments on behalf of the department, the interest payment for 1978 is \$41 976 521, an increase of \$6 158 493, a further indication that the department is becoming expensive to maintain. He also states:

Outstandings for water and sewerage rates at June 1978 totalled \$9 073 000. This was \$2 331 000 higher than at the end of the previous year and was due mainly to higher additional rates (attributable to a combination of increased water price and continuing dry seasonal conditions) which were billed late in the financial year.

The increase in sundry debtors is up about 25 per cent on last year. In regard to this department the Auditor-General states:

As a result of a down-turn in departmental work there was a surplus capacity in the major workshops. Work obtained from other departments introduced a good work-load in all shops except the Ottoway Workshop Foundry, which continued to work at reduced capacity. The Treasurer made a special allocation of \$450 000 in 1977-78 to support the operations of the Ottoway Foundry.

My point is that we realise that there has been a down-turn in subdivisional work in South Australia. In the past the department has demanded the right to at least lay the major part of all water mains and, often, sewerage mains. The department has attempted to maintain a day-labour work force that is higher than is needed in this area of development.

Similarly, regarding the Ottoway Foundry, an attempt has been made to maintain a day-labour work force greater than is necessary for the capacity of that foundry. The private contracting sector in steel construction has been seriously disadvantaged, because the department, for example, had been given a guarantee of doing the work for the new Regency Park bus depot. Tenders were called for the steel sections, but the prefabrication of sections is being done by the department.

There is no way that this Parliament can ascertain whether the department is doing it at a reasonable price, whether it is a jacked-up price, thereby increasing the deficit of the State Transport Authority, or whether it is bleeding off Loan moneys to jack up the department because of excessive charges it makes.

Therefore, unless the department or the Minister makes clear that it will call tenders, and unless the department proves that the price it is tendering is the actual price costing to do the work and that the private sector cannot do it as cheaply and that the department has taken into account all the overheads applying to such contracts, we as a Parliament, are disadvantaged, and taxpayers are carrying a monetary burden they should not have to carry.

Regarding subdivision projects and prices quoted by the department for laying sewerage or water mains, developers are almost bound to stick with the depot, so that there is no way that one can determine whether the department's price is reasonable. The end result is that it is not the developer who loses money but it is the people buying the land. We are saying to young people (we all talk about them and try to win their votes) that they will have to pay more for their land because the services will cost more as a result of a department that is overburdened with day labour.

I know that the Minister is conscious of this and that he realises the problem. True, he cannot tell the department to sack 200 men overnight in these economic conditions, but we need a clear statement from him about whether the department is replacing people who retire or who find other work and move around in the department. We need information about whether the department is allowing the day-labour force to run down.

The department is one of the largest costs to our State as a result of the deficit of about \$25 000 000 annually from its general operating costs and of the deficit in respect of interest on loans. I hope that the Minister will give Parliament some statement indicating that he is conscious of this situation. I realise that he has a voice problem tonight, and it would be unfair for him to attempt to answer now, but a report could be given later stating the Minister's and the Government's intentions concerning the department. Will he also obtain information concerning the total work force in the department's

construction area?

Will the Minister also ascertain the work force in departmental workshops, particularly the Ottoway foundry, and whether it is overmanned. Also, what action does the Minister think the Government can take to treat the men fairly, at the same time trying to reduce the deficit so that the taxpayers are not carrying an unnecessary burden?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I assure the honourable member that the Government and I as Minister have not spared any effort to find a solution to the problem of the excess labour (as the honourable member referred to it) in the workshop area and foundry. The Government has a good policy of no retrenchments, a policy on which I could expound. I will obtain for the honourable member a full report on the matters that he has raised, particularly relating to costs.

Regarding the foundry, it is clear that, because there is no other foundry in Government service and we cannot place people in the Government foundry in private foundries (and we tried to do this), we are, because of the down-turn that has occurred, and by the good grace of the unions and people involved, using these people in other workshop activities. So, in most cases, there is useful employment for them.

Regarding costs and the competition with the State Transport Authority workshops that would take place on the open market, I believe we are competing with any proposition that could have been advanced by private enterprise. However, there may be, as the honourable member has said, certain Government costs which have not been stated but which would have to be taken into account. It is stated in the accounts that \$450 000 had to be obtained from the Treasury to enable the foundry to make up for lost productivity in this area. There is no secret about this, as it is stated in the accounts and in the Auditor-General's Report. The Government could have let the thing slide if it had wanted to do so or if it had wanted to hide the matter, but it did not do so. I said that it was not the Engineering and Water Supply Department's responsibility to carry that loss but that general revenue should do so.

I know the honourable member raises these matters in good faith, believing that there is perhaps a better way of doing things. However, I remind him that the Government is applying natural attrition. Indeed, it has been doing this in relation to the Sewerage Branch over the past three years, during which more than 300 men have been wasted. Wastage is at present occurring in the water supply area, the foundry, as well as in the workshops at Ottoway. This is happening not just in the Engineering and Water Supply Department but in other departments. Every effort is being made where possible to transfer people from one Government department to another in their own trade. Indeed, I believe this has happened in about 40 or 50 cases.

This matter is of great concern to the Government. As the honourable member said, it would be heartless to sack 200 people in order to solve the problem because no-one would be able to take up those people. The Government is trying as hard as it can to avoid this sort of hardship. I will obtain a full report for the honourable member on the points he has raised.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: In the light of what the Minister of Works has said, I am concerned, when I look at the Auditor-General's Report, to see the total number of employees in the department. I realise that the Engineering and Water Supply Department has been making every effort to get people to retire early. Indeed, the Minister indicated that up to 200 or 300 people in the

Sewerage Branch had not been replaced; nor have persons been replaced in other Government departments. However, I point out that at 30 June this year the department had 7 037 employees, compared to 7 079 employees at 30 June 1977. In other words, there has been a natural wastage across the entire department of only 42 persons.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: There's a reason for that: the Irrigation Branch came into it. I will get an explanation of that for the honourable member.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It is indicated that those figures do not include people working for the department under the State Unemployment Relief Scheme. So, those persons would be additional employees. Perhaps the Minister could ascertain how many persons are employed in the Irrigation Branch, which was transferred from the Lands Department to the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Will the Minister also ascertain how many surplus employees are at the Ottoway foundry, the sewerage section, and the metropolitan waterworks section? I realise the problems involved in this respect, because there has been a dramatic down-turn in housing, which has had a dramatic effect on service departments like the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Equally, however, this Parliament needs to be concerned about men who sit around all day long literally looking for work to do.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Most of them are gainfully employed.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If the Minister could get that information, I would appreciate it.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Certainly.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I bring to the Minister's attention another matter which comes under the metropolitan water works allocation and which relates to the charging of fees by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. In December 1977, the Upper Sturt Country Fire Service wrote the following letter to the Director, Engineering and Water Supply Department:

We understand that under the provisions of the Country Fires Act, 1976, C.F.S. organisations are exempt from water rates. We request the provision of a water supply to the above premises—

it gives the folio and volume—

situated on Upper Sturt Road, Upper Sturt, and respectfully request the waiving of the normal \$100 connection fee.

Yours faithfully, John Houtt, Hon. Secretary.

On 10 January 1978 the Secretary received the following letter from the Chief Revenue Officer:

I acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 20 December 1977 regarding a water service to the Upper Sturt E.F.S. Inc. fire station situated on part section 973, Upper Sturt Road, Upper Sturt. Although the fire station will be exempt from water rating, a minimum annual charge of \$40 will be charged if a water service is installed. The amount of water supplied for the minimum charge will be 211 kl per annum, and a further charge of 19c per kl will be charged for each kilolitre used over the allowance. I advise that, under waterworks regulations, a fee of \$100 is required for a 20 mm water service and there are no exemptions from this fee. As discussed per telephone this day, it appears that for protection purposes the meter should be fixed in a cast iron box at ground level and the prescribed fee for the cast iron box is \$40.

If you wish to proceed with a water service, please indicate the desired position the service is required from, either the eastern or western boundary, fix a peg marked "water" in the corresponding position and return it to this office with a cheque for \$140, and arrangements will be made for the service to be laid in due course. Form 169 is enclosed for

completion and return with the appropriate fee.

The Country Fire Services, a voluntary organisation, carries out an excellent service to the community, especially in the Adelaide Hills. I believe that, when this Parliament passed the Country Fire Services legislation, it did so in the belief that it would be exempt from all water charges, including connection fees. It appears that not only will the organisation be charged a connection fee but also a minimum annual charge of \$40. This seems to be against the intention of the Act. According to the letter, an additional charge will be made for extra water used. I plead with the Minister, in investigating the problem, to ensure that the Upper Sturt C.F.S. is able to have water connected and to receive it on an annual basis completely free of charge, which is only fair and proper.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall look into the matter.

Mr. EVANS: I wish to raise a matter of policy in relation to water main extensions. When I have approached the Minister many times over the years he has pointed out that his department does not wish to extend water mains outside of township areas in the water catchment area. I have fought as strongly as I can what I believe to be a stupid decision, because people still build houses outside township areas and the standard of hygiene is lower than it would be if a water main and regular sewerage system were connected.

Yesterday, a constituent brought to my notice a remarkable incident. At Cherry Gardens, from Brumby's Corner, a main has been extended to the top of the hill at Clarendon on the Main Clarendon Road to serve about five houses that are outside the water catchment area. Opposite them is land inside the water catchment area, on the south-eastern side. A person named Stafford wanted to buy a piece of land and he was refused a water connection. He was told the land was within the water catchment area. The department has extended the main along the road past one property, which had to put in rainwater tanks, and has made a connection inside the water catchment area. The run-off water must run into the catchment area.

Because sewerage facilities are going to the Stirling, Crafers, and Bridgewater areas, and there will be a substantial decrease in the problems with septic tanks, will the Minister reconsider his department's policy of not extending mains, as it has been done now for one property? More work would be provided for his departmental employees. I believe the original intention was to prevent subdivision in the area, but that has occurred anyway because of council zoning laws. Why has this block of land been supplied and not the other?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall certainly look at the situation.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I draw attention to the water problem that may exist in the summer months in the Sunnyside, Glen Osmond, and Mount Osmond areas. I thank the Government for installing the service, which is much appreciated by the residents. However, the present storage is a 1 000-gallon tank, not the large concrete tank originally proposed. Although the pressure has been good so far, with the approach of summer and the possibility of bush fires the water supply could be virtually non-existent. Could the Minister check when the larger tank will be installed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This is a matter for Loan Estimates not revenue, but I shall check the matter.

Line passed.

Public Buildings, \$56 206 000.

Mr. EVANS: Has there been a decrease in the work force being employed on Demac construction because of a

reduced demand for Demac material for buildings? As I believe there is a substantial decrease, perhaps the Minister can say how the work force is to be handled.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This is exercising my mind vigorously at present. There will be a dramatic down-turn in the demand for Demac, and I am involved in discussions with the Director-General, Public Buildings Department, to decide on the future of the operation. It is as serious as that.

Mr. WILSON: Can the Minister provide information on the ex-factory costs of one, two, and four-teacher units, without site works, sewerage, and construction facilities?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall see whether I can get that information for the honourable member.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Could the Minister give any indication as to the likely down-turn in the demand for labour within the department during the next 12 months? Has the number of buildings supervised or built by the department diminished? If so, will the same problem be faced as is being faced now by the Engineering and Water Supply Department?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, I hope that can be avoided. Many complaints have been made about the build-up in the construction division. Members will know that that commenced in 1973 for a specific purpose, in the good years when we were not getting such a good deal from private enterprise. The member for Fisher can question that if he likes, but I can show specific examples of why there was a need to keep them honest at that stage and to give us more flexibility in management.

It is interesting to note from figures I have taken out over the past few months that up to two or three months ago the total percentage of work done by day labour in the Public Buildings department across the whole scene amounts to 8 per cent. It is not my intention to sack all those people and transfer that work to private enterprise. That would be ludicrous, and the honourable member knows that.

Mr. Dean Brown: The Opposition does not suggest that you do that.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I know it does not. I have told people that if there was a change of Government tomorrow there would not be any change in the policy towards day labour employment. I know the problems with which the unions would confront the Opposition if it was in Government, as it has confronted the Government. It is also in the interests of good management to have some flexibility. Every effort has been made to reduce the day labour force by attrition to a level that suits management—in other words to a level where we have the flexibility to pick up contracts that cannot be fulfilled for a variety of reasons, which the honourable member knows we do not want to do. It is bad business to get into a contract where a contractor goes broke on the job, because it inevitably makes the job more expensive for us. There are certain types of work for which we need the construction division, such as renovations, in particular. One of the examples is Parliament House and the building next door, for which it is extremely difficult to get the documentation for tendering and allow for the sorts of delays and extras, the contingencies and so on that are involved. It invariably is more expensive than expected. I will get the information for which the honourable member has asked and any other information I think is relevant to this matter at the moment.

Mr. EVANS: The purchase of office machinery and equipment has increased to \$68 000. Will the Minister give me the details in writing of the sorts of machines being bought? Last year \$54 000 was allocated to this line and only \$24 000 spent. I am concerned that most departments

are being supplied with electric typewriters while member's electorate secretaries have to battle along with antiquated manual machines. Last year \$11 355 000 was allocated to service offices and buildings. This year an amount of \$14 040 000 is being allocated. That is an increase of about 28 per cent in one year at a time when the inflation rate is far below that figure. Will the Minister supply me with details of that increase?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I take up the point the Minister has made, that he has informed a number of people that under a Liberal Government there would be no real changes in policy in his department and that there would be no wholesale sackings. It was brought to my attention that three days before the State election in September 1977 the word went out throughout the Public Buildings Department that if a Liberal Government was elected the entire day labour force would be dismissed. I was confronted with this by a person who worked in the department, but I thought it was only one or two people raising that point.

I later attended a function where there was a large number of Public Buildings Department employees, including day labour employees, and I was confronted by 10 or 12 persons all telling the same story. They had all been told three days before the election that if a Liberal Government was elected the entire day labour force of the Public Buildings Department would immediately be sacked and all of the work would go to private enterprise. I want it recorded in *Hansard* that that was not Liberal Party policy. Liberal Party policy was that nobody would be dismissed. The day labour force was to be run down in certain areas but that would be done by natural attrition and no-one would lose his job. I am pleased that the Minister is prepared to give that policy credibility and support, because one gets the impression that the word has been spread, quite falsely, in his department that the Liberal Party would sack people.

On what accounting basis does the Public Buildings Department determine depreciation and overhead costs when it erects buildings for other departments? Is any allowance made for overhead costs and depreciation of equipment? So far as I can see, there is no allowance in the entire accounting procedure of the Public Buildings Department for depreciation or for calculating overhead costs and apportioning them to individual jobs.

I know that supervising staff on particular jobs are debited to that job, but I am referring to overhead costs incurred in running the administration section of the department, which involves people not directly involved in a particular job. I think it is important, if we are to get a true estimate of actual costs of construction in the Public Buildings Department and compare them with private enterprise costs, to have some sort of correct accounting procedure.

When I left the Public Service I raised the point that it was well known in the Agriculture Department that if the Public Buildings Department performed work it was considerably dearer than if the work was done by private enterprise. If full accounting of overhead costs is not apportioned and there is no allowance for depreciation, I believe that those costs incurred by the Public Buildings Department would be even higher.

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

Mrs. ADAMSON: An amount of \$550 000 is shown for preliminary investigation on projects not proceeded with. How many projects does that figure represent, and what was the nature of those projects? If it is a considerable number of projects, I am happy to have the information

provided in writing at a later date. I would like a general idea whether it is a large number of projects that have not been proceeded with, or only a few.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The information I have simply says that it relates to projects not proceeded with, but I will get the details.

Mr. RODDA: An amount of \$32 000 is provided for minor improvements to the West Terrace Cemetery. What progress has been made in relation to converting this area to park lands?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That provision is for minor works, and so on. The committee which was set up to determine the future of the West Terrace Cemetery is still working and doing a fairly good job. I had cause recently to have it before me because of a certain request from a religious group, and it was finding some difficulty in getting the history of the cemetery compiled accurately. It is most important that this be compiled accurately before we go any further with plans to turn the area into a passive recreation area or revert it back to park lands as it originally was. I will have an up-to-date report prepared for the honourable member on how we will do that and still preserve some of the character and the history of the area.

Mrs. ADAMSON: I refer to the provision of \$10 424 000 for school buildings, and relate that figure to the line "Government Offices and Buildings, services costs". When and why was the decision taken to air-condition new primary and high school buildings? I and a great many taxpayers question the value of air-conditioning in primary and high school buildings in a temperate climate (at least in the Adelaide metropolitan area) where the extremes of temperature are not so great that children cannot be comfortably housed in buildings that are not air-conditioned.

I have recently inspected school buildings which are air-conditioned, particularly those at Paradise and Thorndon Park Primary School, and there are three principal reasons why I think this decision needs to be reconsidered. Air-conditioning uses a great deal of energy, and a large sum of money in the installation and maintenance costs, and it also affects children's health. Most children should be able to become conditioned to the normal climate changes from summer to winter. Many parents find that, with air-conditioning, going outside into cold air from a heated classroom or into hot air from a cooled classroom causes seasonal colds which would not otherwise occur. In addition, they are concerned that their children are sealed off from the natural world because there are few windows in these buildings and sometimes a beautiful view is sealed off by a brick wall, which presumably is there to make the air-conditioning effective. It seems to me that, in a climate such as Adelaide's, it is quite unnecessary.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am amazed at what the honourable member has said, although she was making a genuine attempt to put a case forward that we do not need air-conditioning in schools.

Mrs. Adamson: In the Adelaide metropolitan area.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the honourable member had been here a little longer, I am sure she would have appreciated that it was decided to provide air-conditioning as a result of the number of complaints and petitions received by the Government (I am not sure whether it was the Steele Hall Government or the present Government) from not only individual parents but also parent bodies to lessen the discomfort created in the heat of summer and the cold of winter in schools in the metropolitan area of Adelaide. I do not agree that we should suddenly discontinue this practice to find out whether or not children can tolerate the conditions,

because of experience in the past and the objections we received. I recall the member for Florey coming to me on one occasion and telling me about a school in his electorate. The conditions he described were deplorable. This was a school built a long time ago, and he was seeking to have individual air-conditioning units installed. It was not just the classroom but also the staff room being complained about. I admire the honourable member's courage for the suggestion, and I think she is genuine, but the arguments advanced when the decision was taken were cogent and persuasive, and they were acted upon for those reasons. I cannot see that the Government will reverse its position.

Mrs. ADAMSON: I hope the Minister and members of the Committee realise that I am not suggesting that children or staff should endure discomfort of extreme heat or cold, and I am well aware that there are many old-fashioned school buildings that were so poorly designed that children and staff endured discomfort. What I am saying is that intelligent design and architecture which takes account of environmental factors would overcome these extremes of heat and cold and would allow for natural ventilation without the need for air-conditioning.

How many school buildings face east and west with large expanses of glass, and yet how many are properly sited north and south with deep verandahs on the northern side and a shorter verandah on the southern side, and proper planning for natural ventilation and natural lighting? Most of these buildings that are air-conditioned do not have many windows, in order to maintain temperatures for air-conditioning, and this means they must be artificially lit. The Minister of Education may be referring to the Campbelltown High School, which was designed to take account of environmental factors. Why can we not have more schools such as this which are intelligently designed and overcome the need for air-conditioning?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: There is continuing discussion between the Public Buildings Department and Education Department about this question. I often wonder whether we are better off sitting in natural climatic conditions than in an air-conditioned building such as the State Administration Centre where, if somebody has a cold on the sixth floor, I get it on the first floor through the chute. I am not condemning the honourable member; I want to indicate the sorts of pressure that led to the decision to air-condition schools. I will have her comments examined to see whether or not some of the technical people in the department will comment.

Line passed.

Minister of Works, Miscellaneous, \$2 791 000.

Mr. EVANS: I ask the Minister of Works what stage Dr. Melville's committee of inquiry has reached regarding the recreational use of reservoirs.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have received the report and I am having it evaluated. It is for the Government to decide whether to release the report after it has been presented to Cabinet.

Mr. WILSON: I refer to the provision for protection and improvement of the Torrens River, purchase of lands, subsidies to councils, administration, etc. How much of this allocation of \$78 000 is for the Torrens River committee, particularly following the recommendations of the Hassell & Partners report? Could the Minister tell us what stage negotiations have reached and what action is intended on that report? The Opposition has been happy to criticise the Government for spending too much money, but in this case I believe that not enough has been allocated for the splendid recommendations in the report. It is important with the proposed NEAPTR tramline, that there be environmental considerations and that beautifica-

tion works be carried out on the Torrens River as soon as possible.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get a detailed report on the proposal for the honourable member. Despite the best efforts of the Torrens River Committee, it appears as though certain works were carried out by council without the committee's knowledge. The purpose of the committee was to co-ordinate any works along the Torrens, and I am concerned that that has not been happening. I will mention that aspect in my reply to the honourable member. Councils make contributions in their particular areas also.

Mr. RODDA: Regarding the South-Eastern Drainage Board, recently it was announced that about 150 landholders were given the right of further appeal, and confusion has arisen in the minds of some people who have not had that right of appeal. I (together with, I am sure, my South-Eastern colleagues) have had representations made to me regarding the criteria the Minister laid down for this right of appeal. When officers of the Drainage Board delineated areas, perhaps they went over boundaries. Many landholders are disgruntled about the area for which they have to pay drainage rates. What is the Government's attitude to these people who are raising Cain for further appeal rights?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member knows that the Government has been very generous in relation to these appeals. The ideal is that they do not pay rates at all, but the honourable member knows that we cannot justify that stand. There must be some contribution to maintenance. The initial capital cost was about \$19 000 000 or \$20 000 000, which was not funded by the people who gained direct benefit. The majority of benefits from any increased production go to the Commonwealth Government, not to the State Government.

There was a number of people who were in a situation where some injustice was done, and we considered that they should have a further right of appeal. That is as far as we can possibly go. If the honourable member knows of a genuine case, let us review it. Generally speaking, the honourable member must admit that we have been more than fair.

Mr. ARNOLD: There is an ongoing \$50 000 for South Australia's contribution towards the control of water hyacinth. Can the Minister give any information as to how effective this control has been? I take it this refers to the Moree region on the Gwydr River in New South Wales. Is the \$50 000 a quarter, or is there an equal contribution from other States?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The latest information I have is that the programme has been very successful. I expect that much less than \$50 000 will be used, but that is a quarter share. South Australia was the first State to tell the Commonwealth Government we would do our share anyway.

Mr. WOTTON: Could the Minister ascertain how much money the Government intends spending on the cleaning up of the Bremer River and how much has been spent until now? How important does the Minister consider this particular project to be?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This is a matter for the Mines Department rather than the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The Government is aware of its importance and has entered into an undertaking to do the necessary work to control the situation. I understand that the work will cost more than \$1 000 000, but I will obtain the information.

The honourable member was good enough to tell me this morning of something that could cause dire trouble in the area. A report in the *Advertiser* was not correct, and I

took action to allay the fears of people who could have been misled by that statement.

Mr. WOTTON: Will the work be carried out over the next 12 months, and, if so, how much money has been allocated?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will find out and bring down a reply.

Line passed.

Education, \$308 005 000.

Mr. ALLISON: For personnel directorate and teaching staff, a very small increase has been allowed for expenditure on staffing this year, whereas in previous years this item has considerably exceeded budget. Last year, the Auditor-General pointed out that there was a 13 per cent increase. Does the Minister believe that the budgetary allowance for education this year is realistic, and can figures be made available as to staffing increases proposed for 1978-79? Bearing in mind that the teaching staff for last year increased by 193 and the ancillary staff by 522, does the Minister allow for any proportionate increase for the current year and how many graduates does he expect to be able to employ during the first half of next year?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education): There is no allowance for any increase in total establishment of the teaching staff for the coming year, nor for ancillary staffing positions. Any new schools or classes opened will have to be staffed by relocation from schools experiencing a decline in enrolments. I would anticipate that there would be some very slight wastage in Public Service staff as well. The increase allows for the flow-on effect of wage and salary increases rather than representing any increase to establishment. Ministers of Education are never satisfied with their allocation, nor will they ever be.

I can say that this does not represent a deterioration in our position. The teaching establishment will be held steady. That is predicated against a continuing decline in the total enrolments in schools, so that we finish up with some slight improvement in the pupil teacher ratio.

As to the employment of graduates and diplomates from universities and colleges of advanced education, it is always difficult to quantify, because (one almost feels embarrassed to say this, because it is said almost every year, but it is still true) it is difficult to predict what the resignation rate will be. We can say this: that the demand for new teachers in the system in the coming year will be determined completely by the resignation rate rather than by any growth in the total establishment of the teaching profession in this State.

Last year we were able to employ a little less than 50 per cent of the number of people applying for jobs with us. Certainly we will not be able to do any better than that this year.

Mr. ALLISON: Can the Minister make any comment about the unemployment situation generally? The Institute of Teachers has approached him several times on this issue, but I am especially interested to determine whether he is aware of whether unemployed teachers are a mobile or a static group seeking employment in specific areas. How does this affect their chances of employment?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The most telling factor is that it is difficult for us to get contract teachers. As the honourable member would be aware, the situation, should a teacher have to resign at this stage of the year, is that the teacher would not be replaced by a permanent replacement but by a contract teacher, whose contract would have to be reviewed at the end of the year. Therefore, that contract teacher would have to take his or her chances with graduates coming from training

institutions.

That suggests to me that most people for whom we could not find employment in teaching at the beginning of this year have found employment in other areas. They may find it less congenial and be continually frustrated because, having been trained as a teacher, there is not that employment available to them, but at this stage they are not willing to take the gamble of leaving their present employment and come to the department as a contract teacher and possibly being thrown back on the labour market next year through being passed over by a graduate who has better qualifications or a better teacher report.

Briefly, most of the people have probably found employment. They probably do not regard it as being as satisfactory as what they have trained for, but I believe that most are employed. This is also shown by the fact that the lowest percentage of unemployed amongst university graduates are those trained in the humanities. Teachers would loom large in those figures. True, most people greet those figures with some scepticism, but I refer to a report in the *National Times* about two weeks ago on unemployment generally with these figures being quoted from Victoria.

As to the people we are talking about, they tend to cover the broad spectrum of teacher trainees, with the exception of those people trained in special disciplines for which there is a continuing demand, say, remedial teachers and the like, who were referred to, I think, by the honourable member several days ago in a question in this Chamber.

I know, for example, that late last year a significantly higher proportion of people trained in physical education were able to get jobs than were those trained in the more general areas. I would not suggest, therefore, that these people are necessarily committed to a certain area. They are very much a homogenous group, but they differ from those people who have been trained in those areas of continuing, although reducing, demand, most of whom were able to obtain employment.

Mr. ALLISON: I refer to the allocations for primary, secondary, special and general teaching staff under the heading "Personnel Directorate". As the Minister is now able to be far more selective about his employees in the teaching profession, does he nevertheless expect that there will be areas of specific shortage in which we have not trained teachers? I refer, for example, to the remedial, speech therapy, psychology, and other fields. If that is so, is there any possibility that special training can be introduced as a matter of urgency to meet those needs?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will raise this matter with my officers. However, regarding the specific areas to which I have referred, although there may be a continuation of under-supply, there are enough trainees in the pipeline so that, within two years, this situation will no longer apply. The remedial action that the honourable member seeks, if, in fact, it is required, has already been taken, because we are talking about people who are trained for three or four years. To take remedial action now would be too late by the time the additional people came on to the labour market. Those whom we are already training would have satisfied the demand.

Mr. ALLISON: My question relates not only to the items to which I have just referred but also to primary, secondary and special staff in the Administration and Finance Directorate. Has any pressure been applied by the Teachers Institute or student groups, or has the Minister initiated moves of his own accord, to provide an alternative form of employment for newly-graduated teachers? For example, is it possible that these people may come out in the form of an internship and fill some of the

ancillary roles that are made available either by attrition or by newly-created posts, or does he contemplate that the institute would oppose trainee teachers being given an internship, rather than say, "We will put them into a teaching situation and let them benefit? Can the Minister see any advantages that outweigh the disadvantages of such a proposal?"

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Really, there are two issues which can be related to one another but which can also be regarded separately. I refer, first, to internships. The honourable member would know that the Bachelor of Education course at Flinders University demands a year's internship. I know that some of the other colleges have also examined that matter. Getting the scheme off the ground relies on all sorts of things, including the necessary approval from the Tertiary Education Commission. Also, additional funding may or may not be required (that is something that must be negotiated), and so on. This would be an interesting initiative that we should certainly continue to pursue. I have no doubt that the body which, hopefully, will be set up if Parliament approves legislation that I will introduce later this session should examine this matter closely.

Regarding trained teachers going into ancillary staff positions, I am not aware that the Teachers Institute has declared a position on the matter. It is tied up a little with what one might call an inter-union problem, in that the ancillary staff is covered by the Public Service Association and the Teachers Institute. At one stage, I recall that the Clerks Union also sought registration over the same matter.

I have no doubt that any strong thrusts in this area would be resisted by the Public Service Association. As it has not specifically lobbied me on the matter, I understand that it is under no current pressure from the Institute of Teachers. I think the position of the institute is rather that it would simply want me to create the maximum employment possibilities for the trained teachers and overcome the problem that way.

Mr. ALLISON: I have received carbon copies of representations made to the Minister and also to Senator Carrick. An area of concern expressed by many schools is that equipment grants have been reduced in South Australia. The South-East Principals Executive has put forward a constructive suggestion that cuts should not be straight across the board, but rather should be addressed more to the more affluent schools, with schools in need being given first priority. It seems a humane approach. Has the Minister any comment?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: An amount of money has been set aside which otherwise would have been expended as a portion of the grant. It does not represent the whole of the grant that might have been made available if Budget realities had been other than they are. It has been set aside for which schools can make bids. They will do that through the Regional Directors, the cake will be cut up on regional lines, and the Regional Directors are under instructions to make appropriate recommendations on the basis of need. Something like what the honourable member envisages is in part provided for in what we are voting on this evening.

Mr. ALLISON: I have been critical of the apparent proliferation of positions in the administrative and seconded personnel area. Some people (SACOSS was one) suggested that my mathematics was wrong. I have support in a letter before me which says that a large body of teachers generally supports me and that the Education Department should re-examine its priorities. This group of people said that, in times of affluence, it is desirable to expand, but in the times that we are going through at the moment the Minister might consider reviewing duties

performed by some of the administrative and seconded personnel. Does the Minister see that, within the department at present, there are areas that he can cut back without getting rid of teachers, but putting them possibly into a more active position within the teaching service, which is in the classroom situation?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It is expected that there will be some wastage in Public Service personnel during this 12 months, although how much will be determined as much by manpower budgeting decisions by the Government as by the actual dollars we vote on this line. Secondments are virtually frozen at the position of last year. A continuing review of what we are doing is going on all the time. I have in my possession a large report prepared for me on my department, on every Public Service position that we have and what it does, the conditions under which it was set up, and the stress that should be placed on the continuation of that position.

Where there are Commonwealth Government initiatives requiring that there be employment of an individual or individuals because of the Commonwealth money available, there is now a Cabinet decision that these should be contract positions. The contract will last for the term of the Commonwealth grant and the State will not be stuck with the situation of having to fund the position after the Commonwealth money has disappeared.

Mr. ALLISON: Turning to the areas of general expenditure under the headings "Personnel Directorate" and "Administration and Finance Directorate", has the Minister considered setting up a working party consisting of representatives of the Education Department and the Institute of Teachers to examine ways in which expenditure might be reduced without affecting the quality of education? For example, relieving teachers are employed for a large number of conferences, which might be planned for vacation periods. There are certainly areas where schools might voluntarily restrain spending on administration, power, lights, telephone calls, freight charges, and a whole host of things. Would the establishment of a working party provide a practical solution to getting people to work on a co-operative basis rather than on a Ministerial direction?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: First, school-based funding is largely taking account of the matters of potential wastage with telephone calls, lighting, and that sort of thing. As to conferences, these tend to be funded by special grants from the Schools Commission, which in part takes care of the problem raised. As to the matter of consultation with the Institute of Teachers, I doubt very much whether the institute would favour a formal Standing Committee to examine this matter. There are all sorts of informal ways in which this happens on a continuing basis.

Mr. Allison: I thought that if it wasn't involved it would probably be hurt.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Certainly. For example, the honourable member would probably know of the existence of the annual humorously-called "summit conference", at which Mr. Gregory and his executive meet me, my directors and one or two other people and discuss various matters of policy in a relaxed, informal atmosphere in which no-one is held to account afterwards for things said. This is usually productive. These matters are raised on occasions such as this, and I imagine that the institute would prefer that sort of approach rather than a formal setting up of a committee on this issue.

Mr. ALLISON: For "Cultural Facilities (State Museum)", I notice a reduction from \$689 000 to \$678 000. Is there a specific reason for that reduction, particularly in view of complaints which have been made

recently by the directorate of the museum about lack of staff to look after the collection which is not on public view but which is stored away and which is rapidly deteriorating because of storage conditions and lack of staff to take the material out, clean it, and restore it? This is a vital part of South Australia's heritage which cost money to acquire, so preservation is important.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I would agree with the honourable member's sentiments as to the ethnographic and anthropological collections of the State Museum. I point out that what seems to be a reduction here is simply due to the fact that not all of the museum staff came over to me, as it were. The Aboriginal and Historic Relics section is still under the Minister for the Environment. Not being familiar with all the details of these lines, I cannot specify where they are to be found in those lines. If questions are asked about that on the appropriate lines the required answers can be given. The salaries of and expenses of Dr. Ellis and the people in the Aboriginal and Historic Relics section would not be included here. That is the reason for the apparent reduction.

Mr. ALLISON: Regarding head office charges, on page 89 of the Auditor-General's Report a footnote at the bottom states:

1. Payments shown in the foregoing statement do not include any charges for use of premises, telephones, electricity, cleaning, etc., for the department's head offices.

Can the Minister comment about the substantial nature of those, or whether they are relatively minor charges, and who would be responsible for them, and whether this is a separate line with Public Buildings or where the account would lie?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will obtain the information for the honourable member, but I understand that it will be under other Government building lines of the Public Buildings Department.

Mr. ALLISON: The amount available for students in training has diminished quite considerably from \$3 470 000 in 1977 to \$1 290 000 in 1978. Can the Minister say how far this will deteriorate in the present year?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I do not have the specific figures available now, but I believe there was a Question on Notice about this last month. The information was then made available and, if it was not, I will get it for the honourable member. When the Commonwealth altered the means whereby people could claim TEAS there was no point in paying students more than \$150 rather than the original \$600 that we paid. We really left it to the student to determine whether he or she would opt for the \$600 and get a corresponding reduction in the TEAS allowance, or whether they would simply opt to take \$150 from us and get the rest through the TEAS payment.

At the same time we also did away with the \$150 paid for the new entrants to colleges. As those students moved through the system the payments became proportionately less. Until this year there may have been one or two people still on the old bonded scheme where we were making an annual payment of about \$4 000, but they would now be out of the scheme and this would be reflected in the reduction of those payments. The actual figures are available, and I will get them for the honourable member.

Mr. ALLISON: I believe that the answer the Minister has given was in reply to a retrospective question of mine and did not refer to 1979, and therefore I was in possession of those facts. I realise that, while most students take advantage of the Commonwealth allowance, some young people do not qualify and, being eligible for a lesser one, will opt for a departmental bond instead.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: It is still unbonded.

Mr. ALLISON: Yes, the unbonded allowance, as it used to be. Page 91 of the Auditor-General's Report shows that there is a substantial amount of \$121 000 paid by the department to the South Australian Teacher Housing Authority. This was an account that the authority rendered for vacancies in 1977-78 and was paid in July 1978, although it had accrued in the previous year. It is obvious why it was paid late, but why should there be such a substantial amount for vacancies? Is there an over-supply of rental accommodation? Are teachers tending to move away from teacher housing and into alternative accommodation?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will get the information for the honourable member. I am not aware of that being the case. If anything the trend in recent years has been in the opposite direction. Whereas young single teachers in a country town were previously happy to board with people living in the town or on a farm, they now tend to want to go into flat accommodation, either two young women teachers or just on their own, rather than opting for boarding. I suggest that there is another reason for the figures that the honourable member has isolated.

Mr. ALLISON: I seek information about the provision for general expenditure. The Auditor-General commented at page 92, under "Air Travel", that quite a number of matters were found wanting; the fact that vouchers were issued without appropriate authority for air travel; no internal check was applied to books of vouchers;

there was no established method of advising cancellations, so that it could not be determined whether all refunds were obtained from airline companies; and checks were not made beforehand by officers flying intrastate as to the availability of departmental vehicles and, in some cases, vehicles were hired unnecessarily. We appreciate that it is very often difficult to get people to be fully accountable. They tend to take advantage of the fact that central office is considered to be the accountable body. Has the Minister initiated some form of control for problems such as this? Air travel is becoming increasingly expensive.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The following items of remedial action have been taken: first instructions have been issued that travel vouchers may not be issued without prior approval of authorised officers, and a travel requisition has been designed and distributed for that purpose. Completed voucher books are being forwarded to an appropriate officer within the department for examination and relevant officers have been instructed to advise the chief accountant of all cancellations immediately they occur.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.33 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 12 October at 2 p.m.