HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 18 October 1978

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

PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

Petitions signed by 1 437 electors of South Australia praying that the House would pass legislation to provide for Ministerial responsibility to adequately control pornographic material were presented by Messrs. Payne, Whitten, Wilson, and Venning, Mrs. Adamson, and Messrs. Allison, Mathwin, Groom, Olson, and Becker.

Petitions received.

PETITION: VIOLENT OFFENCES

A petition signed by 54 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 was presented by Mr. Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: VOLUNTARY WORKERS

A petition signed by 48 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. Allison.

Petition received.

PETITION: SUCCESSION AND GIFT DUTIES

A petition signed by 37 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to adopt a programme for the phasing out of succession and gift duties in South Australia as soon as possible was presented by Mr. Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: RETICULATED WATER SUPPLY

A petition signed by 38 residents and landowners of Denial Bay area praying that the House would urge the Government to extend the reticulated water supply west from the Ceduna trunk main to the Denial Bay township and properties en route was presented by Mr. Gunn.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

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

SCHUTZENFEST GRANT

In reply to **Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** (10 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No specific provision has been made in the sums proposed for ethnic festivals for assistance to the Schutzenfest, as it normally runs at a substantial surplus.

BUILDERS APPELLATE AND DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL

In reply to **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (10 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Builders Appellate and Disciplinary Tribunal came into operation on 1 September 1975. Since the commencement of the Tribunal the following matters have been lodged for hearing:

1975-1976	41
1976-1977	50
1977-1978	42

During the first year of hearing all of the matters lodged related to appeals against refusal of licences by the Builders Licensing Board.

During 1976-77, of the 50 matters lodged, six were in the nature of complaints by the Builders Licensing Board about conduct of persons holding licences. Six were in the nature of appeals by persons who had complained to the Builders Licensing Board and were dissatisfied by the order that the Board had made.

During 1977-78, of the 42 matters lodged, one was a complaint made by the Builders Licensing Board about the conduct of a person holding a licence. Fifteen matters were appeals by persons who had complained to the Builders Licensing Board and were dissatisfied with the orders made by the Board.

Although the number of matters coming before the Builders Appellate and disciplinary Tribunal has not varied greatly during the three years referred to above, the complexity of the matters being dealt with by the Tribunal has increased. This is illustrated by the fact that in 1975-76 the Tribunal sat on 51 days; in 1976-77 the Tribunal sat on 58 days; and in 1977-78 the Tribunal sat on 82 days. Another factor contributing to the increase in fees paid during 1976-78 was an increase of approximately 30 per cent in remuneration paid to the members of the Tribunal as from 1 April 1976.

GOVERNMENT ROYAL SHOW PAVILION

In reply to **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (10 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The concept this year differed greatly from all previous Royal Show displays. Because of the nature of the theme, i.e. "The Arts", we are able to incorporate an actual presentation using professional actors, musicians, and sophisticated audio visual equipment. The public's response to the presentation was reflected in attendance figures: it was estimated that in excess of 20 000 people saw either or both performances.

POLITICS IN SCHOOLS

In reply to **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (27 September).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Any statement about curriculum in schools should be prefaced by a reminder of the range of curriculum offerings from school to school. This reflects both a desire to respond to local community needs and to enable schools, their staff, council and administration to have the maximum possible decision making powers.

The situation in Primary Schools

1. The new Primary Social Studies course, currently being implemented, provides adequate opportunity for children to acquire an understanding of many of the basic concepts regarding politics and government as well as an appreciation of the processes of democratic government. Such major concepts as community, leadership role, democratic decision making, levels of government, political power, law, law makers, legislation, legal systems, prosecution, legal rights, ideology, etc. are introduced through years one to seven.

2. Schools not using the new course usually make a study of the different responsibilities of local State and national governments. It is usual also for a unit of study to be undertaken which deals with "law and order". In this study there is an introduction to the legislative, judicial and penal systems.

The situation in Secondary Schools

1. Notwithstanding the importance of introducing key ideas regarding politics and government to primary students it is considered that an in-depth study of such topics is most relevant to children of secondary school age.

2. A proportion of the students in our secondary schools undertakes Social Studies. There is no question that the new Secondary Social Studies Curriculum guidelines to be available in 1979 place adequate focus on teaching about politics and government.

The course has as one of its organising themes:"organising and governing" and recommends the study of: legislative and judicial processes, law enforcement, the system of national government, the role of the individual in government, the use of political power by groups and individuals, the role of government and social change, the legal rights and responsibilities of individuals, and the legal aid and welfare agencies available to young people. At year 12 a unit of study seeks to develop enquiry into the distribution, use and abuse of power within the Australian social system.

3. A proportion of secondary students study a course in history. Depending on the particular course taken there will be varying opportunity to learn about politics and government. Overall, the courses include the study of a range of government structures and practices in the global context.

At the junior level, the Australian History course includes a study of: autocratic Government, the development of representative and responsible government, the Federal movement, the rise of labour, Federation and the Constitution.

Senior PEB students may study "The Role of Government in Australia" and "The Labor Movement".

4. Probably about half of the students in secondary schools do not study either social studies or history and therefore they are not exposed to the studies outlined above. However, I would re-emphasise the point I made at the beginning of this answer, in that the curriculum followed by the school and the choices made by the students is in response to the priority set by the parents of those students at any particular school.

FITNESS MEDICAL TESTS

In reply to **Mr. SLATER** (1 August).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Minister of Health has informed me that the payment of medical benefits in respect of health screening services ceased from 1 July 1978. There is, however, provision for the Commonwealth Minister for Health to direct that payment of benefits be made in respect of the services provided by a specific organisation, for example, the Medicheck Referral Centre, Sydney. My colleague would be prepared to add his support to a submission prepared by the Institute of Fitness, Research and Training.

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:

Elizabeth Community College Stage III

Port Lincoln Shipping Berths 2 and 7—Reconstruction.

Ordered that reports be printed.

QUESTION TIME

MURRAY RIVER WATER

Mr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Works say whether the South Australian Government has been asked officially to examine and approve the environmental impact study for the proposed paper mill at Albury-Wodonga; what consultations have there been with other Governments on the matter; and has the South Australian Government any say in the matter, anyway?

A report in the press of 11 October stated that State and Federal authorities have approved of an environmental impact study on the project, but does not indicate if the South Australian Government was one of them. Considerable concern has been expressed recently that South Australia, at the end of the river, does not have effective legislative powers to insist on measures to guarantee water purity over the entire Murray system. Uniform legislation has been proposed for the Commonwealth, Victoria, New South Wales, and South Australia, but no legislation seems to have been prepared, let alone introduced. The uncertainty concerning safeguards for the paper mill continues to concern everyone downstream from Albury.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: First, I would be grateful indeed if the Leader would write to the Premier of Victoria.

Mr. Tonkin: I have done.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I would like to know what answer the Leader gets, if he gets one before I do. The Leader should urge the Premier of Victoria to honour the agreement entered into in October 1976. I would appreciate it if the Leader wrote to the Premier of New South Wales in the same vein.

Mr. Tonkin: I do not think I would get an answer from him.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I would not expect the Leader to say anything else. If he listens to what I have to say, he will realise that this is something that the Opposition in this State can participate in, if it wants to, by urging those Governments to indicate to the Federal Government that they are prepared to honour the undertaking given in 1976, that the functions, not the powers (and I stipulate that clearly, because I am not satisfied with what has happened) of the River Murray Commission be extended to enable it to take into account the quality of water in the Murray River as well as the quantity, for which it has been responsible since its inception.

I have done everything in my power to urge both of those Governments (because the Federal Government agrees with South Australia that this ought to be done as quickly as possible) to finalise their views about this matter

so that the offer I made to make Parliamentary Counsel available to draft the necessary legislation can be proceeded with forthwith. There is little point in drafting legislation (because it is complementary legislation that has to be passed in New South Wales, Victoria and the Federal Parliament as well as in South Australia) until it is known that the other two State Governments are prepared to agree with suggestions that have been made by the steering committee to the working party and Ministers and which have been referred to various Governments.

Mr. Tonkin: Is the South Australian Government one of those, as reported in the press?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader has asked his question.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get to that shortly. I want to talk, first, about the difficulties we are having in getting the River Murray Commission's functions extended, because it is vital to the point the Leader raised about whether or not an environmental impact statement has been agreed to by the State Governments. The South Australian Government has no power to say whether the Albury-Wodonga mill goes ahead or not. The River Murray Commission, through its Commissioner, Mr. Jack Shannon, has kept the South Australian Government fully informed about the queries and the replies it has received about the establishment of the paper mill at Albury-Wodonga and the safeguards that need to be incorporated in order to ensure that the quality of water in the Murray River is not impaired as a result of the establishment of the mill. Whether the environmental impact statement has been agreed to I do not know; I know that the South Australian Government has certainly not been a party to it. I do know that the licences needed by the company to proceed with the mill have not yet been issued by the State Pollution Control Committee in New South Wales.

Until those licences are issued the project cannot proceed. The River Murray Commission is still awaiting certain information from the State Pollution Control Committee of New South Wales in reply to questions that it has posed about the treatment of effluent etc. from the mill. To my knowledge those replies have not been forthcoming, nor has any one of the licences been issued by that committee. In other words, the mill has not yet had a go-ahead from the New South Wales Government, which is the Government that will be responsible for giving it the go-ahead.

Mr. Tonkin interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, it will be, because the River Murray Commission has no power at this stage to prevent it from happening, if the State Pollution Control Committee of New South Wales says it is to go. I can tell the honourable member—

Mr. Tonkin: The Minister's report is correct?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Of course it is, and I can assure the Leader that, if the South Australian Government had its way, the River Murray Commission would have the power, not just the extension of its functions, to see to it that it would be the approving authority and not the State of New South Wales, or Victoria, or South Australia. In other words, we would be perfectly happy to support the establishment of a Federal authority that would have overriding powers over the States in relation to control of quantity and quality of water in the Murray River, and indeed of its tributaries.

APPRENTICES

Mr. KLUNDER: Can the Minister of Education say whether there is any pre-apprenticeship training, through D.F.E. or otherwise, for unemployed school-leavers who want to become apprentices but have not been accepted in present intakes? A constituent of mine approached me on behalf of his son who had applied for several apprenticeships but had been unsuccessful. The young man wanted to be employed in the metal industry as a tradesman and considered that it would aid his future applications for apprenticeship if he could exhibit some degree of skill in his chosen field. I should imagine that there are many young people in this situation, and I would appreciate any information that the Minister can provide.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: No specific pre-apprenticeship training is being provided by D.F.E. In 1977 and early 1978 some Commonwealth funds were made available for this to occur, but with the cessation of that funding the programme ceased. Funds are made available now through what are called the C.Y.S.S. and the E.P.U.Y. programmes, but they do not include a component for pre-apprenticeship training. Unemployed school-leavers are welcome to take part in the conventional vocational courses provided by D.F.E., but there has been no attempt by the Commonwealth to provide any further funds as were provided in 1977 and early 1978.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Deputy Premier say what the Government has in mind for the sittings of the House? This afternoon it was announced that private members' business is to cease next Wednesday.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Finish after next Wednesday.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That would indicate that the Government has decided on the future sittings of the House. The session started on 13 July, and I think it is true to say that the Opposition has not been officially given any detail of the sittings of the House. The Government has always done the Opposition the courtesy of outlining what the sittings of the House would be. What has the Government in mind for the remainder of this year and the start of next year in relation to this session?

Mr. Millhouse: There just isn't much work; that's the thing.

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I always like to give the member for Mitcham the opportunity to say something. It is important. I was under the impression that, before the session began, I provided either the Leader or the Opposition Whip with a programme of the sittings of the House up to 23 November. I think that the Deputy Leader ought to find out the score from his Leader or his Whip.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What about the rest of the session?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will come to that. The House will sit next week and rise for a week; that is, if the Opposition sees its way clear to finish the debate on which we are currently engaged. I think we might have to do something about that. It is well over the time that is normally taken; we have been very generous indeed.

Mr. Goldsworthy: The Government decided—

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The House will resume sitting after the week's break until 23 November. It is the Government's intention to come back either in late January or early February for four or five weeks, to complete the session.

CAR PURCHASE

Mr. HEMMINGS: Does the Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs consider that more publicity should be given to the general public concerning those dealers and finance companies that take advantage of full recourse deals, whereby the car dealer indemnifies the credit provider against any loss in respect of the transaction brought about by the default of the consumer? Two of my constituents could not afford to meet their repayments on a Cortina purchased new in 1977 at $6 058. My constituents thought that they could not continue paying off the Cortina, so they traded down to a second-hand Mini but, because of minus equity in the Cortina, they ended up paying $6 695 for the secondhand Mini. I briefly list some of the additional charges: $219 for goods insurance, $400 for consumer credit insurance, $18·30 for consumer mortage stamp duty, and a total credit charge of $5 320·90, a total cost to my constituents of $12 858·10. This was to be repaid in 60 consecutive monthly instalments of $210·98. It is interesting to note that the credit charge itself of $5 320·90 exceeded by $500 the price of a new Mini, let alone a secondhand Mini.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I certainly do think that much more publicity ought to be given to "deals", so called, of that type that come to notice from time to time. I think that it is particularly unfortunate that it is not possible to have a much wider education campaign in the community to bring that sort of deal to public attention, because allegedly reputable finance companies that enter into that sort of financial arrangement ought to be roundly condemned. Surely, it ill behoves a finance company to act in such a way as to grant credit in those circumstances where the only apparent results are the inevitable repossession of the vehicle (because from the figures quoted by the honourable member it hardly seems that any wage earners would be able to afford those terms) and, in some instances, bankruptcy for the consumers.

Section 36 of the Consumer Credit Act enables investigation of the activities of companies which are licensed, by way of an inquiry before the Credit Tribunal. If the honourable member, or any other person, has further information of financial transactions of the type the honourable member has mentioned, I should be pleased to have it. I have no reason to believe that such practices are not widespread, but at the same time I have no evidence to indicate that they are. If any members have information relating to such deals, I shall be pleased to hear about it. It is the sort of basis on which an investigation could be undertaken if the practice should prove to be widespread. I invite members to make any such information available to me.

NURSE EDUCATORS

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say, as a matter of policy, what priority rating has been or will be given to the employment of nurse educators, having regard to the importance of such staff to future hospital staffing levels and efficiency? A report on page 10 of the *Advertiser* on Tuesday 17 October, under the heading "Shortage of nurse educators", quoting a contribution made by Miss Porter, of the South Australian Health Commission, states:

> Many hospital schools had fewer nurse educators than were "considered to be appropriate. It is imperative for the future of nursing education in Australia—whether it stays in hospitals or moves into the education system—for greater support to be given to the training of nurse educators and increasing the numbers of these people," Miss Porter said.

I fully appreciate the difficulties existing at present in relation to total staff numbers, but the Premier has indicated to the House that alterations are affected within the total staff ceiling which has been imposed, and I seek information on whether this problem, highlighted by a senior member of the South Australian Health Commission, has brought about any consideration or reconsideration in relation to this important group.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not certain that we can make any change in arrangements during this year, although it may be possible to do so next year. However, I shall get a full report for the honourable member.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SIR THOMAS PLAYFORD

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Government has received notification from Sir Thomas Playford that he is retiring from the board of the Electricity Trust of South Australia. An announcement to that effect is being made to the media this afternoon. Sir Thomas has been a member of the board of ETSA for a period of 10 years, which means in effect that, apart from the three years that he spent in Opposition, he has been associated, as Premier and the initiator of the Electricity Trust, or as a member of the board, during the whole period of its existence with the trust.

I think it would be appropriate for me to place on record this afternoon the very deep appreciation of the Government and the community of the contribution that Sir Thomas Playford has made to the development of the Electricity Trust over the years, not only to the trust, but to the community in general. I think he can look back, on his retirement from the board, to the establishment of the trust as one of the most efficient power utilities in the world, an operation of which everyone in South Australia is proud, a power utility which is functioning effectively and competently, which is able to carry out its capital development efficiently, and which has been giving the highest standard of service to the people of South Australia.

I know that Sir Thomas takes great pride in the fact that more than 99 in every 100 people in South Australia now have access to ETSA power. This is not an occasion for a long statement on this matter, but I think that Sir Thomas would like to know that all members greatly appreciate the work he has done, particularly the work he has been willing to do since his retirement, as a valuable and loyal member of the ETSA board. We wish him well in the years to come. We were most pleased that he was able to attend the past two board meetings of ETSA after recovering from a recent fall, and I am sure that the board of ETSA will ensure that he continues to be kept informed of the work carried on by the trust.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Minister's remarks. It is indeed difficult to find words sufficient to describe the contribution Sir Thomas Playford has made to this State. Indeed, many people in the State of all political persuasions believe that Sir Thomas Playford made South Australia. There is little I can add to what the Minister has said. Sir Thomas, not only in Government, put the State first, but after his retirement from Parliament he served the State still further, as the Minister has said, in the background, nevertheless taking a great interest in what has been happening in the State. I am indeed sorry

about his retirement from the board because in one way it ends a direct association with him, but it is an inevitable step which he is taking and one of which I had some slight warning. I place on record the Opposition's appreciation of all he has done, certainly the Liberal Party's appreciation, as well as the appreciation of the State and, I believe, that of the nation.

Mr. Venning: The world's.

Mr. TONKIN: Indeed, as my colleague has said, Sir Thomas has a world-wide reputation, and he is respected everywhere. I have a feeling that, although he may have retired from public and semi-public life, he will not be quiet when he sees some issue that needs comment. He has always been able to sum up a situation and contribute to the public point of view on that subject in some pithy words. I feel certain he will continue to do that, and I hope that he will be able to enjoy his retirement for many years to come in good health and good spirits.

MOTOR VEHICLE CERTIFICATION

Mr. WHITTEN: Has the Attorney-General considered a system of title certification for motor vehicles? Recently, a constituent approached me regarding this matter. The information I have been given is that cars have been sold that might not have been the property of the dealer to sell. The dealer may have obtained the vehicles in good faith but, at a later stage, it has been found that the vehicles did not have a clear title, with resultant financial embarrassment to all concerned. If there were a system of title certification, I believe that it would be a form of protection to the buyer and the seller.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: This matter has been under discussion and consideration not only in this State by this Government but also in other States by other Governments over a long time. I have had discussions, since I have been Attorney-General, with the Minister of Transport and others concerning this matter, which I think needs to be kept under review from time to time. However, there are grave difficulties in introducing a system of titles for motor vehicles. One might think, looking at the matter on a fairly superficial level, that it would be easy to convert the registration system of motor vehicles in South Australia for vehicles taken on public roads into a system of title for motor vehicles.

However, I think people must consider the fact that registration of motor vehicles is not compulsory. It is compulsory only if vehicles are taken on to public roads. Many vehicles or parts of vehicles in South Australia are in wreckers' yards and other places and, as they are not on the road, they are not registered. It would be difficult to determine just when a motor vehicle came into existence, when it should be given a title, and when, in effect, it went out of existence. It is not like the case of land, which exists for all time, in effect.

Another problem we have met is the great difficulty which occurs in Australia because the six States and the territories apply laws to motor vehicles and could also apply laws relating to titles. This problem has been dealt with partially in South Australia by a method of title insurance under the Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act. This has been tremendously successful. However, it applies only to vehicles being sold by a dealer. It could be that some method of extension of the system of title insurance could well provide protection for someone in a position similar to that referred to by the honourable member's constituent. I shall be happy to have a further look at the matter in consultation with the Minister of Transport.

TRANSPORT FINANCE

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Minister of Transport say from where and when the State Transport Authority obtained the $24 388 000 listed as cash in hand in the 1978 Auditor-General's Report, page 492, line 1, under "Current assets"? For what purpose is the money to be expended, where is the money deposited, and what interest rate does that deposit attract?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: From time to time the Treasury acknowledges decisions taken by Government and provides funds in advance to the State Transport Authority for projects approved by Cabinet. For instance, some time ago Cabinet approved the letting of the contract for 30 new railcars at a cost, with escalation, of about $19 000 000. The Treasury provided some of those funds in advance. In addition, we are heavily engaged in the bus programme on which many millions of dollars are being spent. This sum is precisely for that purpose. That is the source and the intent. The money is placed on deposit to obtain the maximum interest rate, but I do not have the location of those deposits, and I am not sure that the Treasurer would want that information divulged. I could discuss it with him and, if it is reasonable to make public that information, that will be done. I have already given details of the purpose for which the money is earmarked.

COOPER BASIN

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether the recent discovery of oil in the Cooper Basin upgrades the availability of liquids to the extent that the degree of Government support for infrastructure can be modified? I ask the question because it has been argued that there is a need for Government infrastructure to ensure the total viability of the Redcliff petro-chemical scheme, and it could well be that a sufficient discovery of oil in that area might alter the position of Government involvement.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I thank the honourable member for the question. The short answer is "No", but I am sure members will be pleased that I do not intend to stay with the short answer to the question. The Strzelecki No. 3 discovery came through at a satisfactory rate of flow and high hopes were held initially that it would be a substantial puddle of oil. However, further drilling that took place indicated that it was a relatively small oil field and that, in relation to the Tirrawarra oil field, which is already part of the Cooper Basin liquids, the Strzelecki No. 3 well would have upgraded the amount of oil available by 20 per cent to 25 per cent. In other words, it is about a quarter of the size of the Tirrawarra oil field.

In those circumstances, the discovery does not significantly alter the overall viability study that has been done in relation to the Redcliff petro-chemical scheme. In other words, the conclusion that has been part of our submission to the Commonwealth Government, that the rate of return on investment in the overall development is only satisfactory if the necessary infrastructure is provided by Government instrumentalities, still remains as strongly supported as was the case previously.

I should add, first, that the Strzelecki discovery is encouraging in one way, since it is an oil discovery in sandstone of the jurassic age and that is highly encouraging in relation to further exploration that takes place in that area. It may be that a number of small discoveries will lead to a significant improvement in the overall liquids situation.

A second general point that needs to be made is that when we talk of Government infrastructure we are not talking of anybody getting anything for nothing. The Loan Council application that this State has made is simply asking for an additional borrowing right. That additional borrowing right for the Electricity Trust of South Australian and the Pipelines Authority of South Australian would not affect in any way the Commonwealth Budget deficit or any Commonwealth financial position. That should be clearly understood.

It should also be clearly understood that Dow and the producers would make use of the Government—provided facilities by paying full tote odds. The charges made would cover the capital costs and full running costs in relation to the pipelines and the power station. It is not a question of any subsidy being involved. The advantage to the economics of the scheme comes, first, because a Government can borrow at a somewhat cheaper rate so that there is a lower interest cost to be passed on to the producers and to Dow and, secondly, it is possible, in relation to Government provision of the power station and the pipelines, to depreciate those assets over a 20-year period and require a pay-back of the money borrowed over a much longer period than would be the case if commercial borrowing had to take place.

Both in terms of the longer pay-back period and the lower interest rate the cost effect on the viability of the project becomes significant. For that reason Government infrastructure is important. It is vital to make clear to everyone concerned that what we are asking of the Loan Concil does not involve any kind of hand-out whatever. It simply involves a method of financing which enables cheaper costs to be experienced, either by the Cooper Basin producers or by Dow, thus improving the overall viability of the Redcliff petro-chemical scheme.

CRYSTAL BROOK

Mr. VENNING: Can the Premier say who makes the final decision on financial assistance from the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department to clubs, organisations, sporting centres and complexes? People in my electorate are amazed at the way large sums of $100 000 and upwards are made to centres that have done little or nothing towards such projects, while small country centres that have worked and accumulated a little money toward a project are finding it very difficult in many cases to get assistance from the Government.

The Premier visited Crystal Brook last year when he opened the Centennial Show and he would have seen the situation there. My question relates specifically to the football club at Crystal Brook, which has applied for some assistance for a building there.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The decisions are ultimately made by the Minister on the recommendation of the department after examination, and I assume the honourable member is referring to grants under the lines for the Minister of Recreation, Tourism and Sport. Development assistance to sporting bodies is granted upon the recommendations of the department after examination of submissions made each year. Since we instituted that system, the number of applications has grown enormously. As a matter of fact, the total amount regarding applications for assistance exceeds $80 000 000. They have to be sorted out on a basis of reasonable priority, and justice is sought to be done between various groups.

I do not know to what the honourable member is referring when he says organisations can obtain large sums of money with comparative ease. I thought the honourable member's district was not doing badly, because when I visited Crystal Brook I also visited Jamestown, and the honourable member came to me with a deputation from Jamestown, and the matter was discussed with the Minister in the honourable member's presence and special assistance was given to Jamestown. So we are endeavouring to assist the honourable member's district as best we are able.

The honourable member, in another area of funding, referred to a contrast between some moneys which became available in Snowtown and those in relation to Crystal Brook. I investigated that matter and found that the moneys in respect of Snowtown were granted under the State Unemployment Relief Scheme for work by local residents who could be employed on community development. That situation differs very markedly from the situation under the direct development grants made specifically to organisations under tourism, recreation and sport, and it was under that heading that another institution in the honourable member's district made an application to us. We are endeavouring to work upon a basis of priorities which are worked out by the officers of the department and recommendations made to the Minister. If the honourable member has a specific case of contrast where it seems to him that priorities have not been satisfactorily worked out, I will look at it.

HERITAGE ACT

Mr. WOTTON: Can the Minister for the Environment say whether the Government will give urgent consideration to including in the South Australian Heritage Act a provision to issue interim preservation orders for a maximum of three months? I received from the Hahndorf branch of the National Trust a request to bring this question before the Minister. As he would be aware, that branch is particularly concerned about any future development in Hahndorf. I suggest that such orders should be issued by the Heritage Committee or the Minister in such circumstances where a building or area is under immediate threat of demolition, alteration or destruction, and I have suggested a period of three months because I believe that that would be adequate time for proper negotiations to be carried out between all interested parties. I quote briefly from the letter that I received from the National Trust at Hahndorf, as follows:

> Our committee feels that it would be an avenue whereby unexpected destruction of the State's heritage could be avoided at a few hour's notice, giving the owners and interested parties an equal opportunity to voice their opinions prior to irrevocable damage to the State.

The Minister would also be aware that a similar proposition was put before the Government by the Opposition, in the form of an amendment, when this legislation was introduced by the Government.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will examine the proposition.

PORT LINCOLN ANCHORAGE

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Minister of Marine obtain a report on the preliminary investigations currently being undertaken to improve anchorage facilities in Port Lincoln? The Minister will be aware that from time to time considerable damage has been caused to vessels and to harbour facilities at Port Lincoln. Further, there has been considerable risk to those persons who endeavour to move their vessels to safer anchorage, particularly when there

are strong northerlies and north-easterlies blowing. I am aware that a local committee, with representatives from all interested groups on Lower Eyre Peninsula, has been working in consultation with officers of the Minister's department, and that there have been some grounds of common agreement as to likely planning and development.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member is correct in saying that investigations are under way and continuing in relation to this matter. Discussions have taken place with interested groups in Port Lincoln. I do not expect that it will be very long before I have a report from the department, first on feasibility, and most importantly on the cost of the type of facility necessary for safe anchorage. I will obtain an up-to-date report for the honourable member.

UNIONISM

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say why the South Australian Government has intervened, in the Uniroyal matter currently before the Commonwealth Industrial Commission, to put a case for effective compulsory unionism and, in so doing, to take the trade union side in a conflict between Uniroyal and the Miscellaneous Workers Union about absolute preference to unionists? Yesterday, in the matter before the Commonwealth Industrial Commission, which relates to the inclusion in the award of absolute preference to unionists, the South Australian Government sought leave to intervene, and this morning that leave was granted. So far the South Australian Government has put before the commission a case which, in effect, supports compulsory unionism. Frankly, I was very surprised about this, because such a move by the Government is obviously undemocratic and against the personal rights and freedoms of individuals.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now debating his question.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I was also very surprised because of the answer given by the Minister in this House on 18 July of this year when the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Kavel, and later the member for Hanson, asked whether the Minister of Labour and Industry would intervene before the State Commission in the case to support the volunteers in St. John Ambulance. The Minister said the following, as reported in *Hansard:*

> I think I made the position clear when I replied to the Leader, that the Government is not is a position to interfere in any case of this nature that is before the court.

He then went on to say:

> I do not think it would be proper for the Government to intervene.

Now, we see that the Minister apparently has changed his mind and has intervened in the case. The other disturbing feature of this intervention is that the Government has taken the side of the trade union, and is putting a case which is almost identical to that being put by the Miscellaneous Workers Union. The Minister constantly boasts that the Government has an even-handed policy.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now debating the question. I hope he will not continue in that vein.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I believe that the even-handed policy of the Government is now being threatened, if it ever had one.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The honourable member has a bad habit of twisting the facts. I am not allowed to use the word "lie" in this House, so I will not do so.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not want the honourable Minister to use that term.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I will not do so, because I am not allowed to. The honourable member refers to compulsory unionism. There is no case before any tribunal to my knowledge relating to compulsory unionism.

Mr. Mathwin interjecting:

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

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The remark certainly displayed the ignorance often shown in this House by members sitting in that corner of the House, as was proven in the debate the other night by the member for Alexandra.

Mr. Mathwin: What's the difference?

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

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: There is no case before the commission, to my knowledge, on compulsory unionism. Let me restate, for the benefit of the member for Davenport and other members of his Party, that the policy of this Government and of the Australian Labor Party is not for compulsory unionism but for preference to unionists, which is what this case is about.

PRIORITY BUS LANES

Mr. WILSON: Has the Minister of Transport decided to institute priority bus lanes in Melbourne Street, North Adelaide, as from November of this year? From inquiries that I made some months ago, I understand that the Adelaide City Council and the Melbourne Street traders received an assurance from the Minister that priority bus lanes would not be commenced in Melbourne Street until after the construction of the so-called Mann Terrace-Park Terrace one-way traffic pair, and the construction of off-street parking in Melbourne Street. If the Minister intends to institute priority bus lanes in Melbourne Street from November, I remind him that those two construction projects have not yet been carried out.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The matter has been the subject of discussion for some time with the Adelaide City Council and the Melbourne Street traders. I do not know of any finality that has been reached. I am not aware that this is to happen in November. What will happen, and I believe it will not be completely operational, is that in February bus-only lanes will become operational on the Main North-East Road. I have no knowledge of finality having been reached in relation to Melbourne Street, although I regret that it has not, because priority for buses using that street must be provided at some stage.

ICE SKATING

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister for Planning speed up the application that has been made or is to be made by a private developer for Government approval for the establishment of an ice hockey and skating rink at the corner of East Terrace, Goodenough Street and Maria Street, Thebarton, on the old gasworks site? I believe that a promoter has received permission from the Thebarton council to establish such a development. However, a change in zoning use is necessary, and that requires Government approval and the Governor's signature. I believe that the project will cost about $1 000 000. The site comprises about 1½ acres, and is where the old gasometer is situated. Ice hockey sadly lacks proper facilities in

Adelaide, and interested people have been arguing for these for years. It is one of the fastest non-machine sports in the world. The sport is an international and Olympic sport, which we badly need. We now have an entrepreneur who is prepared to promote and develop the sport, the followers of which greatly support the proposal. Will the Minister do all in his power to have the approval given and the change made as quickly as possible so that the sporting rink can be developed for the benefit of Adelaide's young and in some cases the not so young who are enthusiastic about this type of sport?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I presume that this application involves a Governor's exemption.

Mr. Evans: That's right.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not familiar with it at this stage, but I will inquire about it and see that a decision is made as quickly as possible. If the day comes when there is an ice-skating rink there, and if the honourable member will provide a demonstration of how to do it, either on skates or on his backside, I hope that he will invite us down to witness the great spectacle.

Mr. Evans: Why don't you come with me?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will not accept any challenge in any circumstances, because I tend to be lopsided.

TOWNSEND HOUSE

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Education say what action, if any, the Government is taking to renovate Townsend House completely or partially? The Minister will be aware that last year we voted an allocation of about $272 000 for renewal of the roof and repairs to the outside of Townsend House. The Minister will also be well aware of the practicality of repairing the whole of the building inside and outside to make it usable, and of the cost of the venture generally. Has the Minister any idea of what the building will be used for if the Government continues with the renovations?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Last year, there was a notional allocation largely from the SURS scheme but, because of the considerable scaling down of the scheme, that finance is not available. When my predecessor entered into an agreement with the Townsend House board about certain works that would go on there, certain things were specified, including the clearing out of some buildings to enable a playground to be constructed for the school. We have always wanted to proceed to be able to discharge that obligation.

As the honourable member would know, the old building at Townsend House is under a green ban, which still exists, and, as long as that exists, it is not possible to remove that building. In addition, there has been some interest locally in the preservation of the old building, and it was this interest that led to the setting up of the inquiry, which brought down a report suggesting certain uses for the building.

Those uses are now revealed as being non-viable. The only one that really survived very long after the bringing down of the report was in relation to the headquarters of the Little Patch Theatre, but I understand that certain negotiations are proceeding that will probably satisfy the demands of that organisation. The position in that, first, the Government has an agreement with the Townsend House board that certain demolition will take place to enable a proper playground to be built. Secondly, some of those demolitions were recommended by the committee of inquiry, which looked at possible alternative uses for those parts of the Townsend House building which would remain. Whilst the green ban does not apply to those excrescences (as they were called by Mr. Morphett and his committee), nonetheless it does apply to the overall building. As a result of all this, within the last few days I have written to the board of Townsend House and to a representative of a committee formed of some local citizens. I have indicated to the Townsend House board that we are anxious to proceed with our commitment to it just so far as this is possible within the constraints currently available to us and I have suggested a sum of money we would make available so that that can proceed.

Mr. Mathwin: Just the playground?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: No. This will include money to secure, but not to improve, the old building. The Government's decision is that, for so long as no viable use can be identified for the building which would be consistent with the concerns of the Townsend House board, we should spend no money on the building. However, it is necessary that it should be secured.

I understand that squatters have been in the building from time to time, and certainly some vandalism has occurred at the building, so a sum of money will be earmarked from the sum we suggested to the board for boarding up windows and nailing up doors so that people will not be able to get into the building. We will be spending no further money on the building until some use can be identified for it which is consistent with the proper use of the Townsend House property. The sum we will be spending simply to secure the building will be a small sum, and the amount that we have suggested to the board would be appropriate in furtherance of so much of our commitment as is possible is, I believe, about $75 000.

FUEL PRICES

Mr. DRURY: Can the Attorney-General say whether the South Australian Govenent will intervene before the Prices Justification Tribunal regarding its public inquiry into the fuel industry? An article in today's *Australian* states:

> The Prices Justification Tribunal has given in to strong pressure from oil companies and granted an interim across-the-board increase for petrol products before beginning its public inquiry into the industry.

Will the Attorney-General comment on that article?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Government has not finally decided whether or not it will intervene in the inquiry. That depends on advice that I will be receiving in a few days from my officers as to their view of the merits of the application that has been lodged, I think in this instance by the Shell Company. On that advice the Government will make its decision. The previous intervention by this State Government in conjunction with the Governments of New South Wales and Tasmania (the three Labor States) was a successful intervention in that the P.J.T., having some support in that instance from three State Governments, stood up to the oil companies and on that occasion did not grant the full application that had been sought by the oil companies. I imagine that was one of the reasons why the Shell Company is now making a further application so soon after the decision following the earlier public hearing had been brought down.

My officers will be contacting other State Governments within the next few days to see whether they are interested in making a joint application to the P.J.T. in opposition to the application for an increase that has been lodged by the Shell Company. It is a most regrettable side effect of the recent intervention by the three Labor Governments that the oil companies have now applied enormous pressure to

the Federal Government seeking either to have the P.J.T. abolished or at least to have its powers severely restricted. It would be a great disaster for the people of Australia if the P.J.T. were tampered with by the present Federal Government. We all know that that Government dances to the tune of the big international corporations, and it would be a great disaster for the Australian people if in dancing to that tune it put the P.J.T. into a straitjacket where it is no longer able to operate in the interests of the Australian people. The South Australian Government will certainly be looking closely at the application lodged by Shell with a view to intervening in that matter if it is appropriate to do so.

At 3.7 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

GRANTS FOR SPORT

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): I move:

That this House condemns the Federal Government for its meagre allocation to sport in the 1978 Budget and supports the Australian Sports Confederation in its open letter to the Prime Minister criticising the allocation.

The allocation in the 1978 Federal Budget for sport was $1 333 000, and because of this amount the President of the Australian Sports Confederation (Mr. Reid), with the unanimous support of the board, has criticised the Budget allocation and expressed discontent in an open letter to the Prime Minister asking the Government to review this allocation and to establish a fixed formula for future funding for sport so that sporting associations can plan their programmes accordingly. The letter also seeks a clear indication of the policy of the Federal Government in relation to sport which would be the basis of future planning by the Australian sporting community. The Australian Sports Confederation consists of 94 sporting organisations throughout Australia.

In 1977 the then Minister (Mr. Newman) spoke to the annual general meeting of the confederation and said that the Government's objectives at that time were to improve the standards of performances at international level. He also said the Government would support the improvement of coaching standards in sport throughout Australia, and that the $1 000 000 funded in 1977 was only to be assumed as a base figure. Because of that remark by the Minister it was taken by the Australian Sports Confederation and the sporting fraternity generally that the $1 000 000 base figure would be increased considerably in future Budget allocations. However, this was not to be. November 1977 was just before the last Federal election, and the Minister may have been endeavouring to seek support from the sporting fraternity with regard to the election. Since that time, of course, neither the Minister nor the Federal Government has honoured that obligation. Is it any wonder that the sporting community, like many other sections of the community, is incensed by the 1978 Federal Budget?

The Australian Sports Confederation has pointed out that most overseas countries spend considerably more on and receive more government funds for sport than Australia. An example is that the Canadian Government spends $1·46 per head of population on sport: the figure for Australia is 9c per head. There are many other similar examples. Australia has one of the worst allocations of money for sports funding of any nation in the world. This is rather ironic in a country where we pride ourselves on our sporting achievements. As a result of the lack of funding and facilities Australian performances in international competition in recent years have waned considerably.

Another matter about which the Australian Sports Confederation is concerned and on which it comments in its letter arises from a press statement by the Federal Treasurer, as follows:

> The Treasury's announcement that the Federal Government collected $30 000 000 in sports sales tax last year has angered sports authorities. Sporting organisations are certain now to increase pressure on the Government for more grants. The revelation by the Treasurer, Mr. Howard came only hours after the Confederation of Australian Sport launched its campaign to secure more Government funds for national sports groups.
>
> Mr. Howard, replying to a Question on Notice from the Opposition spokesman on sport, Mr. Barry Cohen, said no detailed separate statistics were available, but sales tax on gymnastics, athletics, sport and outdoor equipment totalled about $30 000 000. And this did not include taxes paid on the purchase of boats, bicycles or sporting and recreational vehicles.

The Australian Sports Confederation and the sporting community are paying $30 000 000 sales tax a year to the Federal Government and receiving a Budget allocation from the Government of $1 300 000. I believe that the Australian Government's attitude to sport is also reflected in the fact that the Minister, Mr. Newman, is not directly referred to as "Minister for Sport"; he is the Minister for the Environment, Housing and Community Development. One would assume from that that in fact sport is only a minor part of his Ministerial responsibilities.

In my opinion, sport is a telling reflection of national life and physical fitness, and I believe that one is synonymous with the other. We are told by physical educationists and sports doctors that the average level of physical fitness in Australia in children and adults is not what it should be and that our general levels of fitness are below those of many other nations. We recently received the report of a working party into physical fitness in South Australia, a committee was set up by the Minister of Tourism Recreation and Sport, Mr. Casey, and Chaired by Dr. Ian Jobling. I think it is worth while noting some of the recommendations in the report. It bears out what I said a moment ago, that fitness levels in this community are below standard. The summary of recommendations in the report is as follows:

1. There is evidence that most adults in South Australia lack adequate physical fitness. Recent investigations demonstrate that regular, sustained and energetic physical activity is required to achieve and maintain physical fitness. Such activity significantly reduces the risk of coronary heart disease as well as providing many other benefits.

   We recommend that the Government accepts these assertions and adopts a general policy of encouragement of physical fitness throughout the community.

2. The Working Party has noted with satisfaction the spontaneous development of neighbourhood fitness groups consisting of friends and neighbours who exercise together in an autonomous fashion.

   We recommend that the development of neighbourhood fitness groups should be encouraged by appropriate publicity and support from State Government agencies (especially schools). Local government authorities should be encouraged to accept a convening role in such development and this matter should be referred to the Local Government Association.

3. The initial emphasis of the "Life be in it" campaign is one of making people aware of the values of physical activity and stimulating them to undertake simple minimally structured recreational activities.

We recommend that there is a clear need to encourage a general degree of physical fitness in the community which goes beyond that which "Life: be in it" at present suggests.

I will not quote all the recommendations but, in total, they indicate that more funding and more Government activity, both State and Federal, is needed to assist in promoting physical fitness and sporting programmes in this country. The last recommendation in the report is important. It states:

We recommend the establishment of a South Australian Fitness Advisory Committee accountable to the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport to make recommendations on capital and operating subsidies, endorse policy pronouncements, and develop promotional materials.

I think that substantiates the points I have been making. The report conclusively demonstrates that methods should be adopted to initiate community programmes to promote health and physical fitness in the community.

I have been critical previously in this House of the Federal Government's rather meagre contribution to that section of the Budget dealing particularly with allocations to preventive medicine. About 3 per cent of the Commonwealth health Budget was set aside for this purpose. I believe that general participation in recreation and sport is an extension of health and preventive medicine programmes.

One organisation in South Australia that has been helpful in promoting this interest in physical fitness is the Institute of Fitness and Research Training. I received a reply today from the Minister relating to the question I asked about the withdrawal of Commonwealth health benefits in connection with medical tests undertaken by the I.F.R.T. We must remember that the institute is mentioned in this report as being one of the organisations in South Australia that would benefit the community greatly if its activities were extended, yet the Federal Government has withdrawn Commonwealth health benefits for medical tests undertaken by this organisation.

I think that is another example of the short-sighted policy of the Federal Government, and its complete disregard for community fitness standards and programmes initiated by organisations such as I.F.R.T. I believe that these programmes will save both the individual and the Government health costs in the long term. Despite the Federal Government's attitude to funding, there is an increasing awareness by people of the need for regular exercise, particularly among those employed in sedentary occupations.

The South Australian Government, through the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department, has provided, within its limited resources, financial allocations to recreation and sporting bodies for coaching, classes, equipment, and the sponsorship of the Life: Be In It programme. This needs to be extended, as stated in the report by the working party, so that a greater injection of funds is made to enable adequate facilities to be available for sport and recreation, which I believe is primarily the responsibility of the Federal Government. Only this week I had the pleasure of attending the opening, by the Premier, of a private health club, the Kerry O'Brien Health Centre at Payneham. It was through the efforts of the South Australian Development Corporation, and upon the recommendation of the Industries Development Committee, that $530 000 was provided by way of a Government guarantee to assist the project and to bring it to completion.

This is an example of a community resource, even though it is run by private enterprise with Government assistance, that is a valuable exercise; it gives people the opportunity to participate in a supervised physical training programme. It is a pity that the Federal Government is not similarly aware of the need to improve facilities and, therefore, funding for sport and recreation throughout Australia. It would be a sound investment in the future wellbeing of the nation but, because of the Federal Government's meagre allocation in the 1978 Budget, I support the letter of the Australian Sports Confederation to the Prime Minister, and I seek the support of other members of this House in condemning the Federal Government for its lack of financial support to the sportsmen and sportswomen of Australia.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I will speak on the subject because I believe it is important that I do. I do not believe that the member for Gilles is being fair or that he has assessed the total situation. I am not saying that I do not agree that the sports involved in the Olympic Games and in international competitions should get more help if we can give it to them. Later, I will state what the Liberal Party would support in connection with the confederation's request. Mr. Reid said that the Federal Government was spending $26 000 000 in the field of the arts, and that that concerned him when it was only spending 9c a head on sport.

The Federal Government has contributed $26 000 000 toward the Australian Opera, the Australian Ballet, the Elizabethan Theatre Trust, and so on. By way of comparison, the State Government, through the Premier, is making available $8 545 000 toward the arts in South Australia. Regarding the sort of sporting activities that Mr. Reid was talking about in relation to the Federal Government, the State Government is making available only $222 235. In other words, the State Government reveals its priorities by giving 3 600 per cent more to the arts than it gives directly to the kinds of sporting activity in which Mr. Reid is interested.

The figures I have quoted show that the State Government puts sporting activities at a much lower level than does the Federal Government. Further, I am concerned that in other areas the sporting interests miss out. I admit that in 1956 Australia ranked third at the Olympic Games held in Melbourne. We were competing on our own home ground when our sports were in season, because we are in the Southern Hemisphere. It needs to be remembered that at that time there was virtually no money spent from any Government source, except for the development of the arenas that were established in Melbourne for the Olympic Games. Actual money spent from Government sources was virtually nil, yet at that time we came third in the world competitions, whereas when we started spending money on it we dropped back to thirty-second. Is money the problem, or is it some other attitude in society?

The member for Gilles said that Mr. Newman had other interests and was not interested in sport. I believe the honourable member is a long way behind the times, because Mr. Newman has not been Minister in charge of sport for a long time. He has not been Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development for many months.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There will be an opportunity to reply to the honourable member's remarks.

Mr. EVANS: Mr. Groom has been the Minister in

charge of those matters for many months. The Federal Government gives $600 000 to Life. Be In It. Where does the State Government put the priorities for Life: Be In It? I think the State Government gives $15 000 when, if it was to give a comparable figure, it would give a much greater sum. We have a State responsibility. The Labor Party's approach is to say continually that the Federal Government should give more, but where will the Federal Government get it? I challenge Labor Party members to say what activity should be cut out to enable the Federal Government to give more money in the way that the Labor Party suggests. We belong to a club called Australia that has lost between $2 000 000 000 and $5 000 000 000 a year over the past five years. The State branch of the club, the South Australian Government, lost $42 000 000 last year in railways money that was spent, plus $26 000 000 down the drain, making a total of $68 000 000.

The local government area of our club, which is local councils, say they cannot survive, as they have not got enough money. The membership of all of those clubs is by way of taxation, rates, and duties. I have never heard one of the A.L.P. members get up and say that the Federal Government should increase taxation, rates and duties. When the Federal Government seeks to provide funds through raising taxes, it is condemned. We cannot get blood out of a stone, and that is what Government members are suggesting. Their club is going broke, but they are saying that more money should be distributed to the members of the club. When I asked the Premier whether his Government had an attitude toward the request of the Confederation of Sport that it should be allowed to run a national lottery, the Premier replied that he would ask for a report from the Lotteries Commission. The Premier stated:

> The Lotteries Commission has reported previously against attempts by other bodies to get into the large-scale lotteries market in this State. I have not had a report from the Lotteries Commission, but I will make a reply available as soon as I have it.

We have a Premier and one of the members of his Government saying that the Confederation of Sport should be helped, yet the Premier is concerned about his State Lotteries Commission, which does not raise money for hospitals but pays money straight into general revenue. All that we are doing is subsidising general revenue. The Minister knows that this is just another way to subsidise the hospitals.

The Liberal Party supports the conducting by the Confederation of Sport of a national lottery for each of the next two years, with prize money up to $2 500 000. That would give the confederation an opportunity, in terms of normal lottery operations, of making a profit of about $1 500 000, or more than twice the amount it receives under the present arrangement. Further, the State Premiers and the Commonwealth Government would be given the opportunity to find out whether such a national lottery adversely affected State lotteries or the receipts of other voluntary organisations.

If we agreed to the national lottery, we would be telling the Confederation of Sport that it was being given the opportunity to help itself, and a request that the confederation be allowed to do that was made by letter sent to every Parliamentarian in Australia. I challenge the A.L.P. to support the request, because in South Australia, according to Mr. Reid's letter, no legislation is needed and we can merely agree. I challenge the A.L.P. to say that it agrees and that it will support our policy. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

AXLE MASS REGULATION

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I move:

> That the regulation under the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1976, relating to aggregating the mass of individual axles, made on 29 June 1978 and laid on the table of this House on 13 July 1978, be disallowed.

The Opposition is concerned about proceeding with the regulation and, for that matter, any subsequent regulations relating to the Road Traffic Act while there seems to be a series of anomalies when applying that particular weighing law. We must also bear in mind some serious inconsistencies that occur when vehicles are weighed under the systems laid down in the Act. We are particularly concerned about the variation that can occur at the weighbridge site, when articulated vehicles are weighed in the multiple gang axle or single axle manner that is practised.

This afternoon I wish to refer to several points that concern us. The first is the matter of the variations that are occurring. In order to demonstrate our concern and that of the transport industry generally, it is important to describe briefly the types of vehicles involved. First, there is the tray-top type, particularly that with double axles at the rear, which is known as the bogey axle unit.

Then there is the eight-wheeler, or twin steer vehicle, which also has a bogey rear axle gang. In the semi-trailer area, where the problems really arise, first we have the single axle prime mover and the single axle trailer. In the single axle bogey outfit, as it is commonly known in the industry, with the single steer forward axle, there is a single axle under the prime mover and a bogey unit at the rear of the trailer.

The bogey/bogey unit, of course, is, as the name suggests, a double axle unit under the prime mover and under the rear trailer, and there is the bogey tri-axle unit, which has the single steer, bogey axle under the prime mover and a gang of three axles under the rear of the trailer. That is the group of vehicles that is weighed under the end-for-end weighing system that is being considered at present.

Until 1 March 1977 the Road Traffic Act permitted the weights of vehicles to be ascertained by aggregating measurements of weight taken separately in relation to the separate axles of multi-axle vehicles. Section 155 (2) provided, in part:

> It shall . . . be unnecessary to measure the weight carried on all of the relevant axles simultaneously, but the aggregate weight may be determined by aggregating measurements of weight taken separately in relation to the axles in question.

On 1 March 1977, Act No 103 of 1976 came into force. That Act attempted to delete all references to "weighing" vehicles and provided for the determination of the mass of vehicles or axles, etc.

For the purpose of this debate, one of the most important changes made by that Act was the complete repeal of section 155 of the Act so that there was no longer any power to aggregate axle weights in order to measure the total weight carried on all of the axles of a vehicle or even all of the axles in a group of axles on a vehicle.

A further change was effected by the same amending Act. Previously, section 34 of the Road Traffic Act enabled councils within their area and the Minister in any part of the State to erect, provide or maintain weighbridges or other weighing instruments for the purpose of weighing vehicles and for the purpose of ascertaining the weight carried on any axle or group of axles of the vehicle.

The amendments to section 34 were threefold. The first

required the council and the Minister to provide or maintain weighbridges or other instruments in order to determine the mass of a vehicle or the mass carried on any axle or axles of a vehicle in accordance with the regulations.

The second amendment is contained in completely new provisions, namely, section 34(2)(a). This provides that the mass of a vehicle must be determined in accordance with the regulations. It is this part of the amendment to which greater reference will be made later in this debate.

The third amendment provided an aid to proof in prosecuting persons whose vehicles weighed more than the permitted maxima, and section 34(2)(b) provided that the mass when determined in accordance with the regulations shall be deemed to be correct for the purpose of any proceedings for an offence against the Road Traffic Act unless the contrary is proved.

As a result of these amendments, there is nothing in the Road Traffic Act that provides that the total mass of a vehicle can be calculated, determined or measured by adding up the weights or mass carried on each of its axles. It is believed that this deletion of the power to aggregate the weights on each axle was deliberate and was because of information reaching the framers of the amendments that aggregating weights otherwise, known as "end and end" weighing, is likely to lead to an unjust and inaccurate weight.

Section 34 clearly intended that regulations would be made not only in relation to the provision and maintenance of weighbridges or other weighing devices but also regulating the manner in which the mass of the vehicle or the mass of any axle or axles of the vehicle was to be determined.

It should also be noted that a similar power to make regulations had already been provided in the Act in section 176 (1) *(h)*. This part of this section was amended at the same time, but principally to delete the reference to ascertaining weight and substitute the ascertaining of mass. It is, however, interesting to set out the whole of that section. It provides that the Governor may make regulations for or with respect to all or any of the following matters, namely, "prescribing methods of ascertaining the [weight] mass of a vehicle with or without its load, or of anything carried on any axle or axles of a vehicle [by weighing, measurement, calculation or otherwise]".

I repeat that the words have been deleted as a result of that amendment. In the case of the word "weight", the word "mass" has been inserted. This particular word gives rise to concern.

At the time of these amendments, regulations were made under the Road Traffic Act relating to the weighing of vehicles. Those were to be found in regulation 10.05. These regulations were amended on 24 February 1977, that is, about one week before the amendments to the Act came into force. This point also requires further investigation. For the purposes of this debate, that need not be gone into.

However, it may be that the amendments to the regulations made on 24 February 1977 were made without power and in that case all of the regulations made on that day may be invalid. The relevant amendments are set out in regulation 16 of the regulations made on 24 February 1977. Regulation 16 (2) provided that the old regulation 10.05 (2) be struck out and a new subregulation be inserted as follows:

> For the purposes of section 34 of the Act, weighbridges and other instruments for the purpose of determining the mass of a vehicle with or without its load with a mass carried on any axle or axles of a vehicle, shall be erected, provided or maintained, and the said masses shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of the Trade Measurements Act, 1971-1975 and the regulations thereunder.

That regulation remained in force until it was deleted on 29 June 1978 and a new subregulation, the one before us now, was inserted.

The Trade Measurements Act and the trade measurements regulations are completely silent as to the method to be adopted for the purpose of determining the mass of a vehicle or the mass carried on any axle or axles of the vehicle. That Act, and those regulations, provide for weighbridges to be set up and maintained, and they also provide for wheel-load weighers, which is a complicated description of portable weighing instruments designed to determine the axle loads of a vehicle.

It should be noted that regulation 10.05 (4) requires any person in charge of a vehicle to permit the mass of a vehicle and the mass carried on any axle or axles to be determined by means of a highway loadometer or other prescribed instrument and generally to co-operate in facilitating the determination of the mass of the vehicle and/or its load and/or the mass carried on any axle or group of axles of the vehicle when so required by a police officer or a Highways Department inspector. However, the regulations do not proceed to set out the manner in which the determination of the mass is to be made.

Many road transport operators have challenged the accuracy of weighbridges, highway loadometers or other portable weighing devices throughout South Australia, and weighing procedures generally. In particular, it is contended amongst that industry that commonly used procedures work to the substantial disadvantage of road transport operators using modern sophisticated vehicles and especially those using tri-axle trailers. I will come back to that type of vehicle in a moment. It is generally contended that "end and end" weighing results in an inaccurate measurement and that "end and end" weighing, especially when accompanied by the procedure known as "splitting the tri"—a procedure used in relation to tri-axle trailers whereby two axles are weighed together and the result obtained then added to the weight of the third axle, which is weighed separately—is so inaccurate as to be completely unjust, especially when penalties for breach of overweight sections of the Road Traffic Act are fixed on a sliding scale. The Minister knows of the vicious sliding scale effect incorporated in the Act at the present time.

These contentions by road transport operators have been substantiated by evidence given in the case of *Boys v. Brack* which was heard in the Para District Court of Summary Jurisdiction and was action No. 6245 of 1977. Mr. B. D. Amey delivered his judgment on 2 June 1978. In that case the defendant called a Mr. John Gilbert MacKay, a consulting engineer who specialises in problems relating to the weighing of motor vehicles. This debate is based on that case.

Mr. MacKay defines "end and end" weighing as weighing the axles or the axle groups at each end of a vehicle individually and then summing the two or more results and assuming that this represents the gross weight of the complete vehicle. He says that this practice is not reliable, because the weight of each individual axle or axle group can be influenced by a large number of factors, including the attitude of the vehicle on the weighbridge—in other words, the level or irregularity of the road levels on the approaches to the weighbridge. The condition of the weighbridge and its approach can be significant, especially if it is on a slope.

He says, further, that, if a tri-axle semi-trailer is weighed by weighing two of the axles of the trailer and then weighing the third axle and summing the two results

obtained, that the summation would not be accepted by him as an accurate weighing. At present the Act provides for splitting the tri and adding the combination weight of the two to the remaining weight of the one. Mr. MacKay says that an error of 20 per cent plus or minus could easily be involved by weighing by the "end and end" weighing procedure.

It appears that, largely as a result of the decision in Brack's case and the evidence of Mr. MacKay, the Road Traffic Board has decided further to amend regulation 10.05 by deleting subregulation 10.05(2) and inserting a new subregulation specifically providing for the determination of the mass of a vehicle with or without its load, pursuant to the provisions of section 34 of the Road Traffic Act, by aggregating the measurements of the mass taken separately in relation to the axles in question. In other words, the amendment to regulation 10.05(2) made on 29 June 1978 purports to put the position back to what it was before the March 1977 amendments. The aggregation of axle masses is permitted whether the weighing device is a weighbridge or a portable scale such as a highway loadometer.

This amendment, if it in fact is permitted to remain in force, will effectively legalise a system of weighing which is generally recognised as being too inaccurate to enable reliance for the purposes of trade, but which are obviously considered sufficiently reliable for the purposes of revenue raising by prosecuting road transport operators, where the penalty imposed bears a direct relationship to the amount by which the vehicle in question allegedly exceeds the statutory maximum. It should be noted that not only does the State of New South Wales require a notation that "end and end" weighing is not guaranteed (that reference is taken from *Boys v Brack*) but also regulation 169(g) of the South Australian Trade Measurements Act regulations requires a similar notation on any weighbridge docket where "end and end" weighing has been used.

The new regulation 10.05(2) made on 29 June 1978 appears to be in conflict with the policy of the Road Traffic Act. The repeal of section 155 and other associated amendments to the Act indicates that "end and end" weighing and the aggregation of axle weights is no longer part of the policy of the Act. The new regulation 10.05(2) seems to be an underhanded way of reverting to the old policy.

In these circumstances, and on behalf of the road transport industry, I have moved for the disallowance of the new regulations. While the possibility of the industry's suggesting a mathematical formula to take account of the problems discussed in Mr. MacKay's evidence was briefly considered as a possibility by some, on reflection this does not appear to be practical. I will cite examples of this.

I will cite an example or two as I come to them in the remaining few minutes that I have. It must be borne in mind that if a trailer is over-loaded by, say, 3·2 tonnes, giving a gross combination mass (excluding the mas of the front axle) of 36 tonnes, and this is then aggregated by a 20 per cent plus inaccuracy resulting from "end-and-end" weighing, then the alleged gross combination mass would be 43·2 tonnes, an excess of 10·4 tonnes. When one studies the penalties which can now be imposed for over-loading, the penalty range for 3·2 tonnes is from $475 to $1 080. On the other hand, the penalty range for 10·4 tonnes is from $1 915 to $3 960. The figures speak for themselves, demonstrating clearly why the industry is concerned about this wide variation.

I now refer to an instance that I personally witnessed after being requested to take up this matter on behalf of the Opposition. I refer to an incident that occurred on the evening of Tuesday 10 October at the Murray Bridge weighing station operated by the Highways Department. With the permission of the two officers on duty I had the opportunity of observing the procedures at first hand. I refer to the triaxle unit as being the gang of three axles at the rear end of the trailer. A unit moved on to the platform weighing the forward axles and then weighing the triaxle unit. For the purposes of demonstrating what happened, I will number the gang of axles in the triaxles from the front to the rear as No. 1, No. 2 and No. 3.

The first axle was weighed at 4·2 tonnes. As the platform allows for two axles, or a gang of two, to be weighed at once, the next two axles (Nos. 2 and 3) weighed 9·4 tonnes, giving an aggregated mass weight of 13·6 tonnes. In order to witness the whole operation and determine what variations do apply as claimed by the industry and with the permission of the officers on duty, we got that truck to reverse back over the weighbridge again. On the second approach to the weighbridge axles No. 2 and 1 were weighed at 12·1 tonnes. Finally, in order to arrive at the overall weight, axle No. 3 was weighed at six tonnes, giving an aggregated total in that instance of 18·1 tonnes, resulting in a variation between the two weighing systems of 4·5 tonnes.

As I have said, I have heard of many cases of variation. Indeed, it is well recognised across the Commonwealth that this type of multiple-axle weighing is most inaccurate, and is at least 20 per cent up or down. There should not be penalties applying in cases in which such weighing is adopted for determining the aggregate or mass weight. The officers on duty expressed surprise at the extent of the variation that had occurred. We weighed about 30 vehicles in the hour or two that I spent there.

Secondly, I am not happy with any regulations that proceed to aggravate the overall application of the Road Traffic Act with respect to the systems of weighing vehicles in South Australia. Although I have no real knowledge on the subject, from the material I have examined it seems unfair to proceed with any prosecutions that are pending, at least since the regulations were tabled on 28 June 1978. There may be a case to dispense with cases where prosecutions have been made prior to that date but not yet heard, because the variations that can be cited within South Australia under the weighing system that exists here are certainly wide.

The only satisfactory method of weighing multi-axle vehicles is on the jarred scale system, where the weighing platform is 16 metres long and can take the whole outfit at once. For the purpose of weighing individual axles, it is reasonable to apply the system of weighing the individual axles on a split platform basis while the whole vehicle is on the 16 m-long weighing outfit.

It is the only safe and fair way in which to proceed. Obviously, there are platforms of this type around, and the sooner we get them installed at all the appropriate outlet points in the metropolitan area and the other roads where they are required, the better it will be, not only for the Government in its application of the law but also for the road traffic industry.

It has been indicated that the matter is to be taken up by the Government. I have demonstrated to the Minister this afternoon that there is deep concern in the industry about the system of weighing and about the implication of proceeding with these particular regulations and, specifically, in seeking to prosecute and penalise a person whose vehicle is overweight on a single axle when the aggregate or mass weight of his overall axles are within the permissible maximum. While that situation occurs it is our opinion that those regulations should be withdrawn and amended in order to protect the industry from the unfair penalty implication.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): With some of the things that the honourable member has said I could agree, but others I can violently disagree with. I agree that we are seeking to restore the position that applied before the repeal of section 155. However, I disagree that we are doing it in a sneaky way, or whatever the term was. We are open in what we are saying, that an error was made in the repeal of that section.

That error was proved in the case *Boys v. Brack,* to which the honourable member has referred. That case proved that Parliament made a mistake, or, as Minister that I made a mistake, or that the Parliamentary Counsel made a mistake: I do not care who is blamed. In fact, a mistake was made in believing that the provision could be repealed. The court proved that it could not be repealed. Indeed, in believing that we (I am referring to myself as representative of the Road Traffic Board or the Highways Department) had good advice over the repeal of that provision the matter was taken to the Supreme Court, but the opinion that has been expressed earlier, that we had not been well advised, was confirmed. There is nothing sinister about that. We are simply restoring the position that applied before the 1976 amendment.

We are seeking to rectify the error that was made. I am sure that it was not the first error that has been made, and I am quite certain it will not be the last. The honourable member briefly referred to what happened at Murray Bridge when he and another person went there and occupied the crease for a couple of hours.

Mr. Chapman: I didn't say anything about anyone else.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Well, you used the term "we", and one of my colleagues interjected, and asked "Who was your mate?", but you did not hear him.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. Mathwin: Who was with him?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Interjections are out of order, as indeed is the member for Glenelg now. I do not care who went with the honourable member; I only hope that the honourable member learned something. The surprise of the officers was not at the different weighings but at the temerity of the member going in and taking over their weighing station. I can assure the honourable member that, the next time he meets those officers, he will not find a welcome to come inside the door. One would have thought that simple courtesy would have required the honourable member to have sought the concurrence, at least of a senior officer or the Commissioner himself.

Mr. Chapman: There was not a senior officer on duty.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is one of the stupidest things the honourable member has said today. Much of what the honourable member said today was common sense, but now he is being stupid. Officers of the Highways Department are never off duty, and it would have been simple to have sought the approval of an authorised officer before the honourable member walked in on people who were doing their job, and creating a situation that is now a severe embarrassment to them.

Mr. Chapman: Rubbish.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member can say "Rubbish", because he does not mind creating embarrassing positions for people. The honourable member said today that there seems to be a series of serious anomalies in this amendment. As I have just said, the new regulations are seeking to restore the position that applied before the Act was amended in 1976. If there are anomalies now, they were there then but they never showed up. I would say to the honourable member that there are no anomalies, because the only anomaly has now been rectified by introducing the new regulations to overcome the deficiency shown up by the court in the *Boys and Brack* case.

I also take the honourable member to task on the claim he made that he was speaking for the transport industry generally. It is an easy and sweeping term to use, but is difficult to pin down. In the past, when there have been problems with the transport industry, without exception, those people made approaches to me or my officers. I have not had one approach from the transport industry on this matter.

Mr. Mathwin: Come on, Geoff!

Mr. Chapman: Really?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Not one. If the honourable member can show where I have had approaches from the transport industry asking for the repeal of this regulation, I will be pleased to hear from him.

Mr. Mathwin: Jim Crawford has talked to you about it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Discussions that I might have had with Mr. Crawford are between him and me, and I do not think they are any business of the member for Glenelg. I do not want the member for Glenelg to spread his usual rumours alleging that I might have had some conversations with Mr. Crawford. Whatever conversations I had with Mr. Crawford, on any subject, had nothing to do with the member for Glenelg. The transport industry has expressed no concern about this regulation. The only people now trying to stir the pot are those who are so irresponsible that they want to permit overloaded vehicles on our roads causing damage to the pavements, the culverts, and so on. There has to be strict control on overloading.

Weighbridges in South Australia on our highways, and the one that the honourable member took over for two hours at Murray Bridge, have an 8ft top. It is quite ridiculous to suggest that the Highways Department will stop building roads and plough millions of dollars into putting in new weighbridges, as the honourable member suggests.

Finally, I blow wide open the claim of the honourable member that a weighbridge of 16 metres is without blemish. I have a copy of the *"Highway Transport"* of August 1978 that I will make available to the honourable member. That publication deals in six parts with the problem of weighing. In the first part it deals with the problem of weighing "end-for-end", and discusses the errors of single weighing. It shows that with a single weighing of the same vehicle seven ways, the weight recorded varied by 2·1 per cent, 1·1 per cent three times, and 0·42 per cent on others.

If the honourable member had informed himself to the extent that the paper he read to members would indicate, he should know that many factors determine how accurate is the end result of weighing. The condition of the weighbridge is absolutely paramount. The speed that the vehicle enters the weighbridge can have a drastic effect upon the end result of weighing, so that weighbridge operators direct drivers on to the weighbridge at a certain speed. The wind will have a significant bearing on the end result. If the driver's door is left open you would get one weigh and with the door shut you would get a different weigh. The honourable member should know all those things.

Nobody is suggesting that "end and end" weighing is accurate to a decimal point of a per cent. The Highways Department is aware of the problems of weighbridges, and these matters are taken into account when decisions are made about prosecutions. To do as the honourable member is trying to do today is to act in a completely irresponsible way, because without that regulation, which this House is being asked to disallow today in the honourable member's motion, would be to tell every road user that he could no longer be taken to court for

overloading because the legislative power to charge him was not there.

I do not believe that the honourable member would be so irresponsible as to pursue that course, but that on consideration he should acknowledge his responsibilities and withdraw his motion.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I take exception to the manner in which the Minister referred to the source of information that I had received. I do not know what he was implying, but I assumed that he was reflecting on the calibre of the people from whom I gathered this information. I will not name the members: they do not belong to the organisation that supported me previously when the Minister reflected unfairly on that organisation. The panel to which I referred this subject in great depth was representative of South Australian and Australian major transport operators.

Despite Government efforts to revert to the previous situation and to introduce workable regulations, it has again made a mistake. Paragraph *b* of the regulations clearly provides that a person may be convicted for being overweight on a single axle when, at the same time, the aggregate or mass weight of his overall axles may be within the maximum. That is unfair.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (19)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman (teller), Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (26)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan, Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, Klunder, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo (teller), Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

(Adjourned debate on second reading).

(Continued from 11 October. Page 1373).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government): I support the second reading of this Bill, which is designed to assist with problems relating to elections. I have told the Honourable Mr. Carnie that we believe that his wording does not adequately achieve his objective, but that we agree with it, and will seek to amend the Bill. I will ask the House to deal with two other matters when we reach Committee stage. I will introduce a contingent motion at the appropriate time to deal with those extra clauses.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

New clauses 1a and 1b.

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

Page 1—After clause 1 insert new clauses as follows:

1a. Section 126 of the principal Act is amended by striking out from subparagraph *(c)* of paragraph I the passage "other than the said names and crosses, or such other descriptive matter relating to the election as set forth in the form No. 4 in the fifth schedule" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "that may identify the voter".

1b. Section 127 of the principal Act is amended by striking out from subparagraph *(c)* of paragraph II the passage "other than the said names and crosses, or such other descriptive matter relating to the election as set forth in the form No. 4 in the fifth schedule" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "that may identify the voter".

The Government supports the purpose of the Bill, which is to ensure that the intention of the voter is considered by the returning officer and that, in counting the votes at the scrutiny, the returning officer is not directed too forcibly by inflexible provisions within the Act. I believe that the new clauses will make much clearer the intention of the Hon. Mr. Carnie's Bill.

Mr. RUSSACK: I thank the Minister for his comments, and I am pleased that the Government has supported the second reading of the Bill. The amendment involves merely a change of terminology. The spirit of the Bill remains, and the same objective will be achieved. Concern had been expressed that voting papers were cast aside, perhaps because the identity of a voter could be ascertained. The provision covers that area, and we accept the amendment. Apparently, some concern has been expressed, especially where the poll has been close, with one or two votes making a difference in the result. Every candidate should have the right to receive every possible vote. The intention of the measure is to see that, where the intention of the voter is clear, the vote should be accepted, and the amendment does not detract from that purpose.

Dr. EASTICK: Obviously, the provisions of the Bill will be advantageous to all who are genuinely interested in local government. The change of wording now being made does not alter the thrust of the argument put forward by my colleague in another place. I am glad that the problem is being solved, whether in the initial form that came from another place or by the amendment now before the Committee. The end result is what counts, and it is advantageous to local government.

New clauses inserted.

Clause 2—"Voting papers must be given effect to."

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

Page 1, lines 12 and 13—Strike out "be given effect to according to the voter's intention so far as his intention is clear" and insert "not be rejected on the grounds that a cross marked thereon does not comply with the requirements of this Act, if the intention of the voter in so marking the voting paper is clear".

This amendment is consequential on the insertion of the new clauses.

Mr. RUSSACK: The measure was introduced in another place by the Hon. Mr. Carnie. I have spoken to him, and I understand that the amendments are acceptable.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

New clause 3—"Minimum rates."

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

Page 1—After clause 2 insert new clauses as follows;

3. Section 228 of the principal Act is amended by striking out subsection (1b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following subsection:

(1b) A council shall not, in fixing a minimum amount under this section, have regard to any special or separate rates that may be payable in respect of any ratable properties within the area.

New clause 3 refers to the rating powers of councils as they are affected by common effluent drainage schemes. As members know, common effluent drainage has become a highly acceptable and cost effective method of providing a form of sewerage service in small country centres. These schemes are self-financing in that the council strikes a special rate which covers the cost of repaying loans raised

on the capital required for the project and the on-going maintenance costs. However, the Local Government Act ignores some of the peculiar elements of common effluent drainage, and as a result imposes some real difficulties on some councils in recovering reasonable rates for the service.

At the moment when setting a minimum rate councils must take into account all special or separate rates that are payable in respect of ratable properties within their area. This means that the special rate struck for a common drain scheme which is restricted to a geographical area must be taken into account when setting the minimum for the whole council. As a result, the council must either set the minimum rate at a very high level to get a sufficient base figure from those who are benefited by the scheme, and thereby create for all other ratepayers a level which is unreasonably high, or else the council must forgo a reasonable minimum on its effluent drainage scheme in order to keep the minimum rate low over the whole council area.

The second part of these amendments for the effluent drainage scheme relates to section 530c of the principal Act where it is proposed, in new clause 11, to remove the requirement that the rate must be paid by all the ratepayers in the area established for the special rate for common effluent drains, and that it be possible to confine to this the ratepayers who are benefited by the scheme.

This will overcome the unreal situation where owners of vacant land or those who for particular reasons are not required to be connected to the scheme are at present legally required to pay the rate. The section is further amended to provide, legally, a much greater flexibility in the declaration of a rate under a common effluent drainage scheme so that, with the Minister's approval, a council may be able to provide a rating structure that meets the characteristics of the scheme in their community. It has been brought to my attention that a number of councils are charging for effluent drainage in a manner which, although perfectly equitable and acceptable to the ratepayers, may be outside the terms of the Act.

The other new matter that it introduced by the amendments of which I am now giving notice involves alterations to Part XIX of the Local Government Act. In clauses 5 to 10 steps are taken to ensure that a number of regional organisations previously gazetted under existing provisions of the Act are in fact valid. The purpose of these clauses is to provide in Part XIX for joint undertakings to include the different relationships that exist in regional organisations as compared to the fixed cost schemes for the provision of particular physical works or undertakings originally contemplated in the legislation. It has been the Government's policy that, where councils wish to operate together as a regional organisation, they should be permitted to make arrangements acceptable to them and, in terms of the Minister's general responsibility to the community, acceptable to the Minister.

Clause 10 specifically validates those three organisations, which have been incorporated under the existing provisions of Part XIX. Having already dealt with the matter of voting, and as the other matters do not need further explanation, I commend the amendments to the Committee.

Mr. RUSSACK: Yesterday, the Minister made available a copy of the amendments, for which I was grateful. However, I discovered at 1 p.m. today an amended set of amendments, which meant that I had no time to examine closely all the amendments that have been drafted. As the Committee realises as a result of the Minister's explanation, the amendments are many and need scrutiny. I therefore ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

MINORS (CONSENT TO MEDICAL AND DENTAL TREATMENT) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 September. Page 1053.)

Mr. McRAE (Playford): This Bill was first introduced in the Legislative Council by the Hon. Anne Levy on 23 November 1977 and, after being the subject of a Select Committee of that House, was passed in an amended form on 2 August 1978. The Bill was introduced into this House by the member for Ross Smith (as he then was) on 16 August 1978. In introducing the Bill, that honourable member was able to say that, after lengthy debate in the Council and careful scrutiny by the Select Committee, the Bill in its amended form had been carried unanimously.

There has been considerable confusion and concern in the community as to the purpose and intent of the Bill. I am not surprised at that confusion. On the one hand, the Bill deals with technical questions of law and of etiquette and morality, and, at the same time, raises significant questions of responsibility and behaviour precisely when society is re-evaluating the position of the individual, the family and the State in such matters.

I hasten to add that the fact that there is confusion (and I have no doubt that there is) has not influenced my thinking. On the contrary, I have been at considerable pains to read and to try to understand the debate in the Legislative Council, the Select Committee's report, and the debate thus far in this place.

The Bill seeks to define at what age and under what conditions consent to medical and dental treatment may be given by persons who have attained 16 years but who have not yet attained 18 years. As I understand the position, the proponents of the Bill maintain that, provided the professional person is satisfied that a person in that age group has made a free and well-informed decision to undergo treatment that is otherwise lawful, that decision shall be effective and shall conclusively prevent any action against the professional person for assault. The child's remedies in respect of negligence are, of course, maintained.

Honourable members will understand, however, that the professional person will not be required to ascertain the attitude of the child's parents or guardian towards the proposed treatment. The professional person may, of course, seek and ascertain the views of the parents or guardian via his patient but, if his patient persists in either declining to indicate such an attitude or in affirming that he is in effect over-riding the decided views of such parent or guardian, there is nothing further that the professional can do. He can, of course, decline to render the treatment, but in many cases, since the proposed law would grant him immunity, it is likely that he would proceed with the treatment.

The existing state of the law is complex and confused. In respect of what might be termed treatment of a conventional kind, it is unlikely (provided that treatment is willingly and freely submitted to) that the professional person would be guilty of assault. In respect of certain matters of public disputation, which would include the provision of contraceptive devices and the performance of abortions, or the carrying out of surgical treatment of a cosmetic nature, such as re-modelling a child's nose, although that might be the case, it is most unlikely that the medical practitioner would venture to render his services

without a clear and detailed consent of both the child and his parents or guardian. In respect of matters of emergency, the professional person is generally protected by the common law and certainly is protected by the Emergency Medical Treatment of Children Act in respect of life-saving operations and blood transfusions where parental consent is not given.

Both the Hon. Anne Levy and the member for Ross Smith refer to the fourth report on the substantive criminal law of this State by the Mitchell criminal law committee and to an Act of the New South Wales Parliament almost identical in form to this Bill (save that the age in question is 14 years and not 16 years as here proposed) as being of strong support for the Bill. At page 81 of the Mitchell committee report, it is recommended that, in respect of persons above the age of 16 years but not yet of the age of 18 years, where they freely consent to tatooing of the body, the person performing that procedure shall be able to plead consent as a defence to a charge of assault. Furthermore, it is recommended that, on a child's reaching the age of 16 years, he shall be granted the right to refuse the aid granted by the Emergency Medical Treatment of Children Act and refuse an operation or blood transfusion even though that may, or almost certainly will, lead to his death.

Finally, it is recommended that the age of 16 years be generally accepted as the age of consent for purposes of medical or surgical treatment. Before commenting on that, I think it is fair to add that in matters of family law generally, while the courts maintain the power to determine custody, they will not as a matter of practice act against the wishes of a person of the age of 16 years.

Referring, however, to the Mitchell Committee Report, I am obliged to say that I simply cannot agree with the recommendations. Surely members are aware of at least one woman (now of mature years) who bitterly regrets the tattoo marks she consented to years before, which now leave her grossly disfigured and embarrassed. It is absurd to permit the continuation of such a practice, and not only that, but possibly to expand it.

In respect of a person of 16 years who may share his parents' views on the question of an emergency operation or blood transfusion, I am far more able to see the crisis of conscience referred to by the learned committee but, on balance, I am not persuaded to its conclusions. I am, again, only too well aware of a number of persons of adult age who have suffered, and will continue to suffer, from the foolish decisions of their childhood.

Finally, it should be noted that, in what seems to be an exercise of inductive reasoning, the committee's two recommendations just discussed lead to the general formulation of principle. I simply cannot accept the doctrines put to me. Furthermore, I do not accept that the New South Wales Act is of any particular authority since, I have been informed, it passed the Parliament without debate of significant proportion.

Apart from those matters called in aid, the members proposing the Bill produce an argument which in effect states that the age of 16 years is an adequate age to accept the responsibilities of a free choice and urge that, that being the case, the problems which are said to trouble the professional persons should be removed. As against that, I believe that a parent or guardian is entitled to know of both non-controversial and controversial medical or dental treatment that his child of this age proposes to undergo.

Most assuredly, I would like to know if my child was proposing to undergo surgery which, while extremely non-controversial (let us say a tonsillectomy or an appendectomy), did, of its own nature, simply produce a risk factor. Furthermore, the treatment may be non-controversial but one in which the child's parents or guardian might wish to suggest a second opinion or at least discuss the matter with the professional person in question.

Finally, in respect of certain matters where there might be a strong conflict of views between the child and his parents or guardian in the types of situation that I have outlined earlier, one would at least hope for notification of the problem and the opportunity to offer support, comfort and guidance, if nothing else. I have no evidence nor is it even suggested that the current situation has produced an evil: I have no evidence nor is it even suggested that any person has suffered because of the current state of the law: I have no evidence nor is it even suggested that any child, parent or guardian or professional person wants the law to be changed.

I can, of course, envisage curious and unusual situations in which an ill-disposed or evil parent or guardian might abuse the existing situation. Were there evidence of a demand for a change in the law, rather than vote against the Bill I would try to amend it to answer that demand if it was well founded. Even then, I have not hesitated, notwithstanding the lack of such evidence, to attempt such an amendment but I have not been able to find a formula.

I make quite clear that I in no way reflect on the Hon. Anne Levy or the member for Ross Smith who, I am confident, have acted in good faith and conscience throughout. I assure all members that I have most seriously considered the matter before concluding that I cannot support the second reading. I therefore oppose the Bill.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I oppose the second reading. Because notice has been given regarding the time allowed for private members' business, I will not elaborate on the debate other than to say that I support those members who have spoken against the Bill. I have had considerable experience of being a hospital patient with numerous young patients alongside me, and I have seen the situations they have been in. As a result of those situations, I cannot in any circumstances support the Bill.

Mr. DRURY (Mawson): Good arguments have been raised by the member for Morphett and the member for Playford. Being a parent, I would want to know what operations my children were having, because fatalities have occurred during operations. I, for one, would not like to be told by telephone or by a visitor that my child had died during an operation that I did not know he was going to have.

The member for Playford gave various other examples, such as tattooing, which could be summed up by my saying that a person being tattooed at the age of 16 years may think it is fashionable, whereas when he is 20 years or 30 years of age the tattoos remain but fashions have changed, and it is difficult to remove them.

Apart from that, I see the Bill, if it is passed, as perhaps contributing to family tensions, rather than lessening them, if parents see themselves as the guardians of their children until adulthood and if children want to have certain medical attention the parents are not keen on them having. For those reasons, I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. J. C. BANNON (Minister of Community Development): As has been said by speakers in the debate, this is a social measure and, therefore, a matter of conscience. It is not like so many other issues on which the respective political Parties have an ideological or policy position and, therefore, it is freely open to each member, regardless of his political persuasion or support of a political set of beliefs, to exercise that conscience in

respect of the social issue as he thinks fit. The debate has indicated a disparity of views among members, irrespective of the side on which they sit, as to whether this is a desirable measure.

As I said in the opening of the debate, the Bill does not reduce the age of consent or do anything as regards it, except clarify at common law a position which everyone, except the member for Morphett, has conceded is somewhat murky. Several speakers have suggested that the Bill is an attack on the family and is aimed at destroying the family structure and family life, but that is not true; nor does it weaken the family. At present, at the age of 16 years a child can leave home without the consent or the knowledge of his parents, and there is nothing the law can do. Some people do not like it, but that is the law as it stands.

Checks and balances are built into the wording of the Act, but these have been ignored by some speakers in the debate. It is one thing to say, as the member for Kavel said, that a member represents the views of his electorate, but the member for Kavel regards his electorate and himself as conservative on social measures, and he is opposed to the measure. If that is his conscientious position, we cannot argue about that.

When members have gone into the substance of the Bill, they have tended to ignore and become emotional about its possible import. The word "emotional" was used by the member for Fisher, when he said that young people can be emotional but that the Bill did not provide that a minor must be responsible and informed; this was reflected again by the member for Hanson.

The member for Hanson referred to the fact that some young people, particularly those afflicted by certain illnesses, might not be able to make decisions and might authorise a medical practitioner when they could be misinformed about the treatment, which could have disastrous consequences. All those statements miss the key point inserted by the Select Committee in another place, namely, the definition of "consent", which makes clear that "consent" means "an informed consent". The word "informed" is in the legislation. It must be informed consent given after a proper and sufficient explanation of the nature of the medical treatment and the likely consequences.

The consent has to be informed and the explanation has to be proper and sufficient and it has to deal with the nature of the treatment and the consequences. That is all contained in the Bill. If that requirement is not met, consent cannot validly be given in terms of this legislation. I think that provides every safeguard that honourable members on both sides of the House want. That is why it was recommended by the Select Committee. It was not in the original Bill.

The member for Morphett claimed that the common law was quite clear. I think only a member of the legal profession could make a statement with such aplomb and make it sound justified, without recognising that there was considerable dispute and debate about the state of the law. If there was not, there would be no point in introducing this measure. He admits there is confusion in a case of conflict between parent and child, but he tends to scrub out other areas of doubt and uncertainty. He referred to the effect this might have on the Emergency Medical Treatment of Children Act, but that Act is not relevant, because the powers under it are construed as additional to and not in derogation of any other power provided either legislatively or by common law. I refer him to section 3 (3) of that Act in support of my remarks.

He made, I felt, the somewhat facetious point about doctors aiding and abetting an offence by prescribing the pill for a child below the age of consent. In his reference to the Mitchell committee report, as with the member for Fisher and the member for Playford, he tended to dismiss it and disagree. Those findings are open to disagreement on grounds of conscience by any honourable member, but I think his speech indicated that there were considerable doubts about the position. This legislation seeks to clarify those doubts.

I think the member for Playford gave a good and accurate summary of the Bill and its purpose. I am disappointed that, having seen the Bill as clearly as he has, he finds himself unable to support it. He admits that the existing state of the law is complex and confused, but he seems to base his objections, first, on what he sees as the inadequacies of the measure and, secondly, on a lack of evidence of people wanting a new Act.

I will now summarise my arguments in support of the Bill. The first question one asks about this measure is whether it is necessary. I say it is, because the law is confused and complex. Some social good can flow from this Bill. Will this Bill achieve its aims? The answer is that it can. Limitations are written into the Bill, with checks and balances, particularly by reason of the definition of "consent", which overcomes many of the objections.

Is it a completely new or experimental measure in what is a fairly delicate area of social reform? The answer to that question is that it is not. This type of legislation has been on the Statute Book in a far less carefully constructed form in New South Wales for some years, and no problems have arisen. It has been in practice and has worked, so we are not embarking into an area of experimentation or on a path that has not been trodden before. There are no hidden dangers, I am suggesting, in the measure as proposed.

Has it been given proper consideration and thought? Clearly, it has been because it was the subject of a searching inquiry by a Select Committee in another place that took evidence and made amendments to the original measure which have improved and clarified it. I think, therefore, that the Bill as it has come to this place is a well finished and well thought out measure. Have people generally had an opportunity to consider it? Again, the answer to that question is that they have, through the Select Committee process and discussion surrounding the Bill. No substantial objections have been raised to the Bill as it stands in relation to the detailed clauses. The arguments against it have tended to be generalised and, I suggest, somewhat emotional.

Finally, I think that, if this measure is defeated, it will be unfortunate, because it provides important clarification of the law. It does not have in it any hidden dangers to society, our social fabric or the family. It will make the position of medical practitioners, people offering the treatment, and people seeking it, quite clear and give them certain protection at law. It has in it safeguards for those people. I commend this Bill to the House and urge members not to react against it but to support it as being a reasonably progressive but essentially not very radical measure.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon (teller), Broomhill, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, Klunder, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (27)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Chapman, Corcoran, Drury, Eastick, Evans (teller), Goldsworthy, Groom, Gunn, Mathwin, McRae, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, Wells, Wilson, and Wotton.

Majority of 8 for the Noes.
Second reading thus negatived.

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 11 October. Page 1378.)

Mr. KLUNDER (Newland): First, I refer to the Leader's speech, particularly the logic that he used in that speech. He told us that the Opposition voted for a motion in which the crucial term was "not yet", and he stressed that term. What happened next in his speech was that the Leader moved away from logic in one of those deft sideways arabesques of his, and he is now screaming with frustration that the Government will not follow him. Let me illustrate this point. The Leader claims that, although the Government introduced the motion containing the words "not yet" and voted for a motion containing the words "not yet", what the Government really meant to do, according to the Leader, was secretly to pretend that the motion was one that would leave uranium in the ground forever. He then indicated that the expected result of this inference would be that no further mining exploration and no further keeping up with the technology of uranium would occur in this State. He then expressed his great disappointment that, in fact, these things did occur. In other words, he makes an unwarranted inference, draws a conclusion from that inference, and then gets upset because the Government will not act in accordance with his fantasy. The Deputy Leader, of course, as is his wont, went one step further and, for some peculiar reason, decided that a Government acting in accordance with its own motion had to be hypocritical. The Leader claims to have been conned, and he indicated that, if his Party had been aware of this, the Liberal Party would not have voted for the motion of 30 March 1977. Even that claim, tortuous though it is, is not in accordance with the facts.

The television interview with the Australian Broadcasting Commission, at which the Premier is supposed to have indicated a much harder line than the motion indicated, took place on the very night of the debate and, in fact, the member for Davenport referred to that interview later in the evening before the vote was taken. The *News* of that date carried an article referring to the so-called hard-line policy on uranium, but the Leader should have known the Labor Party's intention and the Premier's intention much earlier than that. On 27 July 1976, at page 192 of *Hansard*, in reply to a censure motion by the Leader of the Opposition, the following interchange occurred, commencing with the following statement by the Premier:

> We made it clear as soon as the report was released that a decision would not be made in relation to the mining of uranium or its enrichment in South Australia unless it was established publicly that it was safe to provide a customer country with any form of uranium.
>
> Mr. Millhouse: You'll never establish that.
>
> The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know that we will not establish that, but if we do not do so, the Government will not proceed.
>
> Mr. Millhouse: Good!
>
> The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have made that clear from the outset: it is clearly Australian Labor Party policy and it was discussed at the Labor Party conference held in South Australia. The motion on this matter, which affirmed that policy and which was seconded by me, was passed without opposition at that conference.

So much for the Leader's contention that he did not know what the Government really meant when it passed that motion; of course the Opposition knew, and it knowingly voted for the motion. However, let us accept for a moment the Leader's contention that the Liberal Party was conned. I have struck another difficulty here: the Liberals never cease telling us that they vote as individuals; they are proud of it, and they never cease to say so. In this case, we are therefore asked to believe that 18 (or at that stage 21) Liberal Party members were individually fooled by the Government motion: each and every one of them presumably took the same logical steps to decide that the Government must have been right, and now presumably they have taken individual logical steps to decide the Government is wrong. There is a word for people of that limited intellectual ability—morons. Here we have 18 individual self-confessed morons—people who, even after the debates that took place here, did not hear the information, did not read it afterwards, and therefore we would have to call them self-confessed, individual, deaf, illiterate morons.

The member for Davenport is in a separate category because, on the day of the debate, he referred to it. Therefore, not only is he a deaf, illiterate, self-confessed, individual moron, but there is an 18-month delay between his mouth and his brain. I do not think you, Mr. Speaker, are likely to accept wagers; that is a pity, because I would like to make a wager. I predict that at the end of this debate all of those individuals who make up their minds by themselves will decide to vote for the Leader's motion. It is rather frightening when individuality becomes that predictable.

My second point has already been made by the member for Mitcham. This motion totally misses the previous motion. The Deputy Leader said he did not believe that, so I will spell it out for him in terms that even he may be able to understand. The previous motion of 30 March 1977 indicated that, while mining and treatment were safe, use and disposal were not. The previous motion therefore said that, since use and disposal were not safe, mining and treatment should not occur. This motion, of course, moves peculiarly in reverse of this logic and says that, since mining and treatment are relatively safe, we should therefore proceed with use and disposal. It therefore completely misses the previous motion. The fascinating thought is that the Leader may be trying to con his 17 individual colleagues. One of the arguments put forward by proponents of uranium mining is that put forward by the Deputy Leader when he said that we need to mine uranium to provide energy for our poor brethren in the third world; that is a philanthropic stance. What we are doing, according to this stance, is not mining uranium to get rich but to help other people—a most commendable stance.

We can expose this piece of hypocrisy very simply and ask whether the various companies that would like to be involved in uranium mining would be prepared to do so at cost or even at a slight loss to prove their good faith. The answer is obvious. The second argument is that, if we do not mine uranium, someone else will, and we may as well get in for a piece of the action. That is the moral stance of a hyena, and I am probably maligning that poor animal. I will say no more about this particular stance except to say that it is the moral stance that built the gas ovens at Auschwitz and Buchenwald. The third argument is at least honest, even if it is misplaced; it is that we will get rich out of uranium mining and selling. The Leader instanced in

considerable detail the exact sum that we would get from such a scheme at Roxby Downs, but he did not say who would get rich and where the money would be going.

It is well known to most people that mining is not a labour-intensive industry, so it does not provide that many jobs. The profits from mining, thanks to the recent actions of the Federal Liberal Government, do not in any shape or form stay in Australia: they tend to go overseas. Therefore, we would be making other people rich at our expense.

A fourth argument, and one that was used by the Leader, although he did not specify any proof whatever for it, is that it is now safe to provide customer countries with uranium because of the international agreements that now exist. I do not know whether the Leader really believes that international agreements are worth the paper they are written on, but in case he does I will quote him something that was said towards the end of 1947 by Prime Minister Nehru of India:

> Whatever policy we may lay down, the art of conducting the foreign affairs of a country lies in finding out what is most advantageous to the country. We may talk about international goodwill and mean what we say, we may talk about peace and freedom and earnestly mean what we say, but in the ultimate analysis a Government functions for the good of the country it governs, and no Government dare do anything which in the short or long term is manifestly to the disadvantage of the country.

When the Deputy Leader spoke of living in the real world, I wonder whether that is the real world he meant. This, the twentieth century, is the century of the nation state. People will die for their nation in the way they died for their king and country in the last century and the way they died for religion in the centuries before that. No nation will give a damn about any pieces of paper when it sees its own interests, let alone its own survival, threatened.

Moreover, the Australian Government in the person of Mr. Doug Anthony has been promising uranium or trying to find markets for uranium not only amongst the stable democratic States, which might at least be persuaded to give lip service to international agreements, but also to such States as South Korea and the Philipines, neither of which has a necessarily stable, democratically elected and honest Government. We could ask to what extent we have set the pace for other countries to look after their waste disposal and their uranium. One need look only at the Maralinga situation that has blown up in the past couple of weeks to get a fair idea. Apparently plutonium is there. We were not told about it until it was leaked to the press, and then the Minister for Defence got uptight about the situation. In other words, he would have preferred not to tell anyone about it at all. If we are like that, what are other countries like?

There is an interesting side light to the affair at Maralinga. There are four policemen there, and a total cost of maintaining those gentlemen would be about $50 000 a year. It has been estimated that it is necessary to keep plutonium for about 500 000 years, so the cost amounts to $25 000 000 000, which makes it a particularly cheap form of energy.

Mr. Allison: It's not dangerous—

Mr. KLUNDER: That is right, not for the first 20 years; one would be perfectly safe, but after that problems would arise, and one's children would not be too good, but that is beside the point! I do not wish to prolong this debate unduly by repeating points that have already been covered by other members both in this debate and in the previous one in this House. They have already clearly indicated that there are three separate types of danger associated with the provision of uranium to a customer country. Firstly, there are the dangers of increased risks associated with accidents, theft, loss and terrorism; and perhaps it is interesting to note that on 1 October 1977 the *Advertiser* reported that 75 kg of uranium metal was found in a scrap-metal yard in London.

The Monte Bello Islands were referred to on *Four Corners* over the weekend. In that situation Australia has been looking after some of the atomic explosions carried out by the British in the 1950's. Apparently there are no fences, signs or guards to indicate that atomic bombs were once exploded there. Visiting reporters were told that when their Geiger counters showed counts of 500 they had better get out quickly, and the counts actually went up to 3 000. Apparently some young people camping there had used as tent pegs some of the metal pegs lying around that had given counts of up to 3 000. If our own Government is not prepared to look after this situation, how can we expect other people to do so?

The second danger is that of proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is almost impossible to check on how much the output for a breeder reactor is, so that any country that gets hold of its original stock can breed as much plutonium as it wishes.

The third danger is that of the storage and disposal of waste material. I trust that members have read the interesting article that was sent to them called *Reprocessing the Truth*, by Edward Goldsmith, Peter Bunyard, and Nicholas Hildyard. It is especially in regard to storage and disposal that I would like to bring various points to the attention of the House, because they have not yet been mentioned here. The various people who have spoken about the half-life period of waste material have generally talked in terms of 500 000 years of storage time being required. This is based on the fact that plutonium has a half life of about 30 000 years and, if one maintains plutonium waste under storage for roughly 10 times this length of time, less than 0·1 of 1 per cent of the plutonium is still active.

However, it does not cover the fact that many waste materials have half lives considerably longer than this, and some materials, such as plutonium, change to other materials after their half life, and those materials into which they change are equally dangerous.

Mr. Millhouse: It is a rather academic debate, though. What does it matter whether it is 500 000 years or 750 000 years?

Mr. KLUNDER: The honourable member is right but, if 750 000 years ago the decision had been made that the Liberals would like us to make now, it would not be that sort of esoteric situation at all.

Mr. Millhouse: I don't think you can convince them if it's 750 000 and not 500 000 years.

Mr. KLUNDER: I am aware that the Opposition will not be convinced. I have already predicted how it will vote. However, I want to let some of the people out in the community know the dangers associated with trusting people of that ilk. I will give some of these figures because I am not even sure that members of the Opposition know that they exist.

The uranium series, which starts as uranium 238, has a half life itself of 4 500 000 000 years, and that means that half of the material changes to a different material called thorium in 4 500 000 000 years, and half of what remains changes in the next 4 500 000 000, so that after 9 000 000 000 years there is still one-quarter of the original material left.

It then changes into thorium, which has a fairly limited half-life period, but thorium changes after its half life to uranium 234, which has a half life of 270 000 years. I have forgotten how many steps there are in that series, but I

think that there are eight or nine. Each of them has a half life before the material actually changes to lead. The actinium series, which starts as uranium 235, which is one of the refined products from uranium, also changes to lead, and the longest half life in that series is 710 000 000 years.

Plutonium is part of the neptunium series, and the longest half life in that is 2 200 000 years. It is one of those ridiculous situations where once one starts the process running there is no way of ever stopping it. It can be seen that even the half life of plutonium, which becomes relatively inactive as plutonium after 500 000 years, does not mean that the material is then safe; it has merely changed its name and its toxic qualities.

Even after taking the 500 000 years as a reasonable estimate of the time for which one would have to hold nuclear material before it became sufficiently cool and safe for dispersal, one still has the situation where the recorded history of mankind is about 5 000 years, yet no civilisation has even lasted for one-fifth of that time. We are assuming that we can maintain adequate facilities for storage, cooling and control for some of these materials for 100 times the length of the existence of the recorded history of man.

If one has to make provision for the energy needed to store this material properly, it is the least effective energy source the world has ever seen. The people who feel that this is not a problem either do not mind setting off time bombs or are hopelessly insane.

Mr. Millhouse: They are greedy.

Mr. KLUNDER: I will come to the greed factor in a moment. The second of these is worth commenting on, because, if we ever do find a way of altering the rate of radio-active decay (and I think I have mentioned the possibility of dealing with the waste itself, or alternatively of altering the rate of radio-active decay), then we will have our energy source and we will not need the present sources at all. That is something which is very frequently overlooked.

Much has been said about storage, but I notice that the university people, who have claimed that they had vitrification down to a fine art, have been very quiet of late, and it has not been taken up by politicians in whose interests it would be to be able to claim that there was a safe disposal measure. It has been mentioned that we could dispose of this material in stable geological situations such as pre-cambrian rock, but, of course, in the time scale we are discussing no rock of any kind can be considered to be geologically stable. We are saying that, since a catastrophe may or may not happen a long way in the future, we can wash our hands of it at the moment. Apparently there are some people who are prepared to put the short-term profits of certain overseas shareholders ahead of the increased risk for all of us. I do not intend to be one of them.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I thank honourable members for their consideration of what I believe to be a most important subject, and a subject which I believe we should start trying to get into perspective in this State and in this country. The contribution from the member who has just spoken I think was probably covered fairly well in the speech made by the Attorney-General. He added nothing new, giving the same procession of misconceptions and scientific inaccuracies, as I will demonstrate when I deal with the Attorney-General's points later. The contribution from the member for Mitcham is worthy of comment only because of a misrepresentation resulting from his remarkable ability to recall matters in the way that best suits the occasion.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I actually thought that the member for Mitcham made a fairly good speech.

Mr. TONKIN: He may have done so in his own opinion but not in mine. In this debate he stated that I had at one time signed a petition for a five-year moratorium on uranium. In the *Hansard* report of the debate on a related matter, dealt with in the House last year, he said that I specifically did not sign a petition for a five-year moratorium. I do wish he would remember which attitude he adopts at any one time. At that time he made specific mention of the fact that I had struck out that clause before signing the petition. He cannot have it both ways. I can only say that his most recent statement was quite untrue and a measure only of his bitterness and determination to attack the Liberal Party which he seems to adopt at all stages nowadays in order to help the Labor Party.

The Premier did little better in his response to the motion. He said in opening:

> 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.

That statement, too, was totally untrue, and made in a fashion which was also reminiscent of a schoolboy debate. He would have done better to move at once to the substantive defence of his attitude which he outlined later. That defence rests on the contention that the Government is not convinced that it is safe to supply uranium to a customer country because it believes there is no satisfactory way of dealing with high level wastes and that there are (in its opinion) no satisfactory safeguards.

At least the Premier has conceded that the mining and enrichment or uranium does not present a danger to the people or the environment of this State. That, as the Premier admits, is not at issue. What is at issue is whether or not it is safe to supply uranium to a customer country. It is quite apparent that some people will say that it will never be safe to supply uranium to a customer country. "We are for the future of the world" was the interjection of the Chief Secretary. He will never be convinced whatever advances are made. His mind is totally closed.

People like this have always expressed doubts about any new development, throughout history. There were probably people in the Bronze Age, or about that time, when the knife was first invented, who would have nothing to do with it. They would have liked to impose a total ban on knives for everyone, because there was danger of an accident occurring with such a sharp object, and this danger was not something which should be bequeathed to future generations.

Rumours and speculation as to the dangerous effects of the steam train were rife for some years after its invention. Not only was there a danger from possible explosion of the boiler but alas the dire effects on the human body travelling at speeds in excess of 15 miles per hour was a matter of continued speculation and conjecture for long after cold hard experience had shown fears to be groundless.

There are many other such examples, not the least of which is the development of the automobile. We have come a long way from the days when a man with a red flag walked before the first horseless carriages. In spite of all the fears and concerns expressed at the time, the motor car, with all its inherent problems and dangers, has become part of our daily lives. That dangers exist cannot be denied. Last year in Australia there were 67 549 accidents, 91 616 people were injured, and 3 578 people, unfortunately were killed.

There have been dangers involved in every development

which has contributed to the advancement of mankind, and mankind has generally treated each development with caution and respect. The best possible safeguards have been evolved, but there has been no suggestion, for instance, that the car should never have been developed.

The Attorney-General says that the fundamental future of the human race depends on the issue of whether the world should become nuclear powered. He should face up to reality. Nuclear power is now supplying energy for many countries, and has been doing so for some 20 years. Nothing can stop the world from becoming nuclear powered. It is largely nuclear powered, and, indeed the energy requirements of the third world (and I do not think we should sneer at those requirements) demand that nuclear energy be used until satisfactory alternative energy sources can be developed.

The continued burning of fossil fuels at the rate necessary to supply the total energy needs of the world by the turn of the century will result, it is stated by environmental scientists who have every reason to be believed, in major climatic changes because of increased atmospheric carbon dioxide. The effects on the world environment which would follow melting of even a small part of the polar ice caps would be disastrous.

The plain fact, which members on the opposite side of this debate seem to be ignoring, is that nuclear power is well established throughout the world, and that we cannot afford not to use it until satisfactory alternatives are found. Naturally, we must take every possible precaution, by way of negotiated treaties and safeguards and with advancing technology, but these must be continually updated as that technology advances. No-one can expect them to be absolutely foolproof, but it is patently obvious that the use of nuclear energy, at this stage, is a great deal safer than is the use of the motor car.

The Attorney-General brought forth (and these were echoed by the honourable member for Newland a little while ago) a procession of unsubstantiated rumours, stories and emotional comments. I believe it is absolutely essential that we examine them. The recently released report on Windscale, conducted by Mr. Justice Parker, shows that he believes clearly that the advantages of reprocessing spent fuel from overseas clearly outweigh the disadvantages, and that plants should be double the size required for dealing solely with spent fuels from British reactors.

That was the basis of the inquiry on which Mr. Justice Parker was engaged. I refer to a report in the *Bulletin* of 17 October 1978 headed "The Anatomy of an Atomic Scare Story", which makes extremely good reading, and I commend it to members opposite who spoke against this motion. The report states:

> In the scare over Maralinga plutonium last week the spectre was once again raised that terrorists could somehow threaten a city with "extremely toxic" plutonium. They would certainly have needed a lot more than the half a kilogram at Maralinga to be successful, because while plutonium is certainly toxic—particularly if inhaled—it is not as horrifically toxic as anti-uranium propagandists would have us believe.
>
> Contrary to propaganda, plutonium cannot travel rapidly in groundwater because it is absorbed and held in situ by soil. This has occurred as a natural phenomenon in Gabon. A succinct summary of the dangers and non-dangers of plutonium is contained in the Parker report on the United Kingdom Windscale inquiry.

That is the inquiry to which I just referred. The report continues:

> In his findings, Mr. Justice Parker said: "It is not true that plutonium is highly radio-active. Its principal isotope, plutonium 239, is relatively stable and as a consequence its half life is very long and its radio-activity per unit mass very low."

This is something which we know perfectly well but which the member for Newland has chosen to ignore totally. The longer the half life (the matter which has been emphasised by all honourable members opposite) the lower the level of radio-activity. The report goes on:

> It is not true—

This is Mr. Justice Parker—

> that in all circumstances very small amounts of plutonium are lethal. Insoluble particles when inhaled are certainly hazardous in small quantities. Considerably larger amounts could be eaten without appreciable harm.
>
> "It is not true that plutonium is only safe when protected by massive shielding . . . it could be sat on safely by a person with no greater protection than . . . a stout pair of jeans. It is not true that plutonium is the most toxic substance known to man. Numerous radionuclides are more toxic than plutonium 239 if present in food or water, and particularly the isotopes of radium . . ."
>
> Mr. Justice Parker pointed out that, among other things, plutonium 238 is used within the body as a power source for heart pacemakers. A terrorist threatening Adelaide's water supply would be better off using mercury or arsenic. The stomach contents would tend to neutralise the alpha-radiation of any plutonium which was ingested and the body would tend to excrete it. It is therefore less deadly than mercury and arsenic, which never decay away and have an infinite half life.
>
> One more fact: plutonium is about 10 times as toxic as the caffeine in your coffee. But, of course, you couldn't make much of a scare story out of an unguarded five-kilogram discrete mass of caffeine being abandoned outside the old Maralinga canteen.

That sums up the situation extremely well with the mixture of scientific fact and a little humour and ridicule, and that is about what this deserves.

The Federal Government's safeguards meet the non-proliferation treaty requirements and the needs of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Mr. Justice Fox has been appointed a roving ambassador to keep the Federal Government informed and to watch Australia's interests. Detailed discussions and agreements with overseas countries have been concluded. There can be no question of the adequacy of safeguards developed since 30 March 1977. They would satisfy any reasonable person; they obviously satisfy the Government's Mines Department officers, who continue to grant exploration licences and keep up with uranium mining and technology. They obviously satisfy members of the Government's own Uranium Enrichment Committee following most detailed examinations and reporting.

Only the Labor Party members appear to be unreasonable. It may be said with infinite safety that not all of them are unreasonable. I believe that the Minister of Mines and Energy, his predecessor, and a number of other members on the opposite benches, basically believe that we should be getting on with the job that was started by this Government, and conducted through the Mines Department by the Uranium Enrichment Committee. Let us get on with the job and start doing something for South Australia.

In spite of the logical succession of events, the Premier, the Attorney-General and the member for Newland all attempted to use yet again the old persuasion that Opposition members voted for the original motion, and therefore should still stick to that attitude. They said we had changed our minds. That is just not so, as the terms of the original motion on 30 March 1977 clearly show.

The Opposition had not made up its mind at that stage, in common with Federal Government members and Opposition members. Clearly, the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Whitlam, had the day before expressed qualified support for the use, mining, enrichment and export of uranium.

The Opposition has since conducted detailed investigations of available information. Its members have had discussions with nuclear physicists. It has assessed the safeguard provisions and made a general evaluation of the experience of the past 20 years. Opposition members have worked extremely hard on this whole problem, and the Opposition has now found it possible to make up its mind on this issue. That is why it believes that the passage of this motion is essential.

The State Australian Labor Party members used the 30 March motion to close their minds to further developments. No matter how reasonable, at a time when the Federal colleagues of Government members expressed qualified support for uranium mining, the State Labor Party Government retains its closed mind attitude. It hopes to stifle reasonable consideration by suppressing information—for example, the third report of the Uranium Enrichment Committee. The economic future of South Australia will hang on the development of Roxby Downs, and of uranium and enrichment, in the presence of acceptable and reasonable safeguards. I, and other Opposition members, believe that these exist. That development must go ahead, not only for the good of the State and of the nation but also for the energy needs of the world until the next century. I urge all members to support the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (26)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran (teller), Drury, Duncan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, Klunder, McRae, Millhouse, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Nankivell. No—Mr. Dunstan.

Majority of 8 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 September. Page 1041.)

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): The Bill, introduced in this House by the member for Davenport—

Mr. Gunn: A very good Bill it was, too.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The honourable member illustrates the height of his ignorance by interjecting during my second reading speech. Second reading speeches are usually heard in silence.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Labour and Industry has the floor.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I will start again. The Bill, introduced in this House by the member for Davenport, seeks to make five specific amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act.

Mr. Mathwin: Do you want silence?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: No, I do not. However, I do not want to be interfered with by the honourable member, either.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order. The Minister of Labour and Industry has the floor.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: These five provisions seem to have been selected on an arbitrary basis from matters upon which there is consensus that change of some kind is required. It would seem as though, in choosing those amendments, the member for Davenport has been extremely selective and has ignored a number of other matters which could equally be included in the Bill. Even more to the point, he has ignored the total context in which the 1976 amendments were offered and in which amendments were prepared earlier this year.

In particular, I refer members to the major changes proposed in the insurance area that would have ensured that any concession made to employer interests was balanced by an offsetting reduction in workmen's compensation premiums and would therefore have been contributory factors in incentives to either extra employment or the employment of disabled workers. It is important to place on record that many of the remarks made by the member for Davenport in his second reading speech cannot be substantiated by evidence and are, in fact, blatantly untrue. Specifically, the member for Davenport has said:

> This Bill makes five amendments to the principal Act. Four of those amendments were proposed by the Liberal Party in 1976 and accepted by the Government, although they were eventually lost with the rest of the proposed amendments. In 1976, the Minister of Labour and Industry went so far as allowing these four amendments to be written into the Government's Bill when it passed through the House of Assembly.

Even a cursory glance at *Hansard* in relation to the proceedings on the October 1976 Bill would have shown these claims to be utterly without foundation. Two of the amendments now moved by the honourable member, those relating to the journey provisions in section 9 and the holiday provisions in section 54, were contained in the Bill prepared by the Government and introduced into the House. Where the honourable member can find that these were Liberal Party amendments defies reason.

Mr. Dean Brown: They were in Don Laidlaw's Bill, and you know it.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The honourable member can check *Hansard*, where he will find that they were not in the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw's Bill before they were in mine.

Mr. Dean Brown: You got them out of Don Laidlaw's Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not Question Time. The Minister of Labour and Industry has the floor.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Thank you for your protection, Sir. A third amendment (section 32a) was indeed moved by the Liberal Party in both this House and in another place, and, as appears in *Hansard,* was specifically opposed and defeated by the Government. A fourth, the amendment to section 52, I shall deal with in Committee. In addition, the member for Davenport's description of his clauses in some cases does not accurately reflect the relevant provisions, and in this respect I refer to clause 5, which provides for a notice period of 14 days, and not 21 days, as stated in the honourable member's explanation.

The Government is also concerned that the honourable member has sought to introduce his own ideological approach under the guise of general acceptance. It is no secret that the Government intended to introduce amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act this year. A Bill was prepared and printed on 9 March 1978, as

the honourable member knows. In accordance with my policy of having full consultation in important industrial relations matters with representatives of employers and trade unions, the members of the Premier's Industrial Development Advisory Committee and my Industrial Relations Advisory Council were given the opportunity to comment on the draft Bill.

As a result of that consultation, and after members of I.R.A.C. had consulted the executive committees of their own organisations, the Government agreed with requests made by I.D.A.C. and three of the major employer associations that, instead of proceeding with the Bill, the Government should have a wide-ranging inquiry into the whole basis of compensating and rehabilitating injured workers.

However, despite the fact that the Government, at the request of employer associations, decided not to proceed with its own amendments to the Act, but to appoint a tripartite committee to examine and report on the most effective means of rehabilitating and compensating persons injured at work, the Government has decided not to oppose the Bill outright. Thus, where, by the amendment, there is a possibility of an improvement in the working of the present Act without detriment to a significant community group, the Government considers it appropriate to accept that amendment with or without variation.

Accordingly, the Government will respond to the Bill by accepting those provisions in the present Bill in a modified form which are in accordance with suggestions made by broad community interests and which have achieved general acceptance. In addition, it is considered appropriate to include certain other drafting or administrative provisions that will provide an improvement in the working of the present Act.

In endeavouring to make some amendments that would meet his own purpose, the member for Davenport has overlooked many others, some of which have been requested or agreed to by employers, and he is apparently not aware of the strong feeling in the community that the title and the terminology of the Act should be amended so that it should be titled the Workers Compensation Act rather than the Workmen's Compensation Act. If the Act is to be amended, this is clearly the appropriate occasion to make that change so as to demonstrate from its title, and terminology, that the Act applies to all employees, irrespective of sex.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): One of the things the Bill overlooks is that the great majority of people in our community, certainly the workers, regard the existing Workmen's Compensation Act as excellent and a vast improvement on the so-called Workmen's Compensation Acts of the past that were foisted on them by a progression of conservative Governments. I have sat in the Chamber often and listened to the ridiculous comments made by the member for Davenport and others who supported him, usually without argument, or with arguments certainly not soundly based on fact.

It has been clear for some time that the Act, good though it is, has needed some amendment. As long ago as two years, the Minister, with the support of the Labor Party, attempted certain amendments to the Act. What happened was that the Legislative Council, urged on by the member for Davenport and those who supported him, demanded such ridiculous and provocative amendments that no reasonable person could have accepted them. As a result, the Government was forced to lose the various Bills it introduced. On this occasion, as the Minister has rightly said, there are some good points in the Bill the member for Davenport has introduced.

Let no member think, certainly no member of the community, that the member for Davenport was a shining light in this matter. Every single thing the member for Davenport has had to say and any difficulty to which he has pointed have been foreseen by this Government and its industrial committee two or more years ago. We have tried to implement amendments, only to have our best endeavours frustrated deliberately. On at least two occasions I can recall the absurd day-long confrontations with the Legislative Council in an endeavour to reach some reasonableness on the matter, only to lose out totally.

The amendments foreshadowed by the Minister will deal with some of the obvious defects in the drafting of the Bill.

In particular, in relation to hearing loss, it is essential that, if amendments are to be made to implement the correct policy (namely, that a worker is entitled to proper compensation for noise-induced hearing loss relating to loss caused by his employment but is not entitled to losses that had occurred prior to his employment with that particular firm if they were not work induced or, on the other hand, that there should be some protection to the final employer if apportionment is needed), significant redrafting is required, in the course of which it is not an overstatement to say that a legal nightmare is involved. I know that the Minister and his committee have been at great pains, with the assistance of the Parliamentary Counsel, to try to ensure that all of these objectives are achieved. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

JURIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

HARBORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

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

BROKEN HILL PROPRIETARY COMPANY'S STEEL WORKS INDENTURE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Order of the Day: Government Business, No. 1: Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 3 August. Page 324.)

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

That this Order of the Day be read and discharged.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2) AND PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy) moved:

That the time allotted in connection with these Bills be as follows:

For the remainder of the Committee stages of the Bills, until 4.15 p.m. on 20 October, and for the remaining stages of the Bills, until 4.30 p.m. on 20 October.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

In Committee.

(Continued from 17 October. Page 1492.)

Schedule.

Marine and Harbors, $12 051 000.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Last year I asked questions about the use of Outer Harbor in terms of ships using the facilities, and I also asked questions about the container terminal. The Minister told me that one of his senior officers has been sent overseas to tell firms what South Australia had to offer and to drum up trade for the State. It appears those efforts have not been successful. What happened as a result of those overseas negotiations? I assume that the amount of $16 000 shown for overseas visits of officers will be used for the same purpose as was the $13 500 spent last year.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): I do not have information on the money spent last year or the effectiveness of it, and I will get a report on that matter. The provision this year is for a tour to Japan by the Director and the Commercial Manager, and for the Director to attend an International Association of Ports and Harbors conference in France and visit eastern European shipping organisations. The department is pursuing its attempt to attract direct shipping services between this State and those important overseas trading areas. The provision for overseas visits is directly connected with attempts to attract additional shipping to South Australia.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister give me details about the amount provided for payments to corporations and district councils?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That amount provides for the statutory amounts payable under the Harbors Act. I presume that, wherever the Department of Marine and Harbors has an installation, it is involved in some sort of payment under the Harbors Act to the relevant district council or corporation.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: An amount of $8 000 000 is allowed for maintenance of wharves, and that is one of the largest provisions in the section. Will the Minister give me details of the payments involved?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think the amount shown as "Less—Charged to other accounts" gives about the amount of the line the honourable member has cited, which is charged to the Loan and Deposit Account. Roughly, $3 500 000 of that line is for direct maintenance. The maintenance programme has only slightly expanded over that applying last year, but, against that, last year was considerably reduced, so in terms of the provision made it is down on what was voted in the 1977-78 Budget.

It is expected that salaries and wages will have to be charged to Loan and Deposit Account, which is the line shown "Less—Charged to other accounts". Salaries and wages are expected to remain relatively stable, being attributable mainly to the carry-over of award variations in 1977-78. In real terms, the level of funds transferred from the Revenue Account is expected to decrease, owing to the reduction in the 1978-79 capital works programme. Current Loan projects have passed the planning stage, which will necessitate the use of design staff in revenue projects. In real terms, the amount being charged to Loan Account is likely to be down, which means some design staff will be used on revenue projects relating to maintenance and other works, as against construction.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If $3 500 000 is being used for maintenance, obviously $4 500 000 is being used for construction work. What are the details of that work?

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

Mr. BLACKER: What progress has been made at Franklin Harbor in deepening the channel and up-grading the wharf?

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

Mr. GUNN: About 14 months ago, when the Premier met a deputation of fishermen at Streaky Bay, he agreed to have investigated the possibility of improving the fish handling facilities for the district. It was pointed out to him that a large quantity of tuna is landed at Streaky Bay. Can the Minister state the results of that investigation, because improvements are long overdue?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I suspect that this matter is related to fishing havens in the Loan programme, but I will try to get the information for the honourable member.

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Minister say where the cost of purchasing Halmatic fibreglass hulls from England is included in the votes? We have a capacity in South Australia to produce excellent 40ft. fibreglass hulls. The Tasmanian Government has purchased one such hull that was built in Port Lincoln, and I support the local industry at Port Lincoln. The Northern Territory Government has just had a vessel completed, and 12 such fishing vessels are operating off the New South Wales coast and have met stringent requirements. However, the South Australian Government is not prepared to use the efficient local product, although the price of the imported vessel is more than double the price of the locally built unit. The Government should not snub the efforts and ability of the local industry.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Again, I suspect that this is a capital works matter, but I will get the information that the honourable member has requested.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Recently I received from the District Clerk of the Beachport Council a tape of proceedings at a meeting held at Beachport to obtain information to submit to the Government in support of upgrading the wharfage facilities at Beachport, which is a fairly sheltered port. I point out that additional trawlers are being built to operate within the 200-mile limit in the Southern Ocean. At present the only facilities for unloading trawlers of this size are at Portland and Port Lincoln.

The reason why Beachport has been chosen as a possible unloading site for the vessels is not only that it is a sheltered port but also that it is the nearest port to Millicent, where Safcol has a large operation, including a canning operation for salmon. I have been told that any fish caught in the Southern Ocean must be unloaded at present at Portland or Port Lincoln and transported by road to Millicent for processing. Will the Minister seriously consider the request that the Government examine the possibility of upgrading the Beachport facilities to enable ships of the size to which I have referred, which will be trawling in the deep-sea areas, to come in to Beachport to unload relatively small catches of fish? I am raising this matter because I recently received a tape recording of the meeting to which I referred. My secretary has transcribed that tape recording, and I will make the evidence available to the Minister.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will certainly discuss the matter with the Minister of Marine and bring the representations to his attention. I will also give him the Beachport tape, which, I gather, is designed to ensure the establishment of Beachport as an appropriate Watergate in South Australia for fish.

Vote passed.

Minister of Marine, Miscellaneous, $649 000.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister provide

details about the "redundancy and guaranteed wage payment to waterside workers" amounting to $70 000?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Certain payments were agreed to and negotiated with the Waterside Workers Union in connection with the bulk handling wharf that was established at Port Lincoln. There was an industrial dispute in relation to the commissioning of the new wharf. I am sure the member for Flinders could give the Deputy Leader details of that situation. Additionally, certain agreements were reached in relation to Wallaroo, when the wharf was rammed by the Chinese ship and put out of action. Unemployment was created by that accident but, whether or not the South Australian Government can be successful in a claim against the shipowners in relation to the Wallaroo payments, I am not sure. I do know that the Minister was responsible for negotiating certain arrangements in relation to the waterside workers in Wallaroo as well. The $70 000 covers arrangements made with respect to Port Lincoln and Wallaroo. Regarding specific details, I will see what information can be provided for the honourable member.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I should like to obtain details of payments to individuals. I do not want names, but I am interested to know what redundancy payments were to individuals, as I am aware of certain figures negotiated with waterside unions in other areas, and I should like to make a comparison.

Vote passed.

Transport, $8 603 000.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Transport explain how the $100 000 referred to was spent on transport research projects? Was it only on projects at Flinders University, or in what other areas was it spent? Where is it expected that the $100 000 provided this year will be spent?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): We are holding the level of expenditure at the same rate. Last year $99 102 was spent.

Mr. Evans: What on?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The research and development area involves a multiplicity of projects. I can provide the honourable member with a run-down of the major projects, but we would not want to get into all the little ones.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I refer to line 10-01—"Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries", under the heading "Administrative, Policy and Planning Division", for which $150 000 is allocated. My questions are as follows:

1. As an essential feature of public transport is good publicity, has the Government any plan to introduce a combined S.T.A. road and suburban rail time table detailing all routes, services, fares, etc?
2. Is there any plan to rationalise the present bus route numbering system which is very confusing in several areas—particularly routes 7, 28, and 29, where a mistaken suffix letter to the route number can result in a passenger arriving at a point far distant from his intended terminal, for example, route 7E and 7F? Another confusing aspect is the use of route numbers 1 and 2 for city and Hackney with buses showing "via route A", etc.
3. Has any consideration been given to adequate advertising in the media of time table changes or consolidating such changes to be effective on regular defined dates which could be the date of issue of a time table book?
4. For a number of years a map allegedly showing the Adelaide bus routes has been located at the General Post Office. Who is responsible for this map, and when was it last up-dated? Is it the intention of the S.T.A. to retain this map and, if so, when will it be up-dated?
5. Why do not the placards at Adelaide Railway Station include one indicating the various through rail-bus fares available? Is it to discourage use of these facilities? In addition, why is there no Port Adelaide line time table placarded by the suburban ticket office on North Terrace?
6. It is noted that the bus time tables for the former licensed bus routes generally have different running times for evenings and weekends, when passenger and road traffic conditions allow faster travel. However, the time tables for the former original M.T.T. routes do not show such a difference in running times. Is there any difference on these routes and, if so, why is it not shown for the information of the public? However, if there is no difference, why has it not been introduced thereby to avoid buses crawling along at low speed and further discouraging patronage?
7. Some years ago, the Government indicated that it was considering introducing family weekend fares. What progress has been made in that regard?
8. The Lees Report on the S.A.R. made particular reference to poorly patronised suburban railway lines and the need to close them or severely reduce the service on them. These are: (i) Glanville-Semaphore; (ii) Albert Park-Hendon; (iii) Salisbury-Penfield; and (iv) Dry Creek-Northfield. In addition, it was noted that *(a)* Woodville-Woodville North; and *(b)* beyond Belair to Bridgewater, were also not included.
9. How many passengers use these trains for each line Monday to Friday, Saturdays and Sundays, and what is the Government's intention regarding the future of these services, considering that, apart from the industrial srvice to Penfield, the areas are now served with adequate alternative means of transport?
10. Some years ago, the Government announced a plan to extend the Hendon line to West Lakes. What is the current policy on this plan?
11. One of the problems, I believe, in planning co-ordinated bus services to connect with the North Gawler trains is the lack of a regular service. Is there any intention to introduce such schedules on this line and, if not, why not when the other major lines already have them?
12. May I be supplied with a copy of the 1976 Annual Report of the South Australian Railways? Apparently, that report was not tabled for the commencement of the current session and therefore was not available for the public. As this report covers the year ended 30 June 1976, I would like to know what has caused the delay in tabling it. If it has not been tabled to date, when will it be published, and is the Minister embarrassed about its contents? Similarly, when will the 1977 report be available and will one be published for the 1977-78 year up to the date of the Australian National Railways take-over?
13. Is the S.T.A. Roadliner Division making a profit or a loss? If it is making a loss, why is it, considering that the former operators no doubt

made a profit?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What about putting it in *Hansard* without reading it?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I cannot do that because it is not a statistical series of questions. If the Minister answered such questions when I put them on the Notice Paper, there would be no need to collate them and save them for a period like this. Has the Government any plans to reduce the deficit of the S.T.A., whilst not reducing the services by *(a)* combined duplication services (for example, Para Hills and Northfield-Ingle Farm), and *(b)* using feeder bus services to the truck routes and recognising the rail service about the metropolitan area of Adelaide as the spine of the public transport system?

Will the Government link the feeder bus service to it, including the reintroduction of the feeder bus system into the Christie Downs area from Sellick Beach and beyond, where the public in that area have enjoyed a privately operated service for many years but have finally been squeezed out by the S.T.A. without any understanding of getting a service reinstated? Further, does the Governmen-nt intend to dispense with ticket examiners at the Adelaide station on weekends and in the evenings or to combine this function with the ticket sales by relocating the latter on the concourse?

14. What was the cost of operating trains, trams, and buses on New Year's Eve beyond the normal operating time, and what revenue was earned for this period? Why were the rail schedules not included on the special holiday time table placards on the railway stations, and why were the bus time tables not properly advertised in the media? If these operations are to be a regular feature, will the schedules be included in the various route time tables?
15. A most disturbing feature of the buses is the lack of identification on their destination. However, this is needlessly compounded by instances of route number boxes not being lit at night and the use of supplementary boards which cannot be seen after dark. In some instances the regular supplementary boards are not available, and the temporary boards cannot even be seen in daylight. Similarly, problems arise when buses are used on routes for which they cannot show the number adequately. What plans are there to overcome these problems, particularly those relating to the display of supplementary boards at night?

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister explain the increase to $7 500 regarding compulsory blood tests? Is the cost of blood tests increasing? I am sure the Minister would realise that for some time now there has been concern about this matter, particularly in some country areas, where unfortunately I think there is a higher percentage of road fatalities. A committee was looking into the possibility of extending blood tests to more hospitals in country areas. Can the Minister say whether there has been a report from this committee and whether there has been an increase in the number of hospitals where blood tests are carried out following road accidents?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Both.

Mr. WILSON: I refer to the Auditor-General's Report, and to the line involving the contribution towards transport research projects. At page 273 of the report, we see the following:

> Total payments on transport research projects were $1 100 000 . . . including $340 000 on NEAPTR, making a total of $820 000 to 30 June on that project.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I should point out to the Committee that matters dealing with NEAPTR are more of a Loan nature.

Mr. WILSON: Do you want me to raise it in the debate on Loan matters?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. WILSON: If that is your ruling, Mr. Chairman, I will do that.

Mr. RUSSACK: Will the Minister ascertain which hospitals are now performing blood tests?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes.

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister ascertain how much local councils and groups have received out of the $84 000 allocated for cycle tracks?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes.

Vote passed.

Highways, $19 299 000.

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister explain the policy of the Highways Department, and in particular his own policy as Minister in charge of the Highways Department, regarding the allocation of funds received from the Commonwealth Government for the construction of national highways? In the current financial year the South Australian Highways Department received $16 500 000 for the construction of national highways and $2 000 000 for their maintenance. Unfortunately, a paltry $260 000 was to be spent on the Stuart Highway. I require an undertaking from the Minister that in next year's allocation he will set aside at least $1 500 000 towards the construction of this highway. I want an unequivocal undertaking from the Minister to this effect because the Commonwealth Government has given him a large allocation which he has spent in other parts of the State.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not want to unnecessarily inhibit the breadth of the discussion, but the money actually funded to the State Government by the Federal Government for expenditure on highways appears on the lines. The honourable member for Eyre can debate any issue that he can relate to a line.

Mr. GUNN: I was relating it to the Commissioner of Highways, who is the Minister's chief officer and who I understand has a great deal to do with formulating policy and is responsible for spending this money.

The CHAIRMAN: In that case, the Chairman might have been mistaken in thinking that the honourable member wanted an undertaking that a certain amount of money be spent on highways.

Mr. GUNN: I thank the Chairman for his ruling. The Commissioner of Highways and his engineers, who will be required to supervise and be engaged in work on the construction of this most important road, would also want to know how this $16 500 000 will be spent, and I appeal to the Minister to allocate—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It is not in the line.

Mr. GUNN: I want to know the policy.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It is not in the line.

Mr. GUNN: I seek a clear undertaking from the Minister. His technical staff are engaged in preparing plans and specifications for the spending of this money. I know the Minister probably does not want to talk about this matter, because it is well known that he is not very interested in the Stuart Highway and that he has completely failed to allocate the funds. No wonder he does not want to talk about it.

I want an undertaking from the Minister that some of that money will be put towards sealing this road. The highly-qualified officers whose salaries we will be funding under this line will spend much of their time expending some of the $16 500 000 this year. We will obviously receive about the same sum next year.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I commend you, Sir, for your

tolerance towards the member for Eyre. He would know, as I am sure you do, that the decision on how much is spent on the Eyre Highway, the Stuart Highway, or any other national highway is made by his counterpart in Canberra.

Mr. Gunn: You can't say that.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If you are so dumb that you do not understand that, I suggest you talk to Nixon when he is not raiding the A.C.T.U. offices. Under the national roads legislation, he makes the decision on the allocation of funds.

Mr. Gunn: It is on your recommendation, and you know that.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member would shut up for a few moments he might learn something. I have already applied to Peter Nixon for permission to spend $900 000 this year, not $250 000 as the honourable member has been peddling around his district. He can wave anything he likes. I have seen him wave his blue Liberal tickets all over the place. We applied to Nixon to spend $900 000, and he has not approved it.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! Before this debate expands, I point out that the expenditure of $16 500 000 of Commonwealth moneys funded to South Australia is not a subject for debate under these lines. In the debate concerning the Transport Department, it is relevant for members to debate the activities of departmental officers, but I will rule out of order any attempt to widen the discussion on moneys funded by the Federal Government to South Australia for expenditure on roads.

Mr. GUNN: I wish to reply to the tirade of abuse which in no way gave any explanation of how these highly qualified officers will spend their time. We have heard all the comments that the Minister has made before, even the colourful adjectives he used. I am surprised that the Minister is not aware of the recommendations in the schedule of proposed works for the financial year ending 30 June 1979, provided by the Highways Department. He does not know what is in his own department.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I believe that the member for Eyre is trying to get around, subtly perhaps, the Chair's ruling.

Mr. GUNN: In no way did I endeavour to get around any ruling. There was nothing further from my mind. I was earnestly seeking information not received from the Minister earlier, when he resorted to his usual personal attacks upon me. The sum I mentioned for a project would hardly pay salaries for the design work in which these important officers would be engaged, and it was contained in the schedule of works provided by the Minister's department. I am happy to debate the matter publicly with the Minister. I am surprised that the best that the Minister of Transport in this State (who has now been the Minister, unfortunately, since 1970) can do is abuse the Commonwealth Minister when the Minister accepts this statement as his recommendation, as he does other statements.

Mr. EVANS: How was the money for subsidy to country bus services distributed, and how does the Minister expect it to be distributed this year?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is for the subsidy to the town-country bus services. It is maintained by a committee (on a two-to-one basis) on which local government has representation.

Mr. TONKIN: I wish to raise a matter ventilated in this Chamber earlier this afternoon. The Minister referred to the activities of the member for Alexandra and a colleague who investigated the operations of a weighbridge at Murray Bridge. The Minister made the most extravagant claims about the activities of the member for Alexandra. He intimated that he had taken over and impeded operations at that weighbridge station for some two hours.

I made inquiries about the relatively serious charges that the Minister made, and I found that there was no substance whatever in them. The member for Alexandra, together with a colleague, attended the weighbridge, and asked whether they could observe the process for a time. They were welcomed by the inspectors, offered refreshments by them, and those inspectors were more than co-operative. The only time when anything could have been said that might have impeded the operation of that weighbridge was when a question was asked: "Does the weighing of tri-axles in any way vary by means of the method adopted?" I am informed by a reliable third party who was also there that the inspectors, to whom I pay a tribute in doing their public duty, said, "Is the honourable Minister suggesting that people who are reporting on this matter are telling untruths?"

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Were you there?

Mr. TONKIN: That is not what I was saying. The Minister's behaviour in this Chamber has been absolutely appalling and disgraceful. I am tremendously disturbed to think that this most important portfolio in this State is in the hands of a man who is prepared to sink to the depths to which he has sunk tonight.

The only time that this might have happened was when the officers were glad to give a demonstration of the possible variations that might occur. The implications and imputations that the Minister made in this House this afternoon are totally without foundation. Because this is a most serious matter, I will read from a letter to the member for Glenelg from Commercial Motor Vehicles Limited, dated 18 October 1978, as follows:

> On the weekend you recall talking to me about the problems of split weighing of commercial vehicles and the problems that arise. Attached is an article from the August edition of the Australian Transport Magazine *Highway Transport*, which sets out the problems experienced by Sporns Transport. Personally, I am dead opposed to the highways procedure of split weighing because I think it is not an accurate method of assessing individual axle weights. Whilst I do not condone overloading, it seems to me that, provided an axle group is not overweight in relation to the Road Traffic Act limits, then that is all the department ought to be concerned about, and I would be grateful for any assistance you are able to provide through your Party to have the Act amended to overcome this split weighing problem.

The letter was signed by Mr. Jim Crawford. I want to get the record straight, because the Minister maligned not only the member—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will allow the Leader to debate the matter only if he is able to relate his argument to a line.

Mr. Tonkin: Of course I am able to do that.

The CHAIRMAN: But, of course, the Leader cannot refer to a debate that has already taken place today.

Mr. Tonkin: Well, I haven't done so.

The CHAIRMAN: But the Leader was about to.

Mr. TONKIN: That is so, but I will no longer do so, Sir, because, if I was to refer to the debate that took place on a disallowance motion this afternoon, I would be totally out of order. If I was to say that the Minister had totally maligned the member for Alexandra, the officers at the weighbridge, and Mr. Crawford this afternoon, I would also be out of order. So, I will not say that. These people are not at all pleased, and the Minister, if he had any shred of decency left, would apologise not only to the member for Alexandra but also to the departmental officers who were, from the observations of those members of

Parliament who were present (and I emphasise "members"), remarkably competent and helpful in explaining what their duties involved and how they were performed. The Minister's attitude is despicable.

Vote passed.

Minister of Transport and Minister of Local Government, Miscellaneous, $43 166 000.

Mr. EVANS: I refer to the actual payments amounting to $1 460 598 in relation to pensioners last year. Does that sum include the concessions received by pensioners for bus travel only, or does it also include the concessions they receive in relation to stamp duty on registrations? The department now insists that pensioners send in their pensioner cards so that it can be assured that they are entitled to a benefit. The department is sending out a double sheet of paper, printed on both sides and containing much other detail. Some pensioners, such as those in the Hills, who do not live near a departmental registry office, are embarrassed because, if they send their cards to the department, they are (by the postal service's own admission) without them for anything up to eight days before they receive the cards back.

Also, it is inconvenient for pensioners personally to take their cards into the department, and they do not have photo-copying facilities available to them. If this line does not cover this aspect, will the Minister take up the matter to ascertain whether the department merely needs pensioners to state their pension number to enable it to cross-check?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The line to which the honourable member has referred deals with concessions granted to pensioners, including incapacitated ex-servicemen and blind persons.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Is it intended to continue widening the North-East Road to the Highbury Hotel?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out to the member for Alexandra that the Committee has already debated the Highways Department vote, and that it is now dealing with the "Minister of Transport and Minister of Local Government, Miscellaneous" vote. He will therefore need to be extremely specific. Unless the honourable member can relate his query to a specific line, I will not be able to allow it.

Mr. CHAPMAN: That is unfortunate, because I do not know whether I can do that. Although I was standing throughout the period during which the Committee considered the other vote, when the Clerk was watching me, I was not called on.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable member please sit down? If what the honourable member has said is correct, it is regrettable, and I feel sorry for him. However, I cannot allow the honourable member to ask a question on a vote with which the Committee has already dealt.

Mr. RUSSACK: I refer to the allocations for the Local Government Accounting Committee, the Local Government By-Law Review Committee, and local government examination committees. Will the Minister describe briefly the responsibilities of those committees and say what they are doing?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: They are continuing committees concerned with the areas of responsibility indicated by their names. The accounting committee is concerned with a continuing vigilance of the accounting procedures adopted by local government, and the names of the by-law and examination committees indicate their respective responsibilities. This allocation provides the operating expenses for these active committees.

Mrs. ADAMSON: I refer to the allocation of $40 255 000 for the State Transport Authority. What is the Minister's programme for extending the Newton bus service east of Stradbroke Road along Montacute Road to Maryvale Road? As the Minister would know, this question has been asked in the House many times over the years, and former members for Coles have given absolute assurances to their constituents that the extension of the bus service was imminent. Mr. Justice King, when he was member for Coles, assured the people living in Athelstone Heights and Rostrevor more than once that it would not be long before the road was widened and the bus service extended. Subsequently, the Deputy Premier, when member for Coles, gave the same assurance.

It is many years since this area was developed, and people must now walk a mile uphill in blistering heat or teeming rain, depending on the weather conditions obtaining at the time, after work at night, as well as a mile downhill in the morning. Many must walk longer distances than that. Also, children are in danger on their way to school on foot because they must walk on the verge of the road, there being no bus for them to catch.

The Campbelltown council cannot build a footpath until the road is widened. The people of this area have endured for far too long the State Government's promises that something is just around the corner in relation to extending this bus route. The Minister has said many times that nothing can be done because of the Federal Government's refusal to supply funds. Given that, however, the fact is that the State Government is responsible for setting priorities. I therefore ask what are the Minister's priorities in relation to extending this bus route and when will it certainly be extended?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will seek that information for the honourable member.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I, too, refer to the allocation for the State Transport Authority. The authority services the North-East Road.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is able to ask a question about the service that runs along the road but not about the road itself.

Mr. CHAPMAN: A service is already in existence; I am not questioning that. I am concerned about the safety of service operations and, indeed, the width of the road has been under question for some time. I appreciate that the Government has done much work in this area to ensure the safe passage not only of State Transport Authority services but also other public services that traverse this road, especially between the Paradise Bridge and Lyons Road. I want to ascertain whether it is intended to continue with the programme of ensuring that safety will prevail on this road at least beyond the Highbury Hotel.

The CHAIRMAN: I take it that the honourable member is asking whether there will be any expenditure on the road. I think he perhaps deliberately misunderstood me. I am prepared to allow him to ask questions about the services that use the road, but matters of expenditure on the road itself have already been dealt with.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am encouraged by what you have said, Mr. Chairman, and I may be able to help the member for Alexandra indirectly, because I have had complaints about the lack of the provision of bus services by the S.T.A. in two parts of his own district. He is probably aware of this matter.

Mr. Chapman: I raised it during Question Time yesterday.

Mr. Becker: Was he here?

Mr. Chapman: I think he was.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes I was; I am usually here. I would like to get that on record, because it is not often that Liberals make these admissions.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member should

address the Chair and not enter into discussions with other members.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I had a complaint about the unsatisfactory nature of bus services to Clarendon and Kangarilla.

Mr. Chapman: They absolutely squeezed Premiers out of existence.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps they did. The Director-General of Transport wrote a letter, dated 24 July, about this matter to a lady at Clarendon. It states:

> The Minister of Transport has asked me to reply to your letter of 21 June 1978—

it took over a month, of course—

> concerning bus services to Clarendon and Kangarilla. The bus service which formerly served Clarendon, Kangarilla and Meadows was discontinued by the former private operator on 9 June 1978. The S.T.A. commenced a replacement service between Adelaide and Chandlers Hill on Monday 12 June 1978. Unfortunately, it was not possible to replace the service beyond Chandlers Hill on account of the limited patronage offering and economic considerations. I regret that it is not possible to provide this additional service at the present time.

The bus stops at the top of a hill, with nothing there.

Mr. Chapman: It stops immediately at the outskirts of Mawson, immediately on the boundary of the Alexandra District.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Amazing!

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to be able to join in the conversation with the honourable gentlemen. It would be appropriate if the honourable member for Mitcham were to address the Chair.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is a bare, windswept hill with no seats or anything, and this is where the bus chooses to stop. The letter continues:

> The bus leaving Adelaide at 3.35 p.m. was scheduled at that time in order to allow it to return in time for the evening peak period trip at 5.35 p.m., and so that it would cater for students attending schools in the southern suburbs. A later mid-afternoon departure would result in a later departure in the evening, inconveniencing workers who finish at 5 p.m.

The lady sent me that letter, with her following covering letter dated 6 August, as follows:

> Thank you for your note and continued support. I sincerely wish that there were a few more politicians in Parliament of your calibre and "guts" who really had the peoples' interest at heart. The letter received from the office of the Department of Transport is enclosed for your information, or lack thereof—it told us exactly nothing and has solved nothing.
>
> The statement that "it is regretted that it is not possible to provide additional service at the present time beyond Chandlers Hill on account of the limited patronage offering and economic considerations" is a packet of garbage. All the people of Clarendon are asking is one service out of Clarendon each morning 7.32 a.m. and one return journey home at night. The number of people travelling on the early morning bus who have to be transported to Chandlers Hill is from 16 to 23 persons each morning. For your information the day that they did take a survey (prior to the takeover) to see how many people travelled from Clarendon was on a day when the State Transport was on strike, our private bus did run, but the children did not attend school as the city children could not get to school, so extra homework was set and the school closed for the day. I would suggest that the economic consideration should come into later bus services which are not patronised, where the driver spends some 20 minutes waiting for the time of the return journey and enjoying the country air.
>
> In passing, our private bus which was controlled by such strict inspections by the State transport regarding servicing and brake inspection, etc., never gave us any trouble, but in the seven weeks that the State transport bus has been operating:
>
> 1. Brakes failed on early morning run just before Darlington Police Station causing a chain accident; the passengers were transferred to another bus to complete the journey.
> 2. About three weeks ago, one of the children noticed smoke coming from the rear end of the bus, before it left the terminal. The driver inspected and suggested that he would make it down to O'Halloran Hill and the passengers were transferred to another bus.
> 3. About two weeks ago, we waited at the terminus, Chandlers Hill, from 4.20 p.m. to 5.15 p.m.—bus broke down near Darlington traffic lights—some fault with rear of bus—passengers transferred to another bus.
> 4. Some of the drivers are not familiar with the route, and one found that he had not gone down Bluehill Road so ducked down another street and tried to get back on to the given route.

On one occasion only a couple of months ago on a Sunday afternoon, on our Westbourne Park route a new driver did not even know the way from Northgate Street, Unley Park, down King William Road into the city. My 16-year old daughter was on the bus, and she had to tell him where to go, even to get to Victoria Square. The letter continues:

> The lack of facilities for shelter at the terminal is most unjust, particularly in the middle of winter—Clarendon has a shelter—and a phone near at hand in the event of any emergency. Sorry Mr. Millhouse, you did ask me what I thought—and this is my reply.

This is a serious matter for the people concerned. Clarendon is a cold spot, and to have to stand on the top of a hill to catch the bus, with no facilities, with the insult added to injury that there used to be a bus service to Clarendon, is tough. Another example I had over the long weekend concerned the area a little to the west, Aldinga-Sellicks Beach, which has been deprived of any bus service.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: For how long?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope that the Minister will listen to me. I will tell him, and I will be happy to give him, if he likes—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It stopped on 9 October.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister might like to look at the broadsheet "Aldinga Bay bus service situation", issued over the name Peter McArthur, and dated 5 October.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I've got it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, I hope the Minister will do something about it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I have.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: When this complaint was made to me at Aldinga on the long weekend I wrote to the Minister on 10 October, as follows:

> I have been approached about the abandonment of the bus service to the areas south of Maslins Beach, Aldinga, Sellick's Beach and surrounding districts. I understand that the service ceased last Friday and there is now no public transport at all. This is in contrast, the lady who approached me said, to the situation when she first went to live at Aldinga. About 14 years ago there were three buses to Adelaide in the mornings and one in the afternoon and the converse from Adelaide to Aldinga. I write to relay her protest (and that of many others I believe) at the abandonment of the service and to ask what plans, if any, you have for public transport for this area. I shall be looking forward to hearing from you.

That was only a week ago; even I would not expect to have

heard from the Minister in that time, and I have not. In the meantime, I was approached by another lady from that area a couple of days ago. She sent me a copy of a letter she wrote to the member for Alexandra dated 12 October.

Mr. Chapman: She got a reply yesterday, and I included a copy of the Minister's reply.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Liberals can be efficient sometimes. The letter states:

> I wish to bring to your notice the state of the Aldinga/Aldinga Beach bus service which at the moment seems non-existant. I am mainly concerned with the problem of schoolchildren. Schoolchildren living within 4 km of the school are not allowed to travel on school buses and as most families do not have a spare car to run their children to school it is necessary that they travel by private bus. I suggest that the Government put on another bus and charge a nominal fee. (I have spoken to a number of families who agree.) This would help to defray the cost of an extra bus. We are not, and I repeat not, any longer a mere holiday resort; we are a growing town and a fast growing one at that. I (along with many others here) feel that even if the Government ignores the pioneers of small towns, at least the children should be given some consideration.

The lady also sent me a letter from the Director-General of Transport to her dated 27 September, as follows:

> The Minister of Transport (the Hon. G. T. Virgo, M.P.) has asked me to reply to your letter of 21 August 1978 concerning the inadequacy of the Aldinga Beach bus service. The service to which you have referred is operated by Prime Tours Travel Services Pty. Ltd., under licence from the State Transport Authority and commenced on 13 July 1978. The proprietor of this service is a resident of the Aldinga district and is aware of the need for the service for schoolchildren who are ineligible to travel on Education Department vehicles.
>
> The time table for the bus service was designed to provide connections with peak hour train services and to also cater for schoolchildren attending the Aldinga School. Unfortunately, during the first operating month, the operator of the service was dogged by mechanical problems and on several occasions it was necessary to use private cars to maintain the service. The State Transport Authority has now been advised that the vehicle problems have been overcome and that this bus service should operate satisfactorily in future.

Of course, as State Leader of my Party I must take an interest in matters throughout the State. Within a fortnight this service closed altogether, so it shows how good arrangements for transport made by the State Transport Authority may be. This is a serious matter. As the lady said in her letter, this is now a fast-growing area and there are many people living there. Those people are left without any bus service or public transport. Road transport is the only means of transport available.

I suggest that now the State Transport Authority has gobbled up so many of the private operators that it has a responsibility to make sure that areas like the ones mentioned are serviced. Whatever the reason for the failure of the service, that area has no public transport and it should have. Every person living as close as that to the centre of Adelaide should have some transport available. Children living within four kilometres of a school are not entitled to use of a school bus, so they must use Shank's pony or a bike. There may be good reasons why neither is appropriate. It is quite wrong that these areas are left without transport. These are two examples of the State Transport Authority falling down on its job. Can the Minister give an assurance that something will be done about the Kangarilla-Clarendon and Aldinga-Sellicks Beach situations?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is a pity the honourable member has used this topic as a vehicle to take the mickey out of the Liberal Party. The provision of public transport is a serious matter. I have some immediate knowledge of the service to the Aldinga Bay area. Prime Tours was given an opportunity to service that area at its request and after some fairly sound advice that it was unlikely that it would succeed.

However, they expressed a strong desire to attempt to provide the service, and I am sorry that they failed. There were several reasons for their failing, not the least being the unreliability of the vehicles they were using. All the evidence we have indicates that it is unlikely that, in view of the number of people in the area, it will be possible to provide a service at reasonable cost to the community. The figures I have been given show that Prime Tours was carrying an average of five passengers a day. I do not think even the member for Mitcham would be irresponsible enough to suggest that, if that was the patronage given to the service, the State ought to be called upon to provide it.

I have had discussions on a personal basis with people who are not trying facetiously to take the mickey out of someone else, as the member for Mitcham has tried. A senior officer of the State Transport Authority has been with me during those discussions, and we obtained information that we previously did not have. The people with whom we had the discussions now have a better appreciation of the difficulties. Several aspects are being examined to find out whether we can assist the people in that area. In due course I will have pleasure in giving information to the member for Mitcham and the member for Alexandra, who raised the matter, I think last Thursday during Question Time.

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Government involve itself in the management of the Dogs Home in the future? Has the Government considered meeting similar needs on the northern side of Adelaide? Can the Minister say what form the Keith Hockridge Memorial Scholarship has taken in the past and what form it will take in the future? Can the Minister state the names of the recipients of the scholarships, and the nature of their studies? What is the Government's objective in providing a scholarship in connection with the course for senior local government administrators, what benefits have accrued so far, and what are the plans for long-term application of funds?

I draw the Minister's attention to inquiries undertaken concerning transport services for people in the Elizabeth, Gawler, Kapunda, Robertstown and Eudunda areas. Last Tuesday during Question Time the member for Chaffey referred to this kind of problem. He stated the difficulties that people in Riverland towns had. It is impossible for aged people, particularly if they do not have a driving licence, to do shopping without having to rely on the good graces of some benevolent person. The State Transport Authority may later have to consider providing a community bus in country towns on a rotation basis once a week or once a fortnight. It is difficult to tell these people that the degree of transport assistance given to people in the metropolitan area should not also be available to them. Can the Minister state any long-term plans that the Government has in relation to this matter?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: A loan of $200 000 was approved for the removal of the Dogs Home from Mitcham to Lonsdale. There was also a grant of $100 000. If we add the actual payments for 1977-78 to the allocation for 1978-79, the total is nearly $300 000, which is the total of the $200 000 loan and the $100 000 grant that were approved. It is not a continuing commitment: it was for the transfer of the Mitcham Dogs Home.

The second matter concerns the Keith Hockridge scholarship. For several reasons, the scholarship was not

taken up on a straight annual basis, and this year we are trying to accommodate two scholarships, being the back lag from last year and the scholarship this year. Scholarships are awarded to suitable persons to undertake a three-month study tour overseas in areas of local government.

Regarding the transport question, we are presently providing a subsidy for public transport in the five major country towns where town transport exists; that is, the three iron triangle towns, Port Lincoln and Mount Gambier. They are the only towns with such transport. As each town got into difficulty, the State Government was able to devise a subsidy arrangement in co-operation with local government on a two-for-one subsidy. That matter was dealt with under the vote for the Transport Department; it has nothing to do with these lines.

Mr. ARNOLD: A real problem exists in country towns for disadvantaged people, as the member for Light has said. These people do not have their own transport and they have difficulty doing their shopping and getting around the community. Recently, a seminar was held in the Riverland area on isolation in the community. The Minister of Community Welfare and his department recognise this real social problem, involving especially people without their own means of transport in areas where there is no public transport. Many such people cannot afford taxis. In any case there may not be taxis in the town. There are several reasons why the Government should examine the matter of giving subsidies to country town bus services.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You don't have a country bus service up there to subsidise, do you?

Mr. ARNOLD: I am referring to the concept of the mini-bus. Many enterprising people realise that such a service is not viable without assistance but it would be with a small subsidy. The authorities should determine the level of subsidy necessary to make a mini-bus service a viable proposition in country towns where isolation is a big problem. Unless one is in a disadvantaged position, one does not know the problems confronting these people.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am pleased that the member for Chaffey has raised this matter, which dovetails into the proposals that we put seeking the Government's co-operation in having joint venture contract services where it is clearly uneconomic to operate a total private enterprise operation in areas where there is a clearly identified need. That seems to be the answer not only in country towns but also in the suburban area. It could alleviate the growing losses, and the $40 000 000 covered in the lines must be a source of embarrassment to the S.T.A.

Secondly, is the Minister willing to use one of his buses in a trial run as a special cyclists' bus? It has been suggested by people in the eastern suburbs that they would like to cycle to the city and, as they are not willing to push up hill after work, they would like to board a special bus with their bicycles. It could make better use of one of the buses at Hackney. Will the Minister have one of his officers investigate the merits of this suggestion, which could attract benefit and better use of authority buses?

Thirdly, are any of the buses operated by the S.T.A. wider than the maximum vehicle width allowed for the general public? A constituent in Myrtle Bank claims that some authority buses are wider than the maximum vehicle width permitted and that those buses, when subject to replacement, have a depreciated resale value, because they have to be reduced in width before they can be used by private purchasers.

Mrs. ADAMSON: In view of the growing community awareness of the need for fitness, and also in view of the hazard of congested roads, why has the Government not increased the $84 000 allocation to the bicycle track fund? I have had representations from cyclists who are concerned that the bicycle tracks which have been constructed recently are essentially recreational tracks and not commuter tracks. The Minister is looking surprised, but this is the claim made by cyclists in the eastern suburbs, that there is no convenient route for cyclists to use from the city out to the eastern and north-eastern suburbs. Has the Minister considered using footpath routes on minor inner-suburban roads in these suburbs in order to divert from the major road in busy areas and then to revert to the major road when it becomes open and less congested?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will deal first with the question raised by the member for Chaffey and echoed by the member for Alexandra. The policy of the Government is to subsidise those country town bus services which previously operated as viable units but which, because of rising costs and other factors, were no longer able to operate, and we have provided a two-for-one subsidy on each occasion.

Mr. Arnold: We appreciate that, but can't you look at the other areas?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We could go on and on and provide a bus in every town if the Opposition would tell us what we should cut out to provide the funds to do it. The challenge goes back to the Opposition.

Mr. Arnold: It is not that; you are creating two classes of citizens.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We are not. The people for whom the honourable member speaks have never had a bus service and have never provided sufficient support for public transport to justify a public transport service, and now he is suddenly trying to jump on the band waggon because the Government has stepped in to assist those areas that relied on public transport and had a public transport service but would have lost it had the Government not moved in.

Mr. Arnold: Then you have no genuine decentralisation policy at all.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will leave the honourable member with his little problem, because I do not think he is really convincing himself about it. I apologise to the member for Chaffey if I laughed at the matter he raised, but my laughter was nothing to that of some of his colleagues. The honourable member said that we could use "some of those idle buses that are sitting around the depot".

Mr. Chapman: Or being driven around the city with nobody in them.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I hope the honourable member will go back and read what he said. He wants to provide a bus to take people home to the eastern suburbs after work. The honourable member is asking for a peak-period bus, and he is probably adding at least $20 000 a year per route.

Mr. Chapman: You make incredible statements.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Maybe I do, but maybe I have a little more knowledge of the intimacies of this matter because I have been involved in it for quite some time. I do not think the honourable member would be very happy if he were sitting in a bus and someone came in with his bike and rubbed against him, the grease from the chain marking his trousers. Indeed, why not include surfboards and wheelchairs, One can go on and on.

All of the buses operating in metropolitan Adelaide are 8ft. 6in. wide and operate on that width under a permit from the Road Traffic Board. When they are sold they are cut down by 3½in., stuck together and sold. People say that the State Transport Authority, or the M.T.T., as it was then, lost money because of this. The authority does

very well when it disposes of its old buses, and in fact there is usually a queue of people waiting to buy them and pay quite a reasonable price. Under normal conditions, these buses are about 16 to 18 years old. They are written off over 10 or 12 years so the question raised about the width is really old hat.

Unfortunately many people are giving lip service to the requirement of bicycle tracks. We launched the bicycle track fund with an annual commitment of $250 000, and that has been reduced to $84 000 because that is the amount that was taken up. It is no good putting funds in there if they are not going to be spent; it is as simple as that. I suppose some tracks have been built just for leisure, I do not know the full list of them. The first track provided was the commuter track across the south park lands from Parkside coming into the city. The second was in the north-east area coming into the city under the Hackney bridge. I am aware there are not enough bicycle tracks, and we would like to have a lot more, but this is an area where the State Government and local government are seeking to co-operate. Local government must take the initiative.

Mrs. Adamson: Should people be petitioning local government?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Of course, because we are providing the subsidy to help local government provide cycle tracks. The Tea Tree Gully council has a very extensive cycle track scheme. I do not know whether it has been completed but it was being funded under the State Unemployment Relief Scheme and was not only providing very valuable employment for people in that area but also providing a tremendously valuable asset for the district.

Mrs. ADAMSON: I refer the Minister to the State Transport Authority line, and I would like to know the criteria for establishing bus shelters in suburbs that have been developed over a long period. As far as I am aware there are no bus shelters in the Athelstone area at all, and the people have been very poorly served. The Gorge Road, particularly beyond the Thorndon Park reservoir, is in poor condition, as are the verges, with pedestrians having to walk on rubble, and it is a very sad sight to see mothers waiting by bus stops during summer with no shelter and small children unprotected or to see elderly people standing in the teaming rain. Bus shelters are not a big capital cost and yet they are one of the things that make an enormous difference towards the amenity of an area. I am also concerned about the schoolchildren attending the St. Ignatius College at Athelstone who have to wait in the afternoon with no shelter at all. In a drenching shower many of those children would have a long way to go home in damp clothing.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The State Transport Authority has actively promoted over the past three or four years the installation of bus shelters. I agree with the sentiments, but not necessarily the conclusions, that the honourable member has expressed. There was a real need for bus shelters in Adelaide, and I think that well over 500 bus shelters have been installed. But, until every bus stop has a shelter, obviously we have further to go. I cannot give the honourable member specific guidelines because they vary, but generally shelters are put at stops where people have to wait for a bus. There are more shelters in the up journey into the city than on the outward journey. Proximity of other shelter comes into it: if a shop verandah is at the stop or close to it, there is no need for one. If one or two passengers a day get on at a stop, it would not have the same priority as would one where there were 50 or 100 passengers.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I appreciate the shelter that I use daily waiting for the bus to come into town. But we could go further, and I first raised this many years ago, and put up time tables at bus stops. In the old M.T.T. days, probably during the Playfordian period, I was given 10 000 good reasons why this could never be done, mainly because of vandals, but in the past few years bus routes have been displayed at stops. That is good, and I have not noticed much vandalism occurring. They are pretty impervious to that sort of thing. We should put up timetables. Often there is a 20-minute gap between buses, for example, on the Kingswood route, during the day. It is a long time to wait, but if people could estimate the wait that would be a great convenience. This must have been put to the Minister many times before, and I hope that the S.T.A. is working towards that.

For a little while I thought I could support the member for Coles in what she said about bike tracks, but when she got into the subject she revealed that she was doing not much more than playing with it. We are giving $84 000 for bike tracks out of a total item of $43 000 000. That is infinitesimal. I accept what the Minister said about the need for co-operation between Government and local councils but, in my view, we ought to make a far greater effort regarding bike tracks and encouragement to cycling in this city than we are. We have every natural advantage for the use of bikes; Adelaide is flat, and there are very few hills. As one goes east, it is a bit uphill going away from the coast. Here I thought that the member for Alexandra's idea was a little bizarre, to say that people could ride in in the morning but it was too much of an effort to ride home at night.

Mr. Chapman: Have you tried it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course I have. I used to ride to and from school every day. Adelaide has natural advantages for the use of bikes. There is no doubt that the use of the motor car must eventually decline and must be replaced by public transport (and we are pouring a lot of money into that without too much success, as the Minister will acknowledge, certainly financially), and the alternative that is used widely in many other cities is bikes. Today there are fewer facilities for riding bikes than there were when I was a kid, or much more recently than that. There used to be a bike track up and down the Port Road and up and down Anzac Highway. I used to ride to Outer Harbor or go for a swim at Glenelg. There is apparently no real effort to replace them.

It is absurd, with the utmost charity and respect to the member for Coles, to talk about people dodging in and out of suburban streets. The Cyclist Protection Association, a good body with very sensible ideas on this matter, has in its newsletters prepared routes where people can go, but looking at them one sees the difficulty. It is no good if half one's journey is on comparatively deserted streets in relative safety, if the other half of the journey is on a busy highway.

At present there is too much traffic on our main roads for cycling to be really safe. My daughter rides in and out to university; my heart is in my mouth for her every day, the way she has to dart in and out of traffic. We have to make a far greater and more concerned attempt to put in bike tracks and to encourage the use of cycling in this city. Under the circumstances that the Minister outlined, $84 000 is just not good enough. If it means merely co-operation with local councils, some of which are enthusiastic and others not, we have to change our approach, and the State Government has to take a far more positive initiative in this matter. Otherwise, it will never happen, but it has to happen unless this city is to be absolutely clogged.

I hope that whilst nothing can be done now (and nobody will take any notice of what I am saying anyway), in the

long run more will be done to provide the facilities that must precede the use of the bikes.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think this is one of the few times that I have heard the honourable member really being sincere in acknowledging, without saying in so many words, that he made one hell of a blunder when he was Minister, because it was in the period of 1968-70 Government, in which he was Attorney-General, that the decision was taken to remove the bicycle tracks from Anzac Highway. I think he must be suffering from a little remorse.

I move:

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

Motion carried.

Mr. WOTTON: I notice that the allocation for transport for incapacitated persons has been reduced to about half. Can the Minister explain that?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I should like to be able to say that there are fewer incapacitated persons.

Mr. Wotton: To the extent that the allocation has been halved?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not have the detailed information, but I will get it for the honourable member.

Mr. ARNOLD: I was amazed by the Minister's reply to my proposal regarding a possible subsidy payable to country bus services to enable elderly and disadvantaged people to be made more mobile. I was indeed amazed when the Minister asked, "What do you expect us to do: provide a subsidy to everyone throughout the State?" I do not expect the Government to do that, although I think that everyone in this State should be considered and treated as equals. At present, a subsidy of about $20 000 000 is paid on bus transport in the metropolitan area, in which about 800 000 people live. That works out to about $25 a head each year. The Minister intends, however, that only $190 000 be provided to subsidise transport in South Australian country areas, which have a population of about 200 000 people. That works out at less than $1 a head. If the Minister considers that to be fairly well in keeping with the subsidy of $25 a head in the metropolitan area, and that we are asking too much when suggesting that the country subsidy should be increased, I am afraid things have reached a sorry state.

There is no doubt in my mind that the only group about which this Government is concerned is that section of the community that will vote for it. If the Minister would be kind enough to explain to me how he could justify a subsidy of $25 a head in the metropolitan area compared with $1 a head for people living in the country, I should be delighted to hear it, as would country people.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thought, when the Minister started to deal with the matter of bicycle tracks, that he was simply playing an opening gambit by trying to discomfort me and that he would go on thereafter to give some sort of a sensible answer to my proposition. If the bicycle tracks on the Anzac Highway or the Port Road were pulled up during the term of office of the Government of which I was previously a member, I certainly regret it. However, I do not know what relevance that has now, as that was a mistake of the past.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It was a mistake that your Government made.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As far as I know, the then Opposition did not kick up about it. The Minister was a member then, and I do not remember his saying a thing about it. If he did, that is all right, but it is completely irrelevant to the future. If the Government of which I was a member made a mistake previously, I will plead "guilty" thereto. However, unless the Minister is willing to say something, I presume that the Government has no real plans for any comprehensive network of bicycle tracks or the provision of separate carriageways for cyclists either in the short term or the long term. I therefore give the Minister another chance to show me the courtesy of saying whether the Government has any plans in this respect and, if it has, what they are.

I also refer to the allocation of $15 000 for costs payable by prosecuting officers. Although $6 000 was voted for this line last year, $10 872 was actually spent. I take it that these costs are payable where prosecutions fail in the magistrates courts and solicitors obtain an order for costs on behalf of their clients. If I am correct in that (and that seems to be the obvious meaning of the line), does the Minister expect more prosecutions to fail? Does he think that the tariff of costs has increased? Can the Minister say what is the reason for the steady increase in this allocation? I suggest that perhaps his prosecuting officers ought to be a little more cautious in launching prosecutions if the Minister expects more of them to fail. However, that is a small point compared to the one I made about bicycle tracks.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The costs payable by prosecuting officers relate to Highways Department officers for prosecuting offences under the Road Traffic Act. It is in relation to charges for offences such as overloading that prosecution costs are increasing. I am sure the honourable member will have a sound knowledge of what it now costs to employ lawyers. Certainly, that cost is not decreasing.

Mr. Millhouse: But you don't pay the Crown Law office, do you?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not have the details of who gets paid or how many postage stamps are involved. If the member wants the most minute details, I will try to obtain them for him. Regarding the bicycle tracks, if the honourable member heard what I said to the member for Coles—

Mr. Millhouse: I did.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Obviously, it did not sink in. I said then that the initiative in the provision of bicycle tracks was in the local government area.

Mr. Millhouse: But my point is that that is not good enough.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member wants to take over the role of local government and put this into the State Government area, that is his decision. This Government does not hold the view that it should take away from local government an initiative that it properly holds. However, the Government has made financial provision and provided officers to discuss projects with local government. The Government follows the policy of encouraging local government to do the work rather than take away from local government a role that it properly holds.

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister say whether there is any likelihood of the bus service from the Brighton and Glenelg area being extended to the Flinders Medical Centre to cater for the aged and for staff at the centre who work the early morning and night shifts?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I was not aware that there was still a problem with transport to and from the centre. We took steps about 18 months ago to provide a service there, and it was not easy to achieve the objective. I have not heard any complaints since, and understandably I have assumed that the service was adequate. However, in the light of the honourable member's point, I will have the matter examined.

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister justify the Government's reason for supporting a $25 subsidy in respect of

passengers in the metropolitan area as against a $1 or $2 subsidy for people outside the metropolitan area, particularly in view of his earlier comments?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not propose to take the line up on the score on which the honourable member has put it, because it would be ridiculous to do so.

Mr. Arnold: It's quite true.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is not. One could follow that argument along the lines of saying that, as the people of Burra do not have a town bus service, they are not getting anything. Why not look at other services such as water, sewer or rail? It is foolish to categorise in the way in which the honourable member has tried to do. I do not blame him for stating his case for the people of Chaffey, because if he did otherwise he would be failing in his job, but to try to present a jaundiced picture is specious. I am sure that the honourable member knows it and that he would be capable of putting what he wants in the local press in order to score another political point.

Mr. ARNOLD: The Minister cannot get out of it by making ridiculous comments. I am talking about large communities of 5 000 or 6 000 people. For the Minister to say that the people in such communities do not warrant consideration means that it is time he handed over to someone who considered people, and not just numbers.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's your interpretation.

Mr. ARNOLD: People in all communities are equal. For the Minister to categorise them and say that they are not equal and do not require the same consideration as people living in the metropolitan area is to wipe off certain people completely. I am not arguing for anything more per capita for people outside the metropolitan area than has been provided for those in the metropolitan area. People in a community consisting of 5 000 people have considerable distances to travel from home to the centre of town for shopping and for other purposes. Some of them are totally dependent on the good graces of their friends to get them from home to town and back or to visit the doctor.

Vote passed.

Community Welfare, $29 984 000.

Mr. WOTTON: Can the Minister provide details of the number of officers and staff in each child welfare, residential care, and aged care centre, together with the capacity of each centre and the average occupancy over the past two years? Could he also provide me with information on the costs for the domestic work carried out at each of the centres?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare): I shall be pleased to obtain the information the honourable member has requested.

Mr. WOTTON: I notice that the allocation for the purchase of motor vehicles has been increased by almost $200 000. It seems incredible that such a large sum is to be spent on motor vehicles. Has the Minister examined this matter to see whether this area can be pruned down to enable more money to be spent in the vital area of providing community welfare?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member will be pleased to know that before the beginning of this financial year the instruction was issued by me to the Director-General that the aim for the current financial year was to get the greatest possible value for the dollar delivered care service to the consumer, and that is being followed throughout the department. I have some information that explains the apparent large jump in the sum being provided for the purchase of motor vehicles for the current financial year.

The honourable member will understand that vehicles purchased by all departments are kept for certain periods, either based on mileage or age. This recommendation has come down over some time. This means that at intervals there is a greater need for replacement in one financial year than in another. We are in one of those years. To support that argument, the honourable member will notice that the amount spent was close to the limit in the previous year. There is a small increase in vehicle numbers, because a small number of new vehicles will be used in the new young offenders scheme. I hope that outlines the reasons for the apparent sharp jump in the amount allocated for the purchase of new vehicles.

Mr. WOTTON: Can the Minister explain the set-up regarding financial assistance to sole supporting parents? I would like to know the break-down of both Federal and State funding for these parents.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Generally, for the first six months the Commonwealth makes no funds available for the financial support of sole parents. In those circumstances, whether the sole parent be male or female (and this has applied in the case of females for some years and males since last year), the State Government has accepted the fact that need is the criterion and has stepped into the breach. I do not want to suggest that the Commonwealth is entirely unsympathetic in this area. I think its rationale is that a separation that is apparent at that time may not always continue. It has, over the years, settled on six months as being the time a separation can be argued to be a separation and not a temporary estrangement. That does not provide for care if it is a temporary estrangement and that is why the State has stepped in. Reimbursement occurs in some cases, but I do not have that information in detail now. I will provide it subsequently to the honourable member.

Mrs. ADAMSON: Has the Minister a break-down of how many sole supporting parents are wives or husbands who have been deserted; how many are wives or husbands who have been divorced; and, how many are unmarried women who have chosen to keep their children? I think this break-down is important because it seems that the economic cost to the general community (leaving aside personal costs, hardship and unhappiness) is increasing every year, and we should be monitoring the reasons for that increase.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I think it would be correct to say that we have that information in all of these cases, because eventually there is a form to be filled out. That form contains a minimum of information that the State has found to be necessary. State forms are not dissimilar to Commonwealth forms used for the same purpose but they have some refinements. I do not know whether totals have been collated for this year, but we may have figures for previous years, which the honourable member may be prepared to accept.

Mr. WOTTON: There is an amount of $1 255 800 shown under line 25-05 for maintenance, pocket money, hospital expenses, etc. for care and control children placed in the community. Will the Minister give me a break-down of the costs involved in this line? That is an incredible amount of money to be spent on that line.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I told the honourable member a couple of weeks ago in answer to a question that there are 1 000 children involved in this line, and this makes the $1 255 800 look not quite as heavy. Many of those children are long-term placements. Foster rates in South Australia are adjusted four times yearly in line with, I think, the c.p.i., and that is why there is, in the main, an allowance for a greater amount for next year.

Mr. MATHWIN: I have questions about lines 00-10, 00-20, 20-01, 20-70, and 25-10. I refer mainly to statistics, which I presume come under 00-10. One sees, from the statistics released by the Community Welfare Department

yesterday, that the situation has not improved during the past 12 months.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The honourable member read out a number of lines. I did not catch them all, and neither did the Minister. Could the honourable member read them out more slowly so that the Minister knows what lines he is speaking to?

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister can do what he wants—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. It is not a question of what the Minister will do: it is question of what the Chair will do. In order for the Chair to determine the relevance of the honourable member's questions, it is necessary that he cite the lines to which he is referring. I ask him to do that.

Mr. MATHWIN: I refer to the line "Deputy Director-General of Community Welfare, Director, Professional, Administrative, Clerical, and other Staff", for which $9 637 818 is allocated. A recent information release from the Community Welfare Department states that 180 more offences were brought before the Adelaide Juvenile Court this year, representing an increase of 3·7 per cent over last year's total. State-wide offence figures for matters dealt with by the courts indicate an increase of 9·1 per cent, but this increase must be viewed against the corresponding decrease in juvenile aid panel offences of 12·8 per cent. The report fails to state that there has been an increase in serious offences, but a decrease in minor offences. At page 22, the report states that there has been an increase of 425 children brought before the Adelaide Juvenile Court on charges relating to serious driving offences. What is the definition of "serious" in this connection? Does this term include driving by juveniles under the influence of alcohol? I can see no reference at all to juvenile driving while the offender has a blood alcohol level of greater than ·08. Last year 392 offences of driving under the influence of liquor or a drug were committed by juveniles. What does the department regard as serious driving offences?

State-wide serious driving offences increased from 735 to 873. State-wide minor driving offences totalled 7 232, as opposed to 8 000 last year. At page 24, the report states that on a State-wide basis there were 118 more children brought before the juvenile courts last year, as opposed to 278 fewer children the year before. About 9·1 per cent more offences were dealt with in the period under review but, again, this must be balanced against the smaller number of offences brought before the juvenile aid panels: 4 672 this year, as opposed to 5 358. Again, we are referring to minor offences. When we deal with the more serious offences, we see that there has been a vast increase. So, while fewer minor crimes are being committed, there are more major crimes being committed. During the last week, the Minister, after a long delay, decided to visit McNally Training Centre.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I am giving the honourable member the benefit of the most generous interpretation that I can possibly give to Standing Orders, but the honourable member is making a point relating to the provision of statistics by the department. I can understand that. I ask him not to turn this into a second reading debate or a general grievance debate, but to speak to the lines.

Mr. MATHWIN: Dealing with the treatment centres lines, I refer to McNally Training Centre. I am pleased that the Minister visited McNally last week. I understand that he was well received and that his visit was appreciated by the floor staff. He would have got the message that the matters I have raised in this Chamber over the past six to 10 months were correct, despite his claim that there were no problems. I understand that the Minister received a letter from a McNally consultative committee. I had sent copies of the *Hansard* report to McNally, and the committee asked the Minister why he had refuted my claims. In his reply to the committee the Minister stated:

> Dear Members, in regard to your letter of 18 September, it appears that your remarks have been based upon remarks made by Mr. Mathwin in which—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member should resume his seat. I have stressed before that I have given him the benefit of the most generous interpretation of Standing Orders, but the honourable member appears to be entering into a wide-ranging debate relating to what he says occurred between himself, the Minister, and officers in a Government treatment centre. He must not pursue that line but direct his remarks back to the lines or the vote that the Committee is considering.

Mr. MATHWIN: Throughout the Committee so far the debate has been wide indeed until we have come to Community Welfare vote.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! Of course the debate has been wide. I have done no less than the Chairman of Committees; I suggest that, in respect to the honourable member and what he has had to say in the past 10 minutes, I have been far more generous. If that remark was intended as a reflection on the Chair, it is certainly not well received. The honourable member should direct his remarks to the provision of money in these lines.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I point out to the honourable member that the report he was quoting earlier and the statistics are issued over the signature of Judge Newman, Senior Judge of the Juvenile Court. Some of the statistics have been prepared by officers of my department, but the statements in the report and the conclusions and principles put forward surely are the work of Judge Newman. If the honourable member wants to take issue with the format of that report and so on, I suggest that it is unfair to try to raise that aspect of the report with me, as Minister of Community Welfare. The honourable member, as he has said, has raised the matter of driving offence statistics on several occasions. The statistics are not kept in the form desired by the honourable member. They have not been kept in that form for some years, because all State Ministers and the Commonwealth decided that figures for juveniles in Australia relating to drink driving offences referred to a behavioural matter and would be treated in that way. Neither the South Australian Community Welfare Department nor the Juvenile Court has decided to keep the statistics in that form: it is done by joint agreement. Perhaps I would not disagree about some of the matters that the honourable member is putting forward in support of his argument, that they ought to be kept as he suggests.

The honourable member said that there was an increase in one figure and a decrease on the other in regard to the number of people appearing before the Juvenile Court or a juvenile aid panel. In putting forward that argument, the honourable member seemed to think there was some difference between the two categories. I ask the honourable member to consider that the whole system is a range of ways of handling juvenile offenders. One should not be viewed as being more serious than the other. The figures for the total number of juvenile offenders in this State certainly have validity and I should have thought that the honourable member would be pleased that, as the report stated, there was not a large increase and the figures remained fairly steady for the fourth successive year. Neither he nor I has any control over this, I should have expected the honourable member to be reasonably pleased that the increase was not alarming. My department is not committing the offences.

It almost sounds at times as though he is asking that my

department be made responsible. If the honourable member read the report, and I am sure that he did by the way he quoted from it, he would also have noticed a positive and remarkable statement from Judge Newman that points out that 97 per cent of young people in this State between the ages of 10 and 18 do not offend at all. In talking about these matters, one needs to keep a balance and a sense of proportion.

Mr. MATHWIN: I appreciate the Minister's reply, I agree that we have a heavy recidivist rate, but it is the manner in which the department deals with these young recidivists that causes the system to fail. According to a police report, the juvenile crime rate is high. Of the total number of offenders detected in connection with serious crime (homicide), serious assault, robbery, rape, breaking offences, motor car theft, and fraud, during 1976-77, 26·55 per cent were juveniles under 15 years of age, and 57·65 per cent were juveniles under 18 years of age. That represents about 83 per cent of the total crimes committed in this State, and is a shocking state of affairs. The department's methods of dealing with offenders is the crux of the problem.

I know that the Minister got the message when he visited the McNally Training Centre last week, and I believe that he is doing something about it, but it took a long time to get the message through to him, during which time he accused me of misleading the House and the State, which I did not like. I thought that he would have the decency to apologise for that.

Considerable upgrading is taking place at Vaughan House, and there has been a big influx of young people there. I understand that last weekend gross overcrowding occurred there and that the staff had great difficulty in handling that situation, with young people sleeping all over the place. Will the Minister explain this situation and say, further, whether Vaughan House is to be renamed, as stated in the blue book?

Further, under the new intensive neighbourhood care programme, there will be only two security institutions in this State, Vaughan House and McNally. Will the Minister say what progress has been made in that regard?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I believe that there has been some mollification in the honourable member's attitude, and he suggests that there has been some in mine. He proudly trumpeted to the House on more than one occasion that he had a copy of the blue book, but his copy may be a little out of date. The time scale stated in it in relation to phasing is being adhered to, and from that book he would know that there has been a preliminary move to Vaughan House of the people who were formerly kept in care at Brookway.

That is all that has happened until now. There is a need for alterations to be made at McNally to provide for the gradual removal of the dormitory-type of accommodation, which the honourable member knows has caused problems in the past, and to provide for some degree of segregation, particularly in the sleeping quarters, and so on. That work is already on the books. However, we ought not to be talking about that, as the provision for this work falls into another area.

The honourable member also referred to the allocation for provisions and expenses incurred in normal operation maintenance, and particularly to events that occurred at Vaughan House last week. The majority of the staff there deplores the continual discrimination of administrative and other information concerning the operation of the centre and its inmates. Having asked the staff, I can state sincerely that it feels strongly about this matter. The staff believes that it involves unprofessional conduct on the part of those who engage in this activity, and that this is not in the interests of the inmates. After all, the Act requires the Minister, the department and its officers to keep in mind the interests of the inmates. The staff also believes that this is not in its best interests. To show that the Government has nothing to hide in these matters, I will obtain what information I can about the operations, such as overcrowding last weekend, at Vaughan House and make it available to the honourable member.

Mr. MATHWIN: I thank the Minister for that information and state merely that I have a fair idea of what happened on both occasions. However, I now refer to the allocation of $9 700 for overseas visits of officers. Does this involve the trip made by Mr. Meldrum, the former supervisor at McNally, who is, I believe, at present studying in Scotland? Has Mr. Meldrum gone to Scotland at Government expense, and is he being paid while there? Does this allocation represent his fare; is Mr. Meldrum's salary included in another line; or is that gentleman on a private trip?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Mr. Meldrum is in the United Kingdom on a properly certified study tour, which has been approved by the appropriate authorities, including the Public Service Board. The allocation also contains a component that was used in relation to the recent trip by Mr. Fopp, who, together with three or four other officers, mostly from the Australian States, represented us on a visit to various South-East Asian countries in respect of inter-country adoptions. Endeavours were made to establish better guidelines, and to set up procedures, and so on, that would be uniform in all States and the Commonwealth. I am proud to tell the Committee that Mr. Fopp had the honour to lead the delegation.

Vote passed.

Minister of Community Welfare, Miscellaneous, $11 132 000—passed.

Tourism, Recreation and Sport, $3 700 000.

Mr. EVANS: As we have been set a time schedule by which the Government would like to get the legislation through, is the Minister prepared to guarantee that, if I put all my queries in writing, I will be given the consideration of being provided with detailed replies, thus making it unnecessary for me to put my questions on notice in an attempt to get the information in the future.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Chief Secretary): I appreciate the honourable member's desire to save time. I will refer his questions to my colleague to have them replied to as adequately as possible. That does not mean that every question will be answered; that will depend on the nature of the question, as happens sometimes with Questions on Notice, but I guarantee that the honourable member's questions will be examined seriously and that all possible information will be given.

Mr. EVANS: I accept the Minister's guarantee. It is unacceptable that, although the Government says that it believes in a policy of open government, some questions which could be answered are not answered, because they may present political problems that might embarrass the Government. It is part of public life that we have to face embarrassment at times. I will put my questions in writing to the Minister and await the result.

Vote passed.

Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport, Miscellaneous, $912 000.

Mr. EVANS: I will do exactly the same with this vote.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I give the honourable member a similar undertaking.

Vote passed.

South Australian Health Commission, $164 500 000.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I cannot let this occasion go by without comparing the details that are

presented to us under this vote, but there is only one reference, namely, 05-30. This situation is ludicrous when one considers the expenditure involved every year in providing health services throughout the State. There has been a tremendous amount of difficulty with the transfer to the Health Commission. There is no question but that the commission itself is developing into an enormous bureaucratic monster. It is top heavy in its administration, and it will cost the State an enormous amount of taxpayers' money that could be better spent.

It is almost impossible to find any questions to ask on the vote as it presently stands. I realise that, under the commission, every hospital was supposed to be autonomous and that every recognised hospital was supposed to have its own say in its own affairs, yet I know that, under the system of monthly deficit budgeting that currently applies (and I presume that that comes out of the various grants transferred to trust account, but I do not know), all of South Australia's recognised hospitals are now finding, to their cost, that they are not autonomous at all.

They are autonomous only in name, because the Health Commission holds the purse strings. Indeed, the commission can dictate exactly what goes on in those hospitals simply because it may or may not approve expenditure which is being suggested by the so-called autonomous boards. There is very little more I can say, and I would not dream of transgressing Standing Orders by trying to point out any more of the considerable deficiencies which exist. It seems to me that this is a perfect example of where the expenditure of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money, which should be the subject of the most intense investigation by this Parliament at this time, has been successfully taken out of the hands of this Parliament and therefore out of the hands of the people and placed into the hands of the bureaucratic monster that the Health Commission has become.

There is the matter of the Frozen Food Factory and the matter of spoiled food at the Adelaide Hospital to which I am not allowed to refer. This, to me, amounts to Government censorship and Government secrecy about matters which are vital to the welfare of all South Australians. I protest. It will do the Opposition very little good to protest about this matter, because the Government, in its present mood, will take no notice. It suits the Government, particularly in this area where waste and extravagance are rampant, not to have its actions examined by this House.

I believe that every member of this House, no matter on which side he sits, is being treated with gross contempt by the present system. Having said that, I make my formal protest and say that this, more than any other item in this entire Budget, proves just how outdated and ridiculous the present system of line budgeting is. If ever we needed some set legislation so that the Health Commission would be required to justify its existence within five or six years to this Parliament, this form of accounting proves that beyond any doubt.

I think everyone is aware of the nature of sunset legislation under which a statutory body such as the Health Commission would be required to justify its existence on the basis of performance as against expenditure. Is it in fact providing the services it is supposed to provide to the people of South Australia? Are we getting value for money? Is there a better way of providing certain services? Indeed, should the Health Commission get out of certain areas and let private enterprise take over the supply of those services? I believe there should be sunset legislation in this State for many things. I think sunset legislation should apply to the Health Commission, not within five or three years, but that there should be an entire review of the functions of the Health Commission within 12 months, because I believe it will be the most expensive disaster for which this Parliament has ever been responsible.

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister tell me the policy of the Health Commission in supporting maintenance and giving assistance to non-recognised hospitals and other bodies, which I take it are mainly charitable organisations. I believe the Asthma Foundation receives $1 000 and the Diabetic Association $2 000. What is the Health Commission's policy in connection with funding charitable organisations dealing with special health problems?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare): I will seek that information from my colleague.

Vote passed.

Minister of Health, Miscellaneous, $2 640 000—passed.

Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs, $2 718 000.

Mr. EVANS: Because there is a time limit on the debate, I will put my questions on this vote in letter form. I ask the Minister whether I can have detailed replies.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I undertake to ensure that my colleague receives the requests made by the honourable member.

Vote passed.

Mines and Energy, $7 907 000.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): What current work is being done by the Mines Department on the exploration for and definition of uranium resources in this State? Are exploration licences still being issued, and what progress is being made in what the Premier has called the continual keeping in touch with uranium technology?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): The latter part of the Leader's question would come under "Miscellaneous", and I will deal with the question when that vote is being considered. Companies wishing to search for minerals, including uranium, are issued with exploration licences, provided they meet appropriate conditions relating to levels of expenditure and the environment. That process is continuing. The Roxby Downs copper-uranium discovery stimulated much additional interest in the Roxby Downs area and promoted additional expenditure on exploration. I do not know of any new discoveries made in the past 12 months, but there is continued interest and continued additional work in areas where uranium had previously been discovered; for example, the Beverley area, Crockers Well, and the Lake Frome area. There have not been any additional discoveries to my knowledge.

Mr. TONKIN: I was not specifically referring to the work of the Uranium Enrichment Committee: I was referring to the work of Mines Department officers when I referred to the keeping up with uranium technology. Much work has been done on the leaching method of mining uranium. I understand from a seminar that much work is still being done by departmental officers who are continuing in a way that could totally refute the Government's current attitude toward uranium mining.

I appreciate the work that they are doing, and I believe they are doing exactly the right thing. We should be keeping up with new developments in uranium mining. We should be ready to go the instant the Government changes its mind. I refer to the Laurie Oakes report today and a speech made by the Premier to the Canberra A.L.P. branch, as follows:

> "I changed my mind about uranium", said Mr. Dunstan. "Like the A.L.P., I am prepared to change again."

That must make life difficult for the Minister, and I sympathise with him in his present situation. I seek an assurance that, in spite of the Government's pigheaded leave-it-in-the-ground attitude towards uranium, officers of the Mines Department are getting on with the job and

preparing for an eventual change in heart by the Government about uranium. Regarding the payment of $800 000 for services to Amdel, what services are involved and to what extent are they involved with uranium?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: First, I make my position clear: I support the Government and the Party policy on this matter, and I would not want the Leader to think otherwise. Party policy is in the nature of a moratorium that says that we are not as yet satisfied. I do not know whether or not the Premier was correctly quoted in the Laurie Oakes report. The implication of a moratorium indicates that there can be a change of mind, but there is a strong body of opinion within the Labor Party presently that would not change its mind on the issue. That is representative of a strong body of opinion within the community at large.

The department works closely and tries to maintain good relations with all those who are involved in exploration or the mining industry. It has not been involved directly in questions of, for example, *in situ* leaching. The company concerned has carried out its experiments and, in order to do that, has consulted closely with Mines Department officers. True, because of the previous association in South Australia with uranium mining, there is a degree of technological expertise, especially within Amdel, but also within the department, and there is a natural tendency for people within the mining industry to approach Amdel, and to some extent the department, for advice and consultation in such matters. Along with other States, South Australia has been involved in the working party under the Commonwealth discussing uniform mining codes with respect to uranium mining. South Australian Government officers are also involved in that exercise.

Regarding Amdel, various Government projects with respect to that organisation cover a wide range of activity, but I am not aware of any specific uranium research project that is involved. I will check that and get a report for the honourable member.

Dr. EASTICK: For the geological and geophysical survey, amounts of $2 057 003 and $1 183 637 are provided, or 40·98 per cent of the total expenditure by this department. Can the Minister say what kind of work is being undertaken in this area. I also ask whether any such work is being undertaken on behalf of other organisations and whether there is a benefit to Government revenue for services rendered to mining organisations. What percentage of the total expenditure is going into the geophysical survey side. Obviously, it is a very important component in the total for the Minister's department.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will have to obtain a report on the extent of the geophysical work *per se*. The geological survey, generally speaking, relates to the obtaining of knowledge about potential mineral resources throughout the State. Therefore, much of the work is concerned with such matters as Mines Department exploration, survey work, the necessary preparations for mapping, and the preparation of documents that are available for companies that want to explore. This is the basic source of information for the encouragement of any mineral development.

Further, the geologists are heavily involved in dealings with opal miners. For example, they are involved in the question of the proclamation of the Stuart Creek opal field and in whether any development at Mintabiey leads to the proclamation of an opal field. The geologists will be involved extensively in surveys. The question of a return to revenue is very much a hit and miss business. The work done by the geological survey people at Stuart Shelf and the assistance given to the Western Mining Corporation obviously were important in regard to the Roxby Downs discovery. If that project gets off the ground the revenue for the State will be very significant.

Mr. Tonkin: That is rather inhibiting to policy, is it not?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: We are talking about a project that would not come on stream any earlier than 1983-84 anyway and the size of the ore body is yet to be determined.

Dr. Eastick: It is very significant.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I should think that some kind of development would take place. Much survey work leads to nothing, but other survey work may lead to a bonanza that delivers revenue to the State Budget well in excess of the expenditure of the Mines Department. Development of effective knowledge of our resources is an important investment, but, before investment in geological survey work is undertaken, one cannot do a cross-benefit study and decide whether one should undertake it. There is a pure research element in that work.

Mr. GUNN: I seek information relating to opal mining at Mintabiey, north of Coober Pedy, where there has been limited mining activity.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I assume the honourable member will link his remarks to a line.

Mr. GUNN: I seek information about whether departmental officers have carried out surveys to find out whether it is desirable to declare the area a precious stones prospecting area so that it can be defined as a permanent opal-mining area. Groups living in the area have expressed concern about sacred sites, and correspondence has been sent to the Premier. When I was in the area with the honourable member for Victoria, concern was expressed to me and I pointed out to my constituents that they should approach the Minister of Mines to find out whether it was possible to set these areas aside. I told them that the opal miners were acting within the law and that in my view it would not be possible to prevent them from mining in the future. I have a copy of a letter written to the Premier on 20 September, which no doubt the Minister has seen.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I seek your guidance, Mr. Chairman. There is a Question on Notice, No. 670, which reads:

> Does the Government intend to declare the Mintabiey area, north of Coober Pedy, a precious stones prospecting field and, if not, why not?

I have a reply to that question, but I will not be giving it until next Tuesday. I presume that I would be out of order. A Standing Order states that it is not appropriate to discuss anything that is the subject of a Question on Notice.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: It seems that it is almost identically the same subject matter.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Opal mining can take place regardless of whether an area is declared a precious stones field. The declaration of a precious stones field simplifies the process of registering claims and carrying out the necessary administrative work in relation to the business of opal mining. The honourable member will get the answer Tuesday.

Mr. Tonkin: You mean that it hasn't gone to Cabinet yet?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There is nothing in the Standing Orders of this place to say that it has to go to Cabinet. Normally, Questions on Notice go to Cabinet on the Monday before the reply is given to the House. The Leader, if he read Standing Orders, would discover that I would be out of order if I dealt with his question. It would not be possible to declare a precious stones field at present because not enough knowledge of the situation exists.

Vote passed.

Minister of Mines and Energy and Minister for Planning, Miscellaneous, $617 000.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): Following the Government's suppression of the third interim report of the Uranium Enrichment Committee, will the Minister say whether that committee is still conducting its investigations at the same, or a reduced, level, and is a fourth interim report either in the course of preparation or due for release soon? Indeed, will it be a final report, or has the Government, in view of the policy that it adopted on 30 March 1977, clamped down on any further activity by that committee?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The committee's work is continuing. Its report was not suppressed but is being revised. Because of certain changes that occurred, the report was not completely in line with the present position. The suppression of the report had nothing to do with Government policy.

Mr. Tonkin: But it was totally opposed to your policy.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The report deals with feasibility questions concerning uranium enrichment. Further events occurred after the report was written but before it could be issued that made it necessary to revise the report. The Leader ought to recognise that the Government must take the responsibility for reports that are issued and, if something that is issued obviously needs revision, the Government would be subject to ridicule from the Leader for issuing something that was not up to date. I have no doubt that, when dealing with the Leader in many cases, one simply cannot win and that he will have his piece of cake and eat it too if he can, no matter what happens.

The plain fact of the matter is that a third report will be published. As I have said, further developments have occurred. For example, the Leader would know that URENCO has expressed the view that it would prefer, if it was ever to establish a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia, to establish it not in the Spencer Gulf region but in Adelaide. That is a further fact that must be examined and taken into account. Whether URENCO would be able to be persuaded otherwise, I do not know.

Certainly, this is an area of continuing study and development, and I think I can assure the Leader that the work that has been done in this State means that our officers are more up to date in relation to the economics of uranium enrichment than are their counterparts in other States. Of course, uranium enrichment development is still subject to the same embargo as is uranium mining as a consequence of the general policy of the Labor Party and, therefore, of the Government.

Mr. TONKIN: I assure the Minister that I do not in any way intend to heap ridicule on the third interim report or on the Uranium Enrichment Committee, which produced it. Indeed, I found the report an extremely valuable document, well researched and written, containing nothing at all that could possibly be the subject of ridicule. Obviously, developments will occur from time to time. That is why interim reports are so called: because they are not final reports but are there ready to adapt to changing conditions.

As the Minister has said, the Uranium Enrichment Committee has a fine grasp of the economics of uranium enrichment. The fact that one firm, URENCO, has a preference for performing uranium enrichment near Adelaide rather than in the iron triangle is no reason why the third interim report of the Uranium Enrichment Committee needs revision or why it would be subject to ridicule without that revision. The Minister has been guilty of a series of *non sequiturs,* and obviously he is doing nothing more or less than covering up for the Government. While it does him great credit to support his Government's line in this regard, it does the Government no credit for adopting this line. It is nothing more or less than a cover-up of vital information that the people of South Australia should possess.

Experts have been brought together by the Government to inquire into all aspects of uranium enrichment and to recommend measures by which it can be achieved. When the Minister says that the third interim report has not been released because it is being revised, what he really means is that it does not suit the Government to release it while the Government adopts its present policy of leaving the uranium in the ground and the people in the dark. No amount of huffing and puffing or explaining by the Minister can hide that fact. We have heard, and I am reassured, that the Uranium Enrichment Committee is continuing with its deliberations. I hope that it has not been spending all its time since February 1977 rewriting its third interim report to fall in line with Government policy. I am sure that it has not, because I have far too much respect for the people on that committee to believe that they would do so. I accept the Minister's assurance that they are keeping up to date. If they are keeping up to date and following through with more recent advances in technology on uranium enrichment, and if there is some question of considering a site nearer Adelaide and some need because of the present difficult situation of the iron triangle to offer incentives to URENCO or any other firm to adopt Redcliff as a site, the Government should be investigating those matters now.

I am certain that the members of the Uranium Enrichment Committee will also be making those recommendations. While it is reassuring to hear that its members are going on with their deliberations, I am not happy to learn from the Minister's crystal-clear attitude that they are voices crying in the wilderness. No matter how well informed and enthusiastic they are regarding the development of a uranium enrichment industry in South Australia, as long as the present Government persists in its current attitude they might just as well not exist.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will leave it to anyone who listened to the exchange of views that has just taken place to decide who is huffing and puffing. Uranium policy, if we have a democratic community, will be determined by the elected representatives of the people at any one time rather than by the technical experts.

Mr. Tonkin: Even though they are fools?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the Leader wants to wear that cap, by all means let him do so.

Mr. Tonkin: You've been wearing it yourself.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader has a particular view, and he has changed it since March 1977, almost overnight after he got his instructions from Canberra. His record in this matter does not really bear examination, but there is no point in going into that. Suffice to say that, under our system of Government, technical experts can be as enthusiastic as they like, but it is the responsibility of the elected representatives to take the decisions that affect the lives of people, if it is to be a democratic Government.

Mr. Tonkin: Don't paint yourself too far into a corner.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not painting myself into a corner. The Leader was saying, I think, that we ought to give the technical experts their heads and let them do exactly what they want to do.

Mr. Tonkin: Aren't you?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No, that is not true at all. There are one or two of those experts who are in favour of the mining and enrichment of uranium.

Mr. Tonkin: One or two?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: We do not have great

numbers of technical experts—we are discussing a line for only $10 000. Most of that goes to retain the services of Mr. Ben Dickinson. This is not a great exercise involving a huge number of people and great expenditure; it never has been. Mr. Dickinson is a former Director of Mines in South Australia and is a great enthusiast for anything to be tackled, including the question of uranium enrichment. He has never made any secret of that fact to me, the Premier or anyone else. He is a completely honest and open individual. He is a man who has much respect in the area of uranium mining and enrichment both in this country and overseas. He has access to people within Urenco not matched by anyone else in Australia. He contacts Urenco and has dealings with it on a regular basis, both in England and, more recently, two months ago when Urenco was in Adelaide.

All of that is true, and I would not deny for one moment the enthusiasm of Mr. Dickinson, but he is not the person responsible in a democratic community for taking decisions. In no circumstances in a democratic community should the elected representatives of the people duck the decisions they have to take on the grounds that technical experts are enthusiastic.

Vote passed.

Schedule passed.

Clauses 1 to 9 and title passed.

Bill and Estimates reported without amendment.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

In Committee.

First Schedule.

State Bank, $10 300 000.

Mr. EVANS: Last year estimated payments for advances to the State Bank were $9 000 000, and actual payments were $5 000 000. Proposed payments this year are $200 000 estimated, and estimated repayments are $500 000, leaving a credit of $300 000. What was the reason for not using the total $9 000 000 last year? Perhaps it could have been used for housing or a similar activity. Why can we not make similar sums available this year to the State Bank?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister for Planning): During 1977-78 the State Bank was able to make advances for homes that kept the number of new loans that were granted, even though the total size of a loan was increased during the financial year, more or less steady. The State Bank report shows that the total amount lent out for housing was $275 651 000. During the last financial year 2 751 individual housing loans were approved for an aggregate of $50 422 000. This compares with 2 818 new loans in the previous year, aggregating $50 074 000. So, we were able during the year, partly through increased recoveries and other internal arrangements, to maintain the rate of lending. That was the principal objective that we sought to achieve when we thought at the beginning of last year that we had to make a grant to the State Bank from Loan Account of $9 000 000. In fact, during the year we were able to maintain the rate of lending through providing only $5 000 000. We are not in a position to step up the rate of lending. Our objective has been throughout this period to maintain a steady rate of lending, so that the State Bank is providing some kind of base to the overall housing market.

In connection with the coming financial year, a number of other policies have been adopted that have enabled the State Bank to plan to maintain its rate of lending from last year through this financial year. First, interest rates on some past loans have been adjusted, leading to higher recoveries of interest. Further, a scheme has been introduced whereby people who double their repayments avoid any extra interest payments beyond about ·25 per cent increase. That is leading to increased recoveries into the State Bank. So, that source of relending is greater than what it was in 1977-78.

In addition, the State Bank this year is getting money on short-term deposit from the State Government Insurance Commission in order to finance at this stage the $6 000 second mortgage loan. Furthermore, temporary funds have been made available from the Electricity Trust to the State Bank. All those lendings will have to be refinanced in future years. What has been proposed has been made clear. A finance subsidiary is to be established to borrow outside of Loan Council. This proposal is being developed presently, and we will be able to go ahead on it.

The only reason why we are in no great hurry is that we do not really want to be going into the market to borrow debenture money on a long-term basis while interest rates are still high. We would prefer to wait for a year or so until interest rates have fallen. Therefore, we are relatively happy about using temporary funds from ETSA and S.G.I.C. All these arrangements have enabled us to maintain the lending rate from the State Bank. The waiting list has come down a little, and I will be announcing further arrangements shortly. A consequence is that the charge on the Loan Fund can be reduced, even though the Commonwealth has reduced substantially the amount provided under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement.

Unfortunately, the alternative arrangements we can make for the South Australian Housing Trust are not as satisfactory. The honourable member will appreciate the pressure that has been on the Loan Fund this year with the Commonwealth's refusing to provide any increase. We have had to put a programme together using much ingenuity from the Treasury and the State Bank to provide ourselves with the necessary financial wherewithal.

Mr. EVANS: Referring to the figures for last year, I find that for advances to housing we allowed nothing to be passed over from the Loan area, but actually passed over $4 000 000. For advances to the State Bank we allowed $9 000 000 and passed over $5 000 000. I half expected the Minister to say that what he had done was, instead of passing the $9 000 000 over to the State Bank for general purposes, the Government passed over $4 000 000 of that $9 000 000 to be used to finance housing loans. This year, instead of having no amount in the item as happened at the beginning of last year, we are providing $7 500 000, which it is anticipated will be spent totally on advances to State housing. Under the general line of housing I can accept the Minister's comments.

Dr. EASTICK: The Minister indicated that the Government would mark time for a period because it was able to obtain funds at a lower interest rate. What circumstances create the situation that allows the Government to benefit from borrowings at a lower interest rate?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It's obvious.

Dr. EASTICK: The obvious answer is that the fiscal policy of the Federal Government is leading to a situation in which we will see a marked reduction in interest rates. I am pleased that the Minister was honest enough to give us the lead to this situation, even if he was unwilling to acknowledge the correctness of the assumption that I have just made.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Honourable members should recognise that Australia is now in quite serious balance of payments trouble. There was a record deficit on current account for the September quarter of this financial

year. Thus, the fiscal policy of the Federal Government at present is directed at maintaining interest rates and not reducing them. While the balance of payments situation is out of control the fiscal policy of the Federal Government will not be towards lower interest rates.

I would make the general point that interest rates are partly a function of the rate of inflation. It is certainly true that while inflation was at, say, 15 per cent there was no way you could have an interest rate for longer-term lending at 7 per cent or 8 per cent unless there is an immediate expectation that the inflation rate will fall very dramatically. While the inflation rate was at, say, 15 per cent and people were lending on Government bonds at 10·5 per cent, the immediate effect on the lender was a negative rate of interest and money was available only at 10½ per cent because, presumably, the inflation rate at 15 per cent was not expected to continue over the currency of the loan, otherwise the interest rate would have been higher than 10½ per cent. If the inflation rate is below 7 per cent at, say 6 per cent—

Dr. Eastick: What got it there?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A number of factors will have operated to achieve this, and I would suggest one of those factors has been wage indexation. I do not think that I would allow myself, in any circumstances, to be taken as agreeing that the fiscal policy of the Fraser Government represents the fount of all wisdom. In many respects, while it may succeed in getting down the rate of inflation, it runs the very real danger—

Dr. Eastick: You mean "while it has".

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It has not competely done so. Surely, the honourable member is not suggesting that the current rate of inflation is satisfactory.

Dr. Eastick: It's a damn sight better than it was in December 1975.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: And at a cost of very much higher rates of unemployment, and goodness knows how much more unemployment in 1978-79. If the honourable member wants to get into a discussion on the policies of the Fraser Government, I would strongly suggest that the basic attitudes governing those policies are the reactionary attitudes that are a throwback almost to the 1930's. We run a grave danger in this country that we will see a very significant procession in unemployment rates of about 10 per cent.

It is clear at present that the reason why Federal Government is not prepared to relax on the economy and why the Federal Budget was at tough as it was, was not the inflation rate at all—it was the balance of payments. The balance of payments situation is very difficult, and we have never had as big a deficit on current account as we have had in the last September quarter. It is about time that the Federal Government recognised that some of its policies on manufacturing industry should be reversed.

Some of its policies on manufacturing industry which throughout Australia have reduced manufacturing employment over the past few years by about 200 000 are no longer appropriate, and there is a very strong case for moving back to the kinds of level of protection for manufacturing that prevailed in the 1950's and 1960's. Unfortunately, people who advocate what I regard as very conservative and reactionary economic dogmas about the working of the market and the importance of eliminating tariffs, and who say that if tariffs are eliminated everybody will be better off in another equilibrium position, even if it takes 10 years to get there, and a good many young people are alienated in the process, these people are dominating the Federal policy in a way they could not do in the 1950's and 1960's. If the honourable member wants to discuss the Federal Government's fiscal policy it is along these lines that I would want to argue.

The CHAIRMAN: And not the line we are discussing.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am terribly sorry, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EVANS: The Minister announced earlier this year that the Government intended to set up a subsidiary borrowing organisation. Could he say what he would like the interest rate to fall to before he set up such an organisation to help in housing, and to help carry some of the loan burden that we will have? Can he estimate when that organisation could be set up?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not want to prejudge discussions that are going on at present. There is lending at 6¾ per cent and lending at 11 per cent on second mortgage finance, through temporary borrowing from the Electricity Trust and the S.G.I.C., respectively. So far as the 11 per cent lending on second mortgage is concerned, if the administrative margin of the subsidiary was no more than 2 per cent, one could afford to borrow at 9 per cent. We would be fairly close to that at present, because the long-term bond rate is probably 9¼ per cent or a little below. However, if one wants to cover part of the somewhat higher lending that takes place through the bank, one may be looking at the possibility of borrowing at 8 per cent to 8½ per cent.

I confidently expect that the long-term bond rate, at some stage in the next 15 months, will drop to the 8 per cent to 8½ per cent range if we get a rectification of our balance of payment situation. At that borrowing rate, lending at 11 per cent on second mortgage and some other lending on first mortgage could be effectively accommodated, provided that one used the existing administrative resources of the State Bank, and did not set up an entirely new administration. One could proceed with its establishment, as soon as the proposal is finalised, and get it going on some form of short-term adjustable interest rate borrowing, and not borrow through debentures until a later stage, but the timing of any borrowing will be critical.

Vote passed.

Highways, $1 160 000—passed.

Lands, $1 500 000.

Mr. RUSSACK: The Auditor-General's Report mentions a computer system to be installed and because of the reference to "Buildings, Plant, etc.", I ask whether some of this money is to go towards a computer system.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Part of the Lands Department expenditure is for the land ownership tenure system, the so-called lots proposal, involving an allocation of $110 000. The system will use the computer, and the $110 000 is to purchase ancillary equipment for that computer. The other items do not cover any computer facilities, so the only item related to the provision of the computer would be the ancillary equipment under the $110 000 allocation for the land ownership tenure system.

Mr. RUSSACK: According to the Auditor-General's Report, the computer system will cost about $2 200 000 by 1980. If only $100 000 is to be used for the purpose to which the Minister has referred, in what way is the balance of that sum to be used?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Land purchases for developments and sale cover $102 000. This is to be provided for the completion of developments at Waikerie, Barmera, Kingston, Moorook and Cobdogla. The purchase of equipment for the Survey Division involves expenditure of $503 000, included in which is more than $400 000 for the purchase by the division of two plotters for its mapping programme. There is also a contribution of $250 000 to the Riverland regional office. The Engineering and Water Supply Department is constructing a regional office at Berri, and it is intended that the Lands

Department will share that facility. Also, the sum of $324 000 is allocated to purchase motor vehicles, the balance being to purchase equipment for the department's various divisions.

Vote passed.

Woods and Forests, $9 000 000.

Mr. EVANS: In what area is the Woods and Forest Department cutting down? The department has gained in relation to timber production, having had good sales, and it seems essential that the department continue planting. Last year, $8 000 000 was set aside for an area in which we have sales and where there is a need for timber. Imports of overseas timber into South Australia are high, and this involves a cost against the State. Indeed, this will be an on-going process. I think I read once that it was expected that $200 000 000 to $300 000 000 a year worth of timber would be coming into Australia by 1985. We should try to push as much of our own timber through as we can.

It seems that the Woods and Forests Department will receive payments amounting to about $5 000 000, and that only $4 000 000 is being paid from Treasury. Can the Minister see some benefit in having that figure increased, or will we end up planting about the same amount of forest areas as we have in other years and developing new areas for planting, as has occurred in the past?

The Hon. Hugh HUDSON: If the honourable member checks on previous Loan Estimates and Revenue Budgets, he will find that there has always been a recovery from the Woods and Forests Department not only into Loan Account but also into Revenue Account. That recovery procedure goes hand in hand with the allocation to the Woods and Forests Department of additional Loan moneys. The net provision this year is $4 000 000.

The honourable member will see from the summary provision that there is not any indication of what was the net provision last year. I do not have that information readily available, although I should be surprised if the amount was more than $4 000 000. At page 285 of the Auditor-General's Report, one sees that last year repayments and other credits to Loan Account totalled $5 468 000.

Mr. Evans: So it was $400 000 more.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If one checks, one sees that $7 989 000 was provided, and that there was a credit of $5 468 000. The net payment last year was really $2 500 000, whereas the net payment this year is $4 000 000. The Woods and Forests Department has, in terms of its normal operations, a regular planting programme that goes on all the time. Normally, these days there is some small expansion in the total areas of forests planted. The main provision made in this year's Loan Estimates for new borrowings by the Woods and Forests Department consists of the re-equipping of the log mill at Mount Gambier, costing $7 100 000, which includes a new log yard, green mill, and board sorting and stacking system, and waste disposal. The Public Works Committee has already reported on this proposed development.

Vote passed.

Marine and Harbors, $8 700 000.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The schedule contains details of dredging improvements, etc., for which $2 581 000 is provided, at Outer Harbor. Can the Minister say whether this is for deepening of the channel to accommodate larger vessels?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This provision is for the continuation of departmental plant to deepen the channel from St. Vincent Gulf to the new container berth at Outer Harbor. The work proposed in 1978-79 includes increasing the depth of the new swinging basin from 10 to 11 metres, as well as increasing the width from 415 to 460 metres; it also includes provision for reclamation work at Pelican Point.

Mr. EVANS: Has provision been made for dredging the channel at St. Kilda? I believe that, at times, pleasure and fishing craft cannot get in or out of the channel.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I understand that this work can be carried out as soon as the issue relating to the St. Kilda proposal is determined, and I hope that that will be determined soon.

Vote passed.

Engineering and Water Supply, $77 483 000.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Regarding the $1 066 000 allocation for the Little Para dam, can the Minister say what still requires to be done on this project, which I assume is nearing completion?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The estimated completion date is December 1978. The total estimated cost is $18 431 000. Up until this financial year, $17 631 000 had been spent, so the expenditure proposed for this year will lead to some over-run on the Estimates. The dam should be completed within a couple of months.

Dr. EASTICK: Regarding the allocation of $106 000 for the Morgan control station, I am aware that the station currently monitors all of the pumping facilities from Morgan to the Hanson tanks, taking in the pump stations between Morgan and Robertstown and the major pump station at Robertstown.

It is also responsible for monitoring the pumping equipment from the Murray River at Swan Reach and the pump line to Stockwell. The system there is one of remote control, obviating the original requirement to have one-man and two-man units deployed at each station. With electronic equipment, the men are situated in the one place and can be summoned by alarm systems. The system has been functional for some time now, and the expenditure of $106 000 is either for a back-up system, I suspect, or for major upgrading. However, I would appreciate having some general detail about the matter, or knowing whether some other system is going to be incorporated within the Morgan pumping station.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am sure you, Mr. Chairman, will be interested in what is proposed. The $106 000 is for the provision of facilities at the Morgan control station to dose hydrated lime to the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline in order to control the acid and alkaline levels of the water pumped through that pipeline. We do not want to upset the Chairman or have him coming back to Adelaide in a regrettable condition each week. We want to ensure that he gets better water in Port Augusta, and also that his colleague gets better water in Whyalla. It is contemplated that this work will be completed in February.

Mr. BLACKER: I seek information on the $140 000 allocated under "Country Waterworks" in relation to the hundred of Wudinna, Main 27, and $324 000 in connection with North Side Hill. Does this include possible reticulation from the feeder main between North Side Hill and Summit Tanks?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The allocation concerning the hundred of Wudinna involves the provision of asbestos cement pipes for Main 27 and the relaying of mains which are in poor condition and subject to bursts and which, in consequence, give inadequate supplies. The estimated total cost of the project is $253 000. Expenditure up to this financial year is nil. The estimate for this year is $140 000 and the estimated completion date is May 1980. North Side Hill involves a transfer scheme designed to utilise excess water for the Uley South scheme. The transfer of water from the North Side Hill tank to Summit Tanks will enable the supply of much needed additional water to the

Tod trunk main and the East Coast main. The total scheme was estimated to cost $2 600 000, most of which had already been spent up to this financial year, and the estimated completion date of the scheme is December 1978.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: What are the details of involved in the $1 482 000 allocated to the central workshops and foundry? I know that in the Budget papers $300 000 was set aside for the Ottoway foundry because there is not sufficient work to keep it going. The only departmental foundry of which I am aware is the Ottoway foundry.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This provision is for normal depot requirements and upgrading, and for the amalgamation and rationalisation of workshop facilities at Ottoway to eliminate overcrowding and unsatisfactory conditions.

Mr. EVANS: There is no mention in the Treasurer's statement of allocations for sewerage work in the Mitcham Hills area, Reynella, Happy Valley, Stirling, Aldgate, and Bridgewater. Has the Minister any details of the allocation for the Blackwood and Mitcham Hills areas?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Proposed expenditure in the Blackwood and Belair stage 2 this year is $540 000, and the completion date is expected to be September 1978. I therefore guess that the work is already completed. The other work in the Hills area would be the southern and Onkaparinga trunk sewer, with proposed expenditure of $1 635 000. It is a major sewer system through Port Noarlunga and Christies Beach. There is nothing else set out regarding sewerage of new areas, but I will get the information for the honourable member.

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Minister provide further details about the treatment works at Port Lincoln and the sewerage works at Port Lincoln?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Port Lincoln treatment works involves extending the existing outfall 400 metres into deeper water to ensure that bathing water standards are maintained on adjacent beaches. The estimated completion date is August 1979. The sewerage work involves replacing the existing rising main, which has deteriorated and is subject to frequent failure. The work will commence this year and will not be completed until June 1980.

Dr. EASTICK: Problems associated with electrolysis arose in connection with the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline. Is the neutralisation of the water supply an endeavour to prevent further electrolysis in the pipeline, or is it simply connected with the water quality for Port Pirie and Whyalla?

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

Vote passed.

Public Buildings, $97 700 000.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In view of the time, perhaps I should put my questions on notice.

Vote passed.

Environment, $1 420 000.

Mr. GUNN: Funds are allocated under this vote for the purchase of more national parks or conservation parks. Where is it intended to acquire this land? The department cannot properly administer the land it already has. Therefore, before taxpayers' funds or Loan funds are committed to acquire more land, consolidation of land already held and proper management techniques should be employed to administer this land properly.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The provision of $1 420 000 includes the sum of $425 000 for the development of Wilpena Pound, which is well under way; $50 000 to purchase equipment to bring the fire-fighting capabilities up to the desired level; and $792 000 for improvement to parks. That last sum has been allocated as follows: new facilities for visitors and ranger housing, $300 000; building improvements, $50 000; power, sewerage, water (Belair in particular), $140 000; general development and roads, $145 000; fencing, tracks, etc., $100 000; and minor projects, $57 000. Included in the overall provision is $153 000 for the purchase of land. The honourable member will see that the acquisition of land programme has been wound down significantly.

Vote passed.

Other Capital Advances and Provisions, $18 535 000.

Mr. TONKIN: First, the Opposition is grateful for the assurances given to us tonight that the many detailed questions that we could ask on the Loan Estimates will be answered by way of Questions on Notice. However, once honourable members have finished seeking information on this vote, I intend to move that it be reduced by $100 000. That is the allocation for the Monarto Development Commission, and members are aware of the significance of that sum. My motion is aimed not at members of the commission but at a principle—that the commission and Monarto itself have proved to be an absolute Government disaster. Therefore, I will take that action at the appropriate time.

Mr. GUNN: The relocation of the township of Leigh Creek has been allocated $4 200 000. What stage has the planning for this new town reached? Will there be any more undue delays in its construction? It was my understanding that in normal circumstances construction would have commenced. I know that a considerable amount of work has been done on the site, trees have been planted, earth has been carted and fencing has been erected, but there was some concern expressed about the delay. Is work proceeding according to schedule and when is it expected that the first homes will be put on site?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think things are proceeding to schedule. I am not sure when the first homes will be available. Obviously, there has to be a fair investment for the provision of services in the new town before that can take place, and that will be some time away. I will obtain a precise answer for the honourable member as to what is planned in relation to the first building of new homes in the new town.

Mr. GUNN: I would appreciate that. What types of home will be constructed, and has a final decision been made whether the town will be run on a basis similar to that on which the existing town runs or whether it will be, as has been described in some circles, an open town? A great deal of interest has been expressed by the residents of Leigh Creek on how the town will be run. The existing operation appears to have worked very satisfactorily for many years.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Extensive discussions have taken place with the townspeople, and the detailed decision on what will take place will be announced very shortly.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.58 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 19 October at 2 p.m.