

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 25 March 1980

The **SPEAKER (Hon. B. C. Eastick)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

### ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Barley Marketing Act Amendment,  
Motor Fuel Rationing,  
Wheat Marketing.

### PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

Petitions signed by 650 residents of South Australia praying that the House would legislate to tighten restrictions on pornography and establish clear classification standards under the Classification of Publications Act were presented by the Hons. W. E. Chapman, E. R. Goldsworthy, and R. R. Payne, and Messrs. Bannon, Evans, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Schmidt, and Whitten.  
Petitions received.

### PETITIONS: TRADING HOURS

Petitions signed by 998 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose the Bill to extend trading hours for retail food stores until 6 p.m. on Saturdays were presented by the Hon. D. J. Hopgood and Messrs. Abbott, Ashenden, Glazbrook, Millhouse, and Plunkett.  
Petitions received.

### PETITIONS: PROSTITUTION BILL

Petitions signed by 91 citizens of South Australia praying that the House would pass the Prostitution Bill without delay were presented by Messrs. Abbott and Hamilton.  
Petitions received.

### QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the written answers to all questions on the Notice Paper except Nos. 314, 330, 469, 513, 537, 550, 557, 569, 585, 589, 595, 596, 600, 603, 606, 612, 615, 624, 627, 630 to 632, 638, 649, 667, 671, 683, 699, 702 to 706, 714, 716 to 719, 721, 755, 757, 761, 762, 766, 768, 777, and 779 to 782 be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

### TEA TREE GULLY THEATRE

In reply to **Dr. BILLARD** (21 February).

The **Hon. D. C. WOTTON**: The State Government's arts policy encourages community based cultural activities in outer metropolitan areas such as Tea Tree Gully, including a provision of funds to assist in the establishment of a theatre in the Tea Tree Gully area. The Minister of Arts has approved the establishment of a small working party, under the Chairmanship of the Mayor of the City of Tea Tree Gully, Mr. G. J. Tilley, consisting of representatives of the Department for the Arts and the

Tea Tree Gully Council. The working party has the following terms of reference:

1. To examine the various options for the funding operations and location of a suitable theatre facility at Tea Tree Gully;

2. To recommend to the Minister of Arts the appropriate use of funds currently reserved for the preparation of initial studies, schematic plans and cost estimates; and

3. Recommend appropriate action to the Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully and the Minister of Arts.

The Committee is currently considering these matters and its final recommendation will be made to the Minister by the end of April.

### REGIONAL SALVAGE YARDS

In reply to **Mr. BLACKER** (27 February).

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: Under the Public Supply and Tender Act the control of disposal of all worn-out, obsolete, unserviceable or surplus stores for the Public Service is vested in the Supply and Tender Board. In terms of regulation 19 under the Act, the board has given permanent heads of departments delegated authority to dispose of stores to a limited value. Some auction sales have been arranged in country areas; however, when a sufficiently large quantity of salvage material is available, it is normal practice to call public tenders for sale ex the country depot. The benefits of establishing Government salvage stores in selected country towns has been considered by the Committee of Inquiry into the Public Sector Procurement and Supply Function. The committee's report is currently being considered by the Government.

### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Education (The Hon. H. Allison)—

*By Command—*

i. Legal Services Commission—Report, 1978-79.

*Pursuant to Statute—*

i. Supreme Court Act, 1935-1975—Supreme Court Rules—Chamber Business.

By the Minister of Environment (The Hon. D. C. Wotton)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

i. Recreation Grounds (Regulations) Act, 1931-1978—Regulations—Corporation of Prospect—Penalty.

ii. Corporation of Noarlunga—By-law No. 11—Control of Beach and Foreshore.

iii. District Council of Kingscote—By-law No. 26—Camping.

District Council of Mannum—

iv. By-law No. 4—Petrol Pumps.

v. By-law No. 10—Keeping of Dogs.

By the Minister of Planning (The Hon. D. C. Wotton)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

i. Planning and Development Act, 1966-1978—Interim Development Control—District Council of Karoonda East Murray.

By the Minister of Transport (The Hon. M. M. Wilson)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Road Traffic Act, 1961-1979—Regulations—

- I. Clearways—Traffic Prohibition
- II. Marion
- III. Meadows
- IV. West Torrens
- V. Whyalla
- VI. Woodville

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (The Hon. M. M. Wilson)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- I. Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1978—Regulations—Instant Bingo.

By the Minister of Health (The Hon. Jennifer Adamson)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- I. Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science—Report, 1977-78.  
South Australian Health Commission Act, 1975-1978—Hospital By-laws.
- II. Modbury Hospital—Control of Grounds.
- III. Port Augusta Hospital Inc.—Control of Grounds.

By the Minister of Water Resources (The Hon. P. B. Arnold)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- I. Engineering and Water Supply Department—Report, 1978-79.

#### MINISTER OF ENVIRONMENT

**The SPEAKER:** Before calling on Question Time, I indicate to the House that the honourable Minister of Environment is in New Zealand on Ministerial business and that any questions relating to his portfolios will be directed to the honourable Minister of Transport.

#### QUESTION TIME

##### DEPARTMENTAL AMALGAMATION

**Mr. BANNON:** My question is directed to the Premier and concerns administrative arrangements of departments. Will the Premier confirm that the Environment and the Urban and Regional Affairs Departments are to be amalgamated? Is this the first stage in the dismantling of the Government's environmental protection apparatus? This matter was first raised by my colleague in another place, Dr. Cornwall, on 26 February, and the Attorney-General replied that there was absolutely no prospect of this and no threat to the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs. However, I understand that such an amalgamation is to take place on 1 May, with the Director-General to be appointed on a contract basis, that the arrangements are to be completed by 1 September, and that the announcement of this will be made shortly.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am delighted to answer the Leader's question, and I thank him for asking it for us. Although the Leader's asking this question is slightly amusing under the circumstances, the matters surrounding the reason for his asking the question certainly are not. The Leader of the Opposition is obviously following up some activities which were undertaken by the Public Service Association today in approaching the Acting Director of the departments concerned, and making the allegations which he has paraded forth in this House this afternoon.

Such an amalgamation has not been decided upon, and the matter has not been brought to any decision by Cabinet, but the remarkable thing is that the Leader of the Opposition can stand in this House without blushing and go straight forward into reading what was a submission

that had been prepared for consideration by Cabinet, when, unfortunately, he has not been able to foresee the fact that that submission has not been decided upon by Cabinet and, indeed, has been held back for further consideration. I find it quite remarkable that he is able to quote in this House from dates and time tables given in the draft document. I wonder where he got the information from. I can only repeat in this House my grave concern at this disgraceful occurrence which the Leader of the Opposition has connived at today.

Any possible amalgamation of the Department for the Environment with any other department, whether it be the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs or otherwise, has not been decided. When it is decided, it will be announced in good time. The people in the departments concerned will be notified beforehand, and, if the decision is taken to amalgamate, I trust that we will not hear the Leader of the Opposition quoting from a document which has obviously, to put it mildly, been stolen.

#### PRIVATE HOSPITALS

**Mr. BECKER:** Has the Minister of Health received any complaints regarding the declining quality of patient care in private hospitals? I refer to an article in the *News* of 10 March, headed "Wage cuts affecting private hospital care", as follows:

The State Opposition spokesman on Health, Mr. Terry Hemmings, claims nursing standards in some private hospitals are dropping because of attempts to cut down on wages bills.

Referring to private hospitals, Mr. Hemmings stated:

They are extracting as much profit as they can—at the expense of care standards and nursing unemployment . . .

I am concerned that all health care in South Australia—both public and private—revolves around the dollar. Public awareness of the decline in standards in public hospitals has led to an increase in demand for private hospital care . . .

I want an inquiry into the whole private sector—either by a Government or independent body.

The Secretary of the Private Hospitals and Nursing Homes Association of South Australia replied in the 19 March issue of the *News* as follows:

There are few sectors of private endeavour that continuously operate under close scrutiny as the health care industry.

In view of those statements, I am most concerned that the shadow Minister should make such derogatory and unsubstantiated remarks.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I have not had any complaints about the care of patients in private hospitals along the lines suggested by the honourable member. However, I have had some very bitter complaints from the great private hospitals of South Australia who took great umbrage at those irresponsible statements, reported in the *News*, made by the honourable member, who purports to speak on matters of health on behalf of the Opposition.

I assure the honourable member that, within 24 hours of his statement appearing in the *News*, the great church hospitals of this State were very angry indeed—and rightly so. There was not one scintilla of evidence to substantiate the claims that the honourable member made. As I say, within 24 hours of that article appearing in the paper, I was advised by the Chairman of St. Andrews Hospital that he and Sister Marie Hedigan (who is the head of the Order of St. Mary of the Little Sisters, which runs Calvary Hospital) had prepared a reply to the *News* refuting those statements that he made.

The great church hospitals and the great community hospitals of this State have been slurred by the honourable member's allegations. Had they been substantiated, I would certainly have considered an investigation. Indeed, in all cases I will immediately instruct that investigations be made of any specific complaints, but not one word has come to me or to my office substantiating the allegations that were made.

I should also point out, in case the honourable member is not aware of the fact, that at present a Royal Commission of inquiry is being conducted into the administration and efficiency of hospitals in Australia. I should think that a Royal Commission conducted on a nationwide basis would be sufficient to investigate the matters that the honourable member has raised and, if the honourable member has any evidence to give, perhaps he should present it to that Royal Commission. If he has not, perhaps then he should remain silent instead of casting slurs on the private sector in the belief that somehow it is going to enhance his and his Party's image in the view of the public. I assure him that the reverse is the case, and that that has been proved to be so in respect of the statement that he has made.

### O'BAHN SYSTEM

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** Will the Minister of Transport say what further investigations need to be made into the O'Bahn bus concept before the Minister can announce that he has kept faith with the transport proposals for the people living in the north-eastern suburbs?

In response to a statement made today by the Leader of the Opposition, the Minister of Transport said that his Government had honoured its election promise not by installing the O'Bahn system but by investigating the O'Bahn system, and comparing it with all other NEAPTR options. Yet, in an official press statement issued on 4 September, the Minister stated:

The O'Bahn transport system had been investigated thoroughly by the Liberal Party.

He went on to say, in the same press statement:

In Government, we will move as quickly as possible in seeing the scheme implemented.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** I do not really know how many times the Opposition must be told of the Government's election promise that we put before the people prior to the last election. We said then that the Government would investigate the O'Bahn system and compare it with the other options and that we would compare it to the I.r.t., in particular.

*The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:*

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The reports on the O'Bahn system have been completed. They have not yet been considered by Cabinet, nor has Cabinet decided what method of consultation the Government will undertake with the people of the State, particularly those in the north-east. The Government intends to take that consultative process. The Government is most concerned that the people of the north-east receive a rapid transit system, which they will receive. This investigation has taken six months from the date of this Government's entering office, whereas the NEAPTR investigations took two and a half years.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** But you said, on 4 September, that you'd thoroughly investigated it.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** Surely the Deputy Leader would not expect the Government to bring forth a scheme to the people of this State without a proper technical

investigation by the State's transport officers, and that is exactly what the Government has done.

### GAUGE STANDARDISATION

**Mr. OLSEN:** Will the Minister of Transport investigate the effects that the proposed standard gauge rail link between Crystal Brook and Adelaide will have on existing employment opportunities in the region, particularly in relation to the exclusion of a spur line to the port of Wallaroo, and use his influence to encourage the Federal Government and Australian National Railways to reassess their attitude to the spur line? As a major exporting port for grain and live sheep, in addition to importing phosphate rock that requires sulphuric acid to be railed in from Port Pirie, Wallaroo depends on this vital transport link to provide employment in what is termed a rural industrial area, and it has been reported that any impediment to the movement of 188 000 tonnes of freight will have a very detrimental effect on the port.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The short answer is, "Yes, I certainly will take up the matter." I have had informal discussions with the A.N.R. on the standardisation of the Wallaroo-Snowtown spur line. However, such standardisation will not be part of the standardisation agreement between the Commonwealth and the State; therefore, at present it is not a matter of discussion between the negotiating team. I have had personal discussions with A.N.R. on this fact, and I think I can say that we can be reasonably hopeful that the Wallaroo-Snowtown spur line will be converted to standard gauge after the completion of the other projects. I believe that about six kilometres has already been converted to standard gauge by means of a third rail, and it is my understanding that this is the way in which it will be done.

The honourable member, in his opening remarks, referred to the effect on employment opportunities as a result of the standardisation of the Adelaide to Crystal Brook line. I have to report to him and to other members that I am at present negotiating with the Federal Minister for Transport (Mr. Hunt) about employment opportunities that may be lost in Port Pirie and Peterborough (especially the Port Pirie section will interest the honourable member and the member for Stuart), because I believe it is an important function of the State to try to protect the jobs of the people in those areas.

### WOMEN'S ADVISER

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Will the Minister of Education explain why the Government decided to shelve the appointment of a women's adviser in the Department of Further Education and, following a statement made by a spokesman for the Minister that the decision to defer the appointment will be reconsidered, will the Minister say whether an appointment will now be made? The Government has made a number of about-faces in recent weeks, and I understand that the Minister had a meeting this morning on this subject. Will he inform us of the Government's current position?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** There has not been an about-face in this matter. Several months ago, I was asked to provide about \$2 000 for the air fare for a person to come over from the United States of America to be interviewed for the position. That person was one of the applicants. There was also the possibility that additional funds would have to be made available to transport the lady and her family to Australia should she be successful in her

application. That was the first intimation I had that this position had, in fact, been advertised and that an appointment would be made.

As I was travelling to the United States on a personally funded holiday, I said that probably it might be more expedient if I conducted a preliminary interview of the young woman in San Francisco, and that I did.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member must not speculate.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The interview took place in a public place in a San Francisco harbor-front cafe in the presence of my family, who were interested observers from some little distance away. On returning to South Australia, I discussed this matter with the Director-General of the Department of Further Education, Mr. Kloeden. I had some reservations about appointing yet another women's adviser. It seems to have been the thing over many years to appoint a women's adviser. The reservation I had was that this was possibly another sop to womankind, and that the appointment of a women's adviser might, in fact, set such persons aside from administration rather than directly involve them in administration of whatever department to which they were attached.

I also made inquiries about the number of women actively involved in women's matters who might be promotable within the Department of Further Education. There is an imbalance of staff within the primary branch, with more women than men. In secondary education, the imbalance is the other way. In the Department of Further Education I find that, generally, because of the long-standing connection between the Department of Further Education and the School of Mines, dating back to the early 1800's, there has been a dominance of men in trades.

I do not apologise for wishing to clear up quite a few doubts that I have. I am still doing that, and this morning's discussions with Rosemary Wighton and Mary Beasley (experts in the field of advice to women) went some way along the track in further clearing up the various questions with which I have been worrying myself. The deferment was recommended by me to Cabinet. It is no more than that: it is a deferment, and the matter will be reintroduced to Cabinet when I am satisfied that the appointment of a women's adviser is the best way of resolving a fairly difficult problem.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Do you think you will have to go back to San Francisco to clear it up?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** No. The young lady I referred to had every intention of coming to South Australia and is currently resident here. Indeed, she lived here for several years previously.

**Mr. Becker:** But we paid for her trip.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I will not say any more about that. This young woman had intended to reside in South Australia, as she told me when I interviewed her in San Francisco. I will refer this matter back to Cabinet and will contact a few more interested parties who have expressed their desire to discuss this matter with me. Those interested parties include the Institute of Teachers and its recently-appointed women's adviser.

#### DETENTION CENTRES

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Will the Chief Secretary say whether the Government intends to comply with recommendation 163 of the South Australian Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee in its first report on sentencing and correction, which recommendation states

that Gladstone Prison and Cadell Training Centre should be phased out? Together with some of my colleagues, I recently visited the Cadell Training Centre (I know some of my enemies on the other side of the House would wish that I had stayed there) and we were most impressed with the progress being made in the institution generally, the effects on its inmates and the excellent record that it generally has. The Minister will know that Cadell is a minimum security centre (as it were, a prison without bars), which was established mainly to train the prisoners to prepare them for their return to society. At the same time, it does a service of great benefit to the farming and fruit-growing industries as an experimental centre.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The honourable member raises two matters of great interest. First, Gladstone Gaol is already closed. I understand that it is a substantial building and, if the developments that should take place in South Australia if people are allowed to get on with the job of developing this State do occur, we may unfortunately have to open that gaol again for the purposes for which it was built. When a building is designed for a special use it is often best used for the purpose for which it was intended.

The honourable member is correct in saying that recommendation 163 did refer to the closure of the Gladstone Gaol and the Cadell Training Centre. The detention centre at Cadell, which is a minimum security centre, is doing a wonderful job in relation to the rehabilitation of its inmates. It is engaging them in a useful enterprise that benefits not only the department but also the State. I think all people who were associated with that recommendation now agree that Cadell is worth while, and they do not hold the view about it that they held when they made the recommendation.

As the honourable member pointed out, a visit to Cadell is an eye-opener for those who have not been there, and it points out clearly that all is not lost for people who offend against society, and Cadell goes a long way to rehabilitating them into society. The Government does not intend to close Cadell, but will see to it that the centre's facilities are improved to help the people within it. I leave the House with the comments I made about the Gladstone Gaol.

#### ELECTRONIC LISTENING DEVICES

**Mr. O'NEILL:** Can the Premier say whether a senior member of his staff when he was Leader of the Opposition purchased a number of electronic listening devices from an Adelaide electronic store? For what purpose, if any, were these electronic listening devices used? Was the Premier aware of that purchase at the time and, if so, did he approve or authorise that purchase?

I have been informed reliably from sources within the electronic industry and the media that a former press secretary to the then Leader of the Opposition, who is now employed in Adelaide by the Federal Ministry, purchased a number of electronic listening devices from World Imports, trading at 232 Rundle Street, Adelaide, in May 1978. I understand that these miniature transmitters were purchased for about \$60 or \$70 each. They have a short-term maximum range of 200 metres and can operate using FM receivers. Details of this purchase have been double checked, and I believe them to be true. I am sure the Premier would be grateful for this opportunity to clear up the matter.

**The SPEAKER:** Before calling upon the Premier, I draw attention to the unusual nature of the question. However, as it seeks to do precisely what the honourable member for

Florey last stated, I direct the question to the Premier.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The answer is "No".

### CURRICULUM EXPERT

**Mr. GLAZBROOK:** Will the Minister of Education tell the House the results of the discussions held with Professor Maggs this morning, and also advise members of the purpose of his visit? In this morning's *Advertiser*, in an article written by Sheena McLean headed "More teachers not answer", says expert", it is reported that Professor Maggs was in Adelaide to talk to the Minister of Education on teaching methods and curricula. It is also stated that he said that too often "teachers were teaching in the language but did not teach the language". The article stated:

A 3 per cent to 5 per cent cut in the education budget, without a decline in the quality of services, could be easily achieved if the instructional side of education was improved.

This applies both to training teachers and teaching assistants. Professor Maggs was an adviser on education to the former Whitlam Government.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I believe that Professor Maggs is not, as quoted in the *Advertiser* this morning, a professor but rather a lecturer at some Australian university in, I believe, clinical psychology. There were one or two errors in the article. Professor Maggs, or Mr. Maggs, was certainly not in Adelaide specifically to visit me, but rather an appointment was solicited because he was in the district on business. I have never in any way corresponded with the gentleman or exchanged views with him. I have not met him before, and I do not think there is very much possibility that I will be meeting him.

I did not, in fact, exchange any views with Mr. Maggs. There was no discussion today because upon reading in the *Advertiser* that he was anxious to discuss curriculum developments and teaching methodology, I referred him to the Director-General of Education within whose statutory province those two subjects lie. The Director-General had some brief discussion with Mr. Maggs, and with another gentleman who I believe was with him. The fact remains that, although this gentleman may have been an adviser to the former Whitlam Government, he is not an adviser, nor will he be, to the present Government. I understand that possibly the main tenor of his visit to South Australia was of a commercial nature. I will not be seeing him.

### PITJANTJATJARA COUNCIL

**Mr. ABBOTT:** Did the Premier, after meeting members of the Pitjantjatjara Council Executive on Thursday 13 March, give an understanding not to disclose details of those negotiations and, if so, why did he on the following day break that agreement? On Saturday 15 March the chairman of the Pitjantjatjara Council, Mr. Pantju Thompson, was reported in the *Advertiser* as saying that he and the council executive were "dismayed and angry" that the Premier had chosen to comment on the meeting after promising not to do so. Mr. Thompson said that the Premier's comments in the *News* on the day following the meeting did not accurately reflect what took place. He said the council, bound by a mutual understanding not to disclose matters discussed on Thursday, had remained silent and that the Premier appeared to have broken his side of the promise and made a comment that undermined the constructive nature of the talks, which involved significant Government concessions.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am not quite sure what emphasis the honourable member places on "significant Government concessions".

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Just answer the question.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am perfectly happy to answer the question, and I am certain that you, Mr. Speaker, will make sure that I do. The details given in the newspaper story were not details of the meeting with the Pitjantjatjara people, which was a very good meeting indeed, as I think everyone who attended agreed it was. I made that very comment, and I further answered a question which was asked of me, when I said that I hoped that it would be possible to have a Bill on Pitjantjatjara land rights before this Parliament within the next few weeks.

That did not in any way break any agreement that was made not to comment on the nature of the meeting itself, nor was any such breaking of a confidence made.

### STATE TAXES

**Dr. BILLARD:** Is the Premier aware that a document written by the Leader of the Opposition and circulating within the community forecasts the possibility of a decline in Commonwealth funds to South Australia as a direct result of the State's tax-cut policies and also predicts a rise in State taxes? The Opposition report No. 3 of 17 March states:

It is possible that South Australia could also lose Commonwealth funds in the relativities review as a result of Mr. Tonkin's election promise to cut land tax revenues. The commission places emphasis on each State's tax effort, and Mr. Tonkin's electioneering could lead the commission to conclude that South Australia is making less than a satisfactory effort to raise its own revenues. If this does occur, Mr. Tonkin will have cost the State both land tax revenues and income tax sharing grants. The inevitable result would then be higher State taxes.

Can the Premier say whether these claims are well founded?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The Government is very flattered indeed by the fact that the Opposition has seen fit to take up an initiative which the Government adopted in Opposition, but that is about as far as I can go in passing compliments, because the standard of the publication which I have indeed seen and which has been referred to by the honourable member is far from satisfactory and, indeed, contains a large number of inaccuracies. I have said before in this House that I sincerely advise the Leader to seek better advice than he is getting. Unfortunately, the document which is being set out is personally endorsed by the Leader of the Opposition in an attempt to lend credibility to its sweeping inaccuracies. Again, this is aimed at undermining public confidence in the financial administration of the State, and that is a very dangerous course indeed to follow.

As far as the specific claims that have been made in that document are concerned, the Leader has no doubt been informed that, in respect of special State claims for additional finance and assistance, the Commonwealth Grants Commission has always examined very carefully the tax structures of both claimant States and the standard States of New South Wales and Victoria, and unfortunately he seems to have made a wrong assumption in this matter, because he has assumed that a similar examination will be made in respect of the relativities review which is to occur at the end of next year.

The commission does not, and has not for many years, made a comparison of each State's tax effort. As stated by

the Leader, instead, the commission uses the taxable capacity of the States as the basis for its comparison. That is an entirely different measurement, which, obviously, the Leader of the Opposition has not quite understood. In an effort to understand this matter and to obtain the correct information, all that the Leader had to do was lift the telephone and speak to an officer of the Treasury, or, if he wished, he could have gone to the library and read a copy of the latest Grants Commission Report, if he has not a copy of it. However, he did not bother to do that. To make a political point, once again, he got it all wrong; he seems to be a little accident prone.

The honourable member made reference also to the other misrepresentation on the specific matter of land tax, and the question of affecting the State's entitlements, if State land tax is abolished. He claimed that, if we abolish land tax on the principal place of residence, as we have done, the Government will be lowering its tax effort below that of other States, and that for some reason this will jeopardise our Federal funding arrangements. This suggestion just does not hold water. It is the most empty argument that I have ever heard and is totally inaccurate. I am assuming that it is a misunderstanding of the situation; I do not really believe that the Leader would put forward a deliberate libel in this matter. Perhaps he would, but I prefer to think that it is just sheer incompetence.

*The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Well, it is just not on. I point out to the Leader that every other State took action before South Australia did in granting substantial land tax concessions on the principal place of residence. Again, all the Leader had to do was refer to the various land tax Acts, which are in the library. I point out to him that they are there for his examination if he so wishes and had he looked at them he would have found that New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia completely exempt principal places of residence on half an acre, 2½ acres and 5 acres respectively, and that Victoria and Tasmania completely exempt principal places of residence on an unimproved capital value basis; that is, if it does not exceed \$33 000 and \$30 000 respectively.

Finally, I say that the Leader will have to find some better basis than that of State taxation if he wants to gain any credibility at all, because the tax record of the former Government, of which he was a Minister, is well known. That record has been further reconfirmed by the Bureau of Statistics latest publication on taxation revenue, which collates all figures up to June 1978. I do not think that this has been released before, but I think it bears bringing into this House. As everyone knows, it is an independent publication.

It shows that in the eight years to June 1978 per capita State taxes in South Australia increased by 312 per cent, which was 62 per cent faster than in New South Wales, 34 per cent faster than in Victoria, 80 per cent faster than in Queensland, 81 per cent faster than in Western Australia, 45 per cent faster than in Tasmania, and 55 per cent faster than the national average. If the Leader really believes that the people of South Australia do not appreciate the immediate action that this Government took upon coming into office, which was to significantly relieve the burden of State taxation, then, Sir, I would say that the Leader has no future in politics at all.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. BANNON:** Appreciating the Premier's interest in finances available to the State and the publication of the Opposition report, I ask him whether he can confirm that one effect of recent adjustment to income tax costing \$616 000 000 in 1980-81 will be to cause a further

deterioration in the South Australian Budget outlook to the extent of \$25 000 000 to \$30 000 000 from 1 July next year, through reduced income tax sharing grants from the Commonwealth. Will the Premier now support my repeated calls for the States to share in the massive revenues being generated from the Federal Government's petrol tax and world parity pricing policy which have financed the recent changes to income tax? Will the Premier raise this matter at the Premiers' Conference later this year?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The Leader of the Opposition can try to divert attention from his own ineptitude as much as he likes but, regarding revenue changes, the Government is well prepared to take up any challenge that may come to it because of the difficulties that may arise as a result of a reduction on any relief in income tax. He has omitted to say that the total sum which will come to South Australia may well be reduced by virtue of the changes which were made at the most recent Premiers' Conference. It may well be that this State has to make up a shortfall, as he has said, but I find it absolutely remarkable that he should now be adopting the tack that the State should be looking for additional income to make up a shortfall of \$25 000 000, when he denies that that is a question which should concern us at all when talking about his spurious claims of a shortfall or, rather, a deficit of \$40 000 000 next financial year.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** He said "this financial year".

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** He said "this financial year" earlier. As far as I am concerned, the revenues that have been coming to the Federal Government as a result of its taxing policy on petroleum products are a matter of concern. They have been discussed with other Premiers and they will be a matter for discussion with other Premiers at the Premiers' Conference in June. Regarding whether it should be considered directly with the States, every member is well aware of the Opposition's commitment to centralist government and hand-outs from Canberra, as opposed to the States taking responsibility for their own affairs. If that happens, we will have, as a State, our share of whatever there is to come. We will do everything possible to ensure that this State's share is as high as it can be (that goes without saying), but we are also prepared to take the responsibility of looking after our own affairs and doing it to the best of our ability, which the previous Government was totally unable to do.

## TILES

**Mr. OSWALD:** Has the Minister of Industrial Affairs seen the report in the *Advertiser* of 20 March 1980 concerning the problems faced by local plaster tile manufacturers, and can he comment on the type of tile being used at the State Government Insurance Commission building?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I have seen the report, and I thank the honourable member for the question. After listening to the Australian Broadcasting Commission news last Sunday evening, I had expected the member for Mitcham to be asking this question today. Apparently, there must be a sitting elsewhere this afternoon, as he is not here. I have carried out an investigation of the claims made in the report in the *Advertiser*, and, undoubtedly, local ceiling-tile manufacturers are undergoing some difficulty. Undoubtedly, too, employment in that area has dropped. I believe, also, that they should look at the circumstances and some of the basic reasons why employment in the industry has dropped.

I take the example quoted in the *Advertiser*, namely, that of the S.G.I.C. building. This decision was taken by the previous Government, but I have carried out a full investigation as to the type of tile to be used in that building and of the various cost factors involved. When the tenders were issued for that building in Victoria Square, the tender for plaster tiles that came from a local company was \$375 904, whereas the tender for imported mineral-fibre tiles was \$290 058, a difference in favour of the cheaper imported tile of \$85 846. After some investigation with a local plaster tile manufacturer, there was a request that it reduce the size of the tile, with the possibility of reducing its cost.

After that subsequent adjustment in the price of the local product, the price was reduced to \$352 181, leaving a difference of \$62 123 in favour of the imported mineral-fibre tile. With a difference of more than 20 per cent extra involved in the cost of the local product, and because that exceeds any level of difference that a Government could reasonably expect to include to favour a local product, it was decided by S.G.I.C. to proceed with the importing of tiles. I point out to the House that S.G.I.C. is a statutory authority: it makes its own decisions and is not under the direct control of the Minister. It is not for me, as Minister of Public Works, to instruct S.G.I.C. on the type of tile it will use in its buildings.

However, S.G.I.C. did supply other information about why it had selected the imported tiles, one important reason being the maintenance of the imported tile when compared to the much heavier local tile. The imported tile is very light, and the local tile is much more susceptible to damage in handling during the construction stage. Finally, S.G.I.C. pointed out that the aesthetics of the imported tile were superior to those of the domestic tile. It has already erected a prototype ceiling and believes that the quality of that ceiling is better than if it had used the local product.

I have arranged a meeting with the local plaster tile manufacturers. During that meeting I will put to them that they should start to review some of the products that they are producing, and their production techniques, because it has become fairly obvious to the Government that some of the tiles are not suitable for modern building standards and that, if local manufacturers wish to maintain employment and to obtain local contracts, they must produce a much lighter, smaller tile produced of mineral-fibre rather than the heavier plaster tile they have produced so far. When that meeting takes place, I hope we can do something to reorganise the local industry and redirect it so that it is much more efficient.

#### HEALTH SERVICE

**Mr. PETERSON:** Will the Minister of Health say whether she intends to discontinue the Port Adelaide occupational health service and allow the industrial injury clinic at Port Adelaide to take over all casualty services for the area? Currently, there are two emergency medical aid stations servicing the area. One is the industrial injury clinic, which is a privately owned and operated business with direct arrangements with some local industries for treatment of their employees. Members of the general public are not treated at that centre. The other is the occupational health service, which is Government funded and occupies the building used by the old Port Adelaide Casualty Hospital. In those two forms those facilities have provided special clinic facilities and emergency aid for general industry and the general public for many years. In addition, an occupational health nurse is employed by the

service. The service is also used as a casualty station by the Department of Marine and Harbors, the State Transport Authority, Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Port Adelaide corporation, and the Department of Customs and Excise.

There is a strong feeling in the community that this service should be extended from a 5½ days a week to a seven days a week operation and be the nucleus for a community health service so badly needed by Port Adelaide, a need that will not be catered for by private enterprise. That need has been acknowledged by the Government, and I quote from *Hansard*, as follows:

It [the Government] recognises the importance of hospitals and of locally accessible community based health services in the overall pattern of health care.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The matter has not come before me for a decision. In light of the honourable member's question, I will certainly ask for a report and let him know the result of that inquiry.

#### FIRE LEVY

**Mr. GUNN:** Can the Chief Secretary say whether the Government intends to examine the current method of funding fire protection in South Australia and particularly the levy charged on insurance policy holders? This matter was raised recently in a report which was made to him. Also, it seems that those members of the public who are prudent enough to insure their properties against fire are forced to pay a levy to help to finance fire protection in this State, whereas those members of the public who care to carry their own risk escape having to make a contribution but are entitled to the same protection as those members of the public who care to insure. This is an important matter and I would be pleased if the Chief Secretary could examine it.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The member for Eyre is quite right. A lengthy report was made as a result of an investigation set up by the previous Government and it looked into the operations of fire protection in Fire Brigade districts. I made a submission to Cabinet that the report should be circulated to interested parties, and that has been done. Amongst the many recommendations made is one regarding the raising of funds for fire protection. It is that a levy should be raised on property within the respective districts. I point out that this does not cover the Country Fire Services districts about which I daresay the member for Eyre is speaking. It is not proposed that this report shall cover the C.F.S. districts, although I have had much input from interested parties in those districts.

We are examining this report in detail and I have had a summary in general made by members of the committee regarding the responses we have received from the forwarding of those reports. It will be some time before I am able to make a submission to Cabinet, because it is an extensive report and its ramifications are wide. The report does bring within its ambit all property that has fire protection under the Act and it does recommend the removal of the funding from the insurance policies. That seems to have the approval of most of the responses that we have had. I again point out that the report does not cover the C.F.S.

#### PAY-ROLL TAX

**Mr. WHITTEN:** Will the Premier say whether there is now a new Government policy by which departments and

statutory authorities no longer have to pay pay-roll tax? If there is, when will an official announcement be made? In this House of 6 March the Premier quoted from and endorsed a letter from the Earthmoving Contractors Association of South Australia which stated that the public sector paid no pay-roll tax. However, in the Premier's own Budget there is provision for pay-roll tax to be paid by all departments; for instance, \$986 000 by the Public Buildings Department and \$13 600 000 by the Education Department and others. Does the Premier's answer mean that these charges will not be levied in 1980-81?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** No.

#### MINISTRY OF DEREGULATION

**Mr. BLACKER:** Can the Premier say whether he will consider the appointment of a Minister of Deregulation? I have received complaints that during the term of office of the previous Government South Australia was subjected to "government by regulation", and that these numerous regulations were stifling initiative, enterprise and progress, particularly in the small business area. This Government still has a large number of regulations coming through: more than 100 regulations are on today's Notice Paper.

I have been informed that some other countries have found themselves over-regulated and have appointed a special Ministry of Deregulation to systematically examine and, if appropriate, remove redundant and unnecessary regulations.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am most grateful for the interest shown by the member for Flinders in this most important matter and I thank him for the question. I think it may be the Province of British Columbia (it is certainly one of the Canadian Provinces) that has appointed a Minister of Deregulation. The annual reports of that Minister which have been received for the past two years have been closely studied by members of the research staff of my department. Further, a committee has met to investigate means of cutting back all unnecessary regulations; in other words, cutting through red tape. That committee has met steadily and it is finding more and more on which to report. I am expecting that it will make an interim report some time in the relatively near future.

At the present time there is no suggestion that we should have a Minister of Deregulation as there is in Canada. The matter can be dealt with on a departmental basis. I can assure the House and the people of South Australia that the Government is determined to make sure that unnecessary red tape and regulations, much of which adds to the cost to consumers and manufacturers of consumer goods in this State, will be identified and dealt with as soon as possible.

#### SACRED SITES

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs say, in the light of recent negotiations between the Pitjantjatjara people and the State Government over land rights in the North West, what has happened to the time table announced on 3 February by the Premier relating to the identification of sacred sites in order that they may be protected? Has the working party established by the Government, as announced at that time, commenced its work?

Since the announcement on 3 February the Government has been silent on the sacred sites working party and the role of the Relics Unit generally. However, according to a

report by Kym Tilbrook and Robert Ball in the *Advertiser* of 13 March, only 1 per cent of sacred Aboriginal sites throughout South Australia have been documented by the Government's Relics Unit.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The question of the working party was a contentious one in the early debates with the Pitjantjatjara during our private negotiations and the matter has simply been held in abeyance at their request. It will be revived, in all probability, but it certainly will not be revived without the concurrence of the Pitjantjatjara. Meanwhile, I reassure the member that the work which has been going on rather slowly by the unit connected with the Department for the Environment has been continuing and will continue, and the work of the working party which was proposed by the Government and to which the Pitjantjatjara objected was not to usurp the authority of that unit within the department, but simply to complement, to help things along much more quickly.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** You have held it back.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Our working party, at the request of the Pitjantjatjara, has been held in abeyance regarding appointment and commencement of its operations. We do not wish to do anything for the time being to prejudice those negotiations.

#### FIRE RESISTANT TREES

**Mr. EVANS:** Will the Minister of Agriculture negotiate, through his department, for further research to be carried out by C.S.I.R.O. regarding the fire resistance of different plant species and the benefit of fire breaks? It has been brought to my notice that, in the fires that have occurred in the bushlands of the State, some species of trees in particular are more dangerous in relation to fire. In the case of stringy bark, it tends to explode in extreme heat and, according to many people, it is the most dangerous tree.

However, cottonwood and some of the Northern Hemisphere trees, such as elm, oak and maple, are less likely to catch alight. In many cases, following the recent fires, they still remain standing, the fire having devastated the rest of the native bushland area. People are concerned that the road verges in the Hills are covered with native flora, which makes it very difficult for fire-fighters to operate. If this information was available to local government, and therefore to residents, we would have much better protection, whether fires be major or minor. Would the Minister also ask those responsible to investigate what is the best or the right size fire break to have in relation to the different types of growth that may exist on adjoining properties? That would also help, as has been pointed out by many Hills residents who still live in fear of a fire occurring in the major part of the Hills that has not been burnt.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** In response to the first part of the honourable member's question, I will ask the department to co-operate, and to seek recommendations from C.S.I.R.O. with respect to identifying those trees that are most fire resistant. However, in relation to the rest of the question and the explanation, I feel bound to say that, irrespective of which type of tree it is recommended should be planted in the Adelaide Hills, a degree of good management and good sense is still required by residents in the area. We already have within the Woods and Forests Department considerable expertise regarding the desirable types of plants that should be planted in such areas. Eucalypts and highly flammable plants of that kind do make fuel for pretty hot fire, in the event of one getting out of hand.



I repeat that it is important that every resident ensures cleanliness and good housekeeping of an area to be planted, even if that area is a building allotment. Unless the undergrowth, leaf build up, and other highly flammable material that accumulates in forests or tree-planted areas are kept clean, people will have not only their trees but also their fingers burnt. I urge the honourable member, in his capacity as a representative of the Hills district, in turn to urge his constituents to exercise common sense and every degree of caution possible in cleaning up their own boundaries, and to ensure that areas outside their boundaries are also cleaned up.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

**Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr. BANNON:** In answer to my question to the Premier seeking information concerning the possible change in Government administrative arrangements, the Premier accused me of having recourse to a stolen document in order to ask the question of him. In fact, I have seen no document and was not aware that one existed. Indeed, the Premier's answer revealed its existence, and confirmed the accuracy of the information that the Government plans to amalgamate the Departments of Environment and Urban and Regional Affairs.

#### 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:

Gilles Plains Community College, Stage III, and Redevelopment of Marleston College of Further Education,

North-Eastern Suburbs Trunk Sewer Re-organisation, Stage III,

Hillcrest Hospital (Fire Safety Upgrading, Wards 1, 2, 3, 4 and Litchfield House),

Stirling North Primary School.

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

River Murray Salinity Control Programme—Noora Drainage Disposal Scheme,  
Ordered that reports be printed.

#### ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1979. Read a first time.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

This legislation reflects this Government's concern for the loss of life and the injury that occurs on the roads of South Australia. It is one of several actions being taken by the Government to deal with the road toll, as we promised to do during the last election campaign. Having been elected by the people, we are now proceeding to carry out our promise and this legislation embodies one of them. This one in particular we promised because of our deep concern about the drink-driving problem. Indeed, because the

Government has a mandate from the people for this policy, we present this Bill to the Parliament.

The House will hardly need reminding of the loss suffered by our community because of road accidents. In the eight-year period from 1972 to 1979 the number of those killed on South Australia's roads dropped below 300 only once. In 1972, 312 were killed; in 1973, 329; in 1974, 382; in 1975, 339; in 1976, 307; in 1977, 306; in 1978, 291; and in 1979, 309. Many of our fellow citizens received injuries on the road. In 1972, it was 10 997; in 1973, 12 625; in 1974, 12 725; in 1975, 12 020; in 1976, 11 082; in 1977, 10 781; and in 1978, 11 209, the last year for which the full year figures are available. There are great costs to society from these accidents, whether we consider the extra demands they place on our hospital and health care facilities, the work and ability lost from the work force, or, most of all, the personal grief and tragedy caused to those closest to accident victims. The Government would be quite neglectful of its duty if it did not share the community's concern about these things.

It is widely known in the community these days that alcohol plays a particular role in road accidents. For information on this as it occurs in Adelaide, we have only to turn to the Adelaide In-Depth Accident Study carried out by the Road Accident Research Unit, University of Adelaide. The study revealed that in at least 28 per cent of the accidents surveyed, one or more of the active participants had been drinking. Of these accidents for which the blood alcohol content levels are known for all active participants, 29 per cent had one or more participants above 0.05 per cent, 24 per cent had one or more above 0.08 per cent, and 13 per cent had at least one participant above 0.15 per cent.

Alcohol involvement in multi-vehicle crashes tended to be at somewhat lower blood alcohol levels than for pedestrian accidents or single-vehicle crashes. The survey comments that the single-vehicle crash, which in the Adelaide metropolitan area involves a collision with a parked car or with a utility pole or tree at the roadside, can be characterised as the intoxicated driver's accident. Fifty-five per cent of the drivers in these single-vehicle accidents had a blood alcohol content level above 0.05 per cent, 50 per cent above 0.08 per cent, and 33 per cent above 0.15 per cent. These accidents tend to occur late at night, at times when drivers are most likely to have been drinking.

Because a collision with a utility pole or tree is often very severe, even at normal traffic speeds in the metropolitan area, these drivers and their passengers are often very badly injured, and so a close association is found between the severity of the crash measured in terms of the injuries sustained by the persons involved and the blood alcohol content level of the driver.

In the light of this situation and the increasing community awareness of it, the Government has decided to alter the law relating to breath testing in the way proposed in this legislation.

There are two major aspects to the Bill. One is to insert a clause allowing a police officer to require an alcotest from anyone committing an offence against the Act of which driving a motor vehicle is an element. At present there is a list of prescribed offences against the Act the committal of which makes the offender liable to submit to an alcotest. This amendment will both simplify and widen the impact of this part of the Act. This is not in any real sense random testing, since it relates only to drivers who have drawn attention to themselves by the nature of their driving.

The second aspect of the Bill is to allow the possibility of a somewhat wider form of breath testing than has hitherto been possible. The Chief Secretary will be empowered to

authorise the police on specific occasions, at specific locations, to require any person driving a motor vehicle to submit to testing. The Bill spells out the safeguards attached to this procedure. This is clearly not a completely random form of testing but is a selective testing that the Government believes will help in deterring drink-driving and, therefore, will save lives. The time involved for innocent drivers will be small, and the procedures will not be onerous and oppressive.

Members will be aware that Victoria has had a form of random breath testing since 1976, although I stress that this Bill is by no means along the same lines, and is rather restricted in its scope compared with the Victorian legislation. Despite the differences, it is instructive to look at the Victorian experience, for it does indicate the potential value of widening the impact of breath testing. Overall, there has been a drop in the number killed on Victorian roads from 954 in 1977 to 869 in 1978 and, very significantly, 843 in 1979. I believe that breath testing has played its part in this. In particular, during October to December 1978 there was an intensified operation of testing on Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights around Melbourne, and the results of this are significant.

During this seven-week period there was a 50 per cent reduction in the number of people killed in road accidents in the Melbourne statistical division on Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights, compared to the same weeks the year before. There was also a reduction compared with the same nights in the previous seven weeks. As well, the number of blood alcohol readings above 0.05 per cent (the Victorian limit) calculated in respect of all road accident victims who attended hospital casualty departments in the Melbourne metropolitan area decreased during November and December 1978 compared with the number of such readings calculated in October 1978, whereas in previous years the November and December readings were higher than those for October.

Further, and this is most important, survey work established a significant increase in the community's perceived risk of detection for drink-driving offences from the level measured before breath testing was carried out in this more widespread way. The Government believes that this legislation will save lives on our roads. I trust that members of this Parliament will not shirk their duty to the community, but will support this Bill, as one part of the Government's programme for road safety, and thereby show their willingness to support determined action to deal with the problem of drink-driving.

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 amends section 47a of the principal Act by inserting a definition of "breath test", being either an alcotest or a breath analysis. Clause 4 provides for the enactment of a new section 47da. New section 47da provides that the Commissioner of Police may, with the consent of the Chief Secretary, authorise members of the Police Force to conduct breath tests. This authorisation is, however, limited in its application to motorists using a particular road on a particular day. Subclause (2) requires members of the Police Force conducting such breath tests to be in uniform. Subclause (3) requires that the breath tests be conducted in such a way as to avoid undue delay and inconvenience being caused to those affected.

Clause 5 amends section 47e of the principal Act which confers upon police officers the power to require alcotests and breath analyses. The clause strikes out paragraph (aa) of subsection (1) and subsection (1a) which confer power to require breath tests where a member of the Police Force suspects upon reasonable grounds that a driver has committed certain listed driving offences. Instead the clause provides that that power may be exercised in relation to any offence against Part III of the principal Act of which the driving of a motor vehicle is an element. The clause also provides that a member of the Police Force may require a driver driving on a road and on a day specified in an authorisation under the proposed new section 47da to submit to an alcotest. Where such an alcotest indicates that a driver may have the prescribed concentration of alcohol in his blood, a member of the Police Force may then, under the clause, require the driver to submit to a breath analysis. If that breath analysis confirms that the prescribed concentration is present in the driver's blood, the other relevant provisions of the principal Act apply in the same way as they presently do in relation to a breath analysis conducted pursuant to any other provision.

Clause 6 amends section 47g of the principal Act which is an evidentiary provision relating to breath tests. The clause provides that a certificate purporting to be signed by a police officer to the effect that an alcotest indicated that the prescribed concentration of alcohol may be present in the blood of a person shall constitute proof of that matter in the absence of proof to the contrary. The clause also provides that a certificate purporting to be signed by the Commissioner of Police to the effect that he authorised under proposed new section 47da the conduct of breath tests on a day and on a road specified and that the authorisation was approved by the Chief Secretary shall constitute proof of those matters in the absence of proof to the contrary.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 6 March. Page 1526.)

**Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier):** The Opposition supports the second reading. We on this side of the House believe that at long last a major recommendation of the Guerin Committee is being implemented. However, when one looks at what the Government has been doing since it came into office with regard to the Health Commission and its function, one sees that the Government's action has been nothing short of scandalous. Conflicting statements by the Minister have left the public completely confused and, contrary to what the Minister said in his second reading explanation, that the staff of the Health Commission are well motivated even though they are working under difficult conditions, the staff at all levels have become completely demoralised.

In conversations I have had with administrators in various hospitals, I have found complete bewilderment at what the Minister of Health is doing, and the same applies with regard to boards of management. We had the situation in which one of Adelaide's most responsible citizens found that he could no longer work as Chairman of the Board of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. We on this side are sure from reliable information we have received

that the reason Sir Norman Young resigned as Chairman of the Royal Adelaide Hospital is that he could no longer work with the Health Commission or the Minister.

The Bill creates the positions of Chief Executive Officer and his assistant, Deputy Executive Officer. The Minister, in recent replies to persistent questions from this side of the House, has placed great emphasis on the supposed difference between Executive Commissioner, the position previously held by Mr. Guerin, and the new position as outlined in this Bill. The shenanigans surrounding the abolition of the position of Executive Commissioner has, in the opinion of the Opposition, resulted in Mr. Guerin's reputation being tarnished in the eyes of health administrators throughout the State and the Commonwealth.

As a result of happenings within the Health Commission involving the Commissioners themselves, and in the run-up dealing with the sacking of Mr. Guerin, a large question mark hangs over the position of the existing Commissioners. Since Mr. Guerin was sacked (and let us make no mistake: he was sacked), there have been repeated attempts by the Opposition to force the Minister to explain why, after the sacking of Mr. Guerin, who as Executive Commissioner was carrying out the recommendations of the Guerin Committee, she felt in November 1979 there was no need for an Executive Officer at all. Mr. Guerin was got rid of, and then two months later the Minister has decided to implement the major recommendation of the report in question. I think it is relevant that I quote from the Guerin Report dealing with the structure of the Health Commission itself. The report states on page 7:

Finally, the implications of all these matters for the structure and operation of the Health Commission must be considered. The Premier [that is the former Premier, Mr. Corcoran] has announced the Government's intention to amend the South Australian Health Commission Act in the next session of Parliament. It is considered premature to bring forward proposals relating to the precise composition of the board of the commission itself at this stage. Preliminary changes have however been made in the executive management of the commission, and it is considered that these should be pursued further if efforts to place management of the health system on the best possible footing are to succeed. In particular, clear arrangements for decision-making and executive responsibility must be developed, especially at the most senior level.

That was the major recommendation of the Guerin Committee, yet in November 1979 the Minister and the Government decided that it was the right time to get rid of Mr. Guerin, and said that, as far as the Minister and the Government were concerned, Mr. Guerin had carried out his functions as previously dictated by the former Labor Government and that there was therefore no need to have an Executive Commissioner in the Health Commission.

Let us see what the *Advertiser* (that bastion of conservatism which would usually be most reluctant to criticise the Liberal Government in any way) had to say about the complete turn-about by the Minister by way of editorial on Friday 1 February 1980, as follows:

The long and unhappy saga of South Australia's health services, which has often enough had the appearance of never-ending tragedy, now takes on elements of farce—and still without any end in view. The Minister of Health, Mrs. Adamson, offers for the ills of the system yet another restructuring, yet another committee.

It would be funny if it were not so serious. The South Australian Health Commission presides over expenditure getting on for \$400 000 000 a year, with a staff equivalent to

15 258 full-time employees as at 30 June last year. It has been the subject of numerous inquiries and criticisms—by the Auditor-General year after year, by the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee, by a Government committee last year—all of them tending in the same direction. That direction was and is that the commission, like its departmental predecessor, has problems with financial management, for which it lacks the necessary structures and skilled personnel.

The Government committee, created at last by the previous Government under the chairmanship of Mr. Bruce Guerin, drew up a scheme of reform of which Mr. Guerin was placed in charge. The intention then was to create, in due course, a statutory position of executive commissioner on the Health Commission. Only last November, Mrs. Adamson told us that the rearrangements of the management structure and all the rest were going swimmingly—so swimmingly, indeed, that Mr. Guerin was no longer needed. As the Premier Mr. Tonkin later put it, Mr. Guerin had been put in to do a short-term job, and had done it. Plainly enough, that was not so, for we are now told that the management structure remains deficient and that the Government seeks yet more advice from Sir Charles Bright on what to do about it. But that is not all.

When Mr. Guerin was dispatched from health administration in November, Mrs. Adamson said this: "In view of the fact that the Government does not intend to give the position of executive commissioner statutory recognition, the commission has decided that the position should be abolished."

Her latest statement is that the Government will amend the Health Commission Act to create the position of a chief executive officer who will be Chairman of the commission. This is to be a key element of the management reforms.

The Government, it seems, has changed its mind, presumably on the merits of the case. This is commendable, but what persuades it now that did not persuade it then? We are not told; and there seems to be a marked reluctance to speak plainly and frankly about the whole business. If we are not offered reasons, the explanation that suggests itself is that the November statement is, as they used to say in Mr. Nixon's embattled White House, simply "inoperative"—and there has been a needless hiatus.

That illustrates what has been happening within the Health Commission. There has been a lack of information going out to the public, the hospital boards, and the health administrators. More importantly, there has been a lack of information coming into this House. If one refers to the questions that Opposition members have asked the Minister in relation to the Guerin Committee reports, one sees that the Minister is displaying complete confusion and incompetence.

The Minister has told us time and time again that the recommendations of the Guerin Committee have either been implemented or are in train.

Yet let us look at some of the recommendations made by the Guerin Committee, which were outlined in an article in the *Advertiser* of 1 February this year. These were recommended as a matter of priority, and were to be implemented without delay, because the whole thrust of the Guerin Committee Report indicated that, unless these recommendations were implemented before the 1980-81 Budget, we would have the same situation that we experienced in 1979. Regarding the recommendation dealing with the budgetary arrangements and the devolution of responsibility to hospitals and how it should be drawn up, the following comments appeared in the article:

How many hospitals had the systems completed?—None.

Which hospital was furthest advanced?—The Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

When was it expected the systems would be completed?—As soon as possible.

How soon was as soon as possible?—As soon as possible.

Those were the questions that concerned people were asking the senior departmental officials in relation to how far the recommendations were implemented, and the answer given was "as soon as possible". Yet, the Minister repeatedly told us in this House that they were implemented or that they were in train. It appears that we will have the same situation in the 1980-81 financial year with regard to the Health Commission as that experienced in the past, and a lot of the blame can be laid fairly and squarely at the door of the Minister, because of her continued procrastination in implementing the major plank of the Guerin Committee Report, namely, the appointment of a chief executive officer. The Minister told us in 1979 that there was no need for that position, that Mr. Guerin had carried out his job and that therefore he was no longer needed.

Why, in the opinion of the Minister and the Government, was Mr. Guerin no longer needed? The simple reason is that, in the eyes of the present Government, Mr. Guerin's was a political appointment. The Government saw Mr. Guerin not as an extremely capable public servant (a point that was made in the Guerin Committee Report, namely, that there were too few public servants with the expertise to run the Health Commission with its budget of \$400 000 000) but as an appointment of the former Government, especially as an appointment of the previous Premier, and that, therefore, his services had to be dispensed with.

Health administrators in this State saw Mr. Guerin as a capable administrator. Because of Mr. Geurin's position on the committee, they saw him as someone who could implement the recommendations of the Health Commission and also as a person who could make decisions fairly promptly.

Unfortunately, Mr. Guerin had one fault: because he was efficient and saw the need for changes to be made in the structure of the commission, he was seen to be rocking the boat. Within the department and the commission itself, Mr. Guerin upset a few people and ruffled a few feathers and, from what we understand, complaints started to come in to the Minister. She was forced to act, but the Opposition is still confused about whether the Minister sought advice from the Premier and the Cabinet on how Mr. Guerin should be dismissed.

In answer to questions in the House, the Premier is on record as saying that he had something to do with it. The Minister had stated previously, in answer to questions, that no-one in the Government, apart from herself, had anything to do with the decision to sack Mr. Guerin.

This Bill, which amends the principal Act, primarily to create the positions of Chief Executive Officer and Deputy Chief Executive Officer. This Bill could have been before the House last November, in which case, in the opinion of the Opposition, Mr. Guerin would have been the ideal appointee, whereas the Minister has said, "What's in a name?" Mr. Guerin was appointed as an executive Commissioner. However, the present Government has decided that the position should be Chief Executive Officer. In reply to a question from the member for Salisbury, I think, the Minister said, in effect, "We are not sacking the incumbent; we are just sacking the position." Many able people who are concerned with the health of the people of the State see this as the sacking of a person and not of a position.

This series of events that I have related to the House is typical of what the Opposition feels is the incompetence of the Minister and her failure to accept expert advice or the

fact that Mr. Guerin was invaluable to the Government and to the commission, if the recommendations contained in the Guerin Committee Report were to make any headway. The Minister chose to listen to ill-informed advice. She chose to judge a public servant by the fact that he was appointed by a previous Labor Government. She chose to ignore the fact that Mr. Guerin was highly regarded by health administrators in the various hospitals and that these people were perfectly pleased with the way in which he was carrying out his position. The Minister disregarded all those attributes of Mr. Guerin's and decided to get rid of him. In deciding to get rid of him, it would have appeared too political if, in November, when Mr. Guerin was dismissed, the Minister had introduced this Bill. We had to have a period of time during which the public could forget that one of the finest people who had been working as an executive officer in the Health Commission had been dismissed as a result of a political decision.

We had to wait from last November until almost the end of March before the Minister had the courage to introduce this Bill. I am certain that other speakers will be able to point out other areas where the Minister's incompetence has continually thrown the Health Commission into chaos. There are also members of the community who must deal with the commission's administrators, who are being subjected to severe budget restrictions being imposed by this Government. In effect, we are dealing with a commission which has no head and which is running around, because no-one is in charge of the commissioners themselves.

One of the criticisms that I have heard from health administrators is that the Health Commission was designed to end the bureaucracy of the old Hospitals Department. What we are seeing now, since the Minister has been in charge of the health portfolio, is an even greater bureaucracy. I am sure that the Minister has been getting that message, the same as Opposition members have been getting it. I am sure that she has made the point of talking to boards of management to ascertain their views, and I am sure too, that, if she were honest enough, she would admit the complete and utter confusion, and realise that hospital boards are fearful of the way in which the commission has been proceeding.

The Opposition is not saying that, with the creation of the position of Chief Executive Officer, together with the provisions in the Bill, the position will be made worse. Hopefully, as a result of one of the major recommendations in the report, we will get the kind of managerial expertise that is needed within the commission. Our complaint concerns the way in which a capable person was dismissed from his position as executive Commissioner and the way in which the Minister has persistently denied telling us the exact reasons for the dismissal—who made the decision, whether it was the Minister herself, the Premier, or even the Deputy Premier, whether it was a collective decision by Cabinet, or whether it was a decision by the Commissioners themselves.

The commission has shown extreme loyalty to the present Minister. When the truth comes out, we will find that pressure was exerted on the commission and on Dr. Shea, and that, because of their loyalty, that pressure will not surface for a few years yet. Mr. Guerin himself has shown extreme loyalty after the way in which he was summarily dismissed. He has not once gone on record and said that his dismissal was a political one. That says much for the loyalty of the Public Service and of senior public servants in this State. Now, it will not be until 1 July that the name of the new executive officer will be announced.

During the period from November 1979 to July 1980, it

could be that few people would want to be tainted by the Health Commission, such as people with the expertise to be Chief Executive Officer of the Health Commission, or Deputy Chief Executive Officer, lest at some future date a person incurred the wrath of the Minister of Health (or a future Minister if the present Minister has been removed from her portfolio). It will be interesting to see exactly who will be courageous enough to undertake the position of Chief Executive Officer in the Health Commission.

Since Mr. Guerin was dismissed, people have been saying that his presence on the Health Commission has been sadly missed. Already people are saying that the Health Commission, after the traumatic period between November 1979 and now, will take months (or possibly years) to overcome the situation in which it finds itself. The new appointment is to be made in July of this year. Perhaps the Minister, in some future reply, may say that that appointment will be sooner or later than July. The date I have mentioned was gained from a press release given by the Minister in which she said that the appointment would take effect from 1 July 1980, a time close to the time for bringing down of the 1980-81 Budget.

If one looks at the report dealing with budgetary control, one sees that the whole of its recommendations are dependent upon those systems being in operation in every major hospital in this State. One can be sure that, unless a miracle happens, those systems will not be functioning by the time the Budget is brought down. The Minister, in reply to questions I asked, said that she intended to change the system completely. That answer was given in respect of a series of questions I had to place on notice because there was only one line referring to the Health Commission in the Budget. I thank the Minister for the speed with which she replied to about 500 related questions. The Minister supplied me with answers within three or four days so that I was able to see where money was to be spent.

It was in line with what the Minister said then and what the Guerin committee said, namely, that, unless these different systems are operating within the major hospitals, the Health Commission cannot impose (and I do not use the word "impose" in a bureaucratic way) budgetary limitations on these particular hospitals. These systems need to be operating so that the Health Commission can have a fair idea of exactly how cost cuts can be effected.

The Health Commission, with a Budget of \$400 000 000 a year, would be classed as the biggest employer in this State. It is because of this procrastination, and this desire to get rid of Bruce Guerin, that we find a situation where the new Chief Executive Officer to be appointed on 1 July will be placed in the untenable position of trying to implement the recommendations of the report, but with literally no time to do it. The Opposition believes that, if the Minister had not been so obsessed with the dismissal of Mr. Guerin, or had not come under the influence of other members of the Government to agree with Mr. Guerin's dismissal, we would not be in the situation in which we find ourselves today.

There is nothing wrong with the Bill, and we support it, but what we are critical of is the series of events that led up to, first, the dismissal of Mr. Guerin, and, secondly, the fact that after that dismissal took place there had to be a passage of time so that the public would, hopefully, forget that a capable public servant who could have quite conceivably filled this position of Chief Executive Officer was dismissed. A period of more than three months has elapsed, with no-one being effectively in charge of the Health Commission. This can only result, after 1 July, in the Health Commission possibly finding itself in a situation of going from bad to worse.

**Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition):** I rise to support the remarks made by the member for Napier, our spokesman on health matters. I think he has canvassed this area adequately and precisely, and has put on record the sorts of objection the Opposition has to the way in which the Government has, in effect, fiddled around with the Health Commission and interrupted, by its actions, the steady progress of some months toward ensuring that the efficiencies and improvements in administration set in train by the former Corcoran Labour Administration continued unchecked. Indeed, because of the activities of the Minister, I am afraid we have lost at least six months of productive and important administrative work in the Health Commission. An enormous amount of time has been wasted on matters that were well in hand and could have been got on with by the Health Commission but for the interference that has taken place in its operations, and but for the indecisiveness with which the Government has handled this matter.

I thought it particularly important to make some remarks about this Bill because of the way in which the Minister has been presenting her portfolio and answering questions in this House about this matter. It appears to me that she has devised a strategy (a clever strategy, I suspect one could say) of ensuring that, in answering questions seeking information about what has been going on over a period of time, she says as little as possible and tries to ensure by the very shortness and incompleteness of her answers that we are not in a position to actually pin her down to untruths or totally misleading statements. By their incompleteness, her answers allow for ambiguity and differences in interpretation. I congratulate the Minister on her cleverness in the way in which she has been able so adroitly to fence with the Opposition on this matter.

By her answering in this way, the position has become more and more clouded and confused, but if one analyses the answers the Minister has given, and the statements she has made (particularly in the light of the Bill now before us), I think one will see that there have been things going on in the Health Commission about which the Minister has been less than frank. I would go so far as to say that she has misled the House as to her role and intentions in relation to the matter. I suppose the genesis of the Bill before us, which amends the Act brought into operation following the recommendations of the Bright Commission, can be traced back to the time of the publication of the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee Report into the Health Commission and health services in South Australia.

That was an important and thorough report indeed, although much of the areas which it traversed was of a historical nature. I think the very fact that the report took so long to produce meant that many of the matters referred to in it had been corrected or brought to the attention of the appropriate authorities: remedial action was taking place. Nonetheless, the report put its finger on important changes that needed to be made and problems that had arisen in the administration of our health system.

The report was published in February 1979 and immediately the Government acted to do something about its recommendations, to ensure that prompt action was taken to continue some of the remedial work I have mentioned, and to take up any fresh matters that had been raised in the committee's report. In order to achieve that, it set up a top-level committee under one of the best administrators in the Public Service at the time, an administrator who had been closely involved with high-level policy development and administration in the Premier's Department for some years. I refer to Mr. Bruce Guerin. He was given a special task to, in fact, report on

what had been recommended by the Public Accounts Committee and on any other relevant matters in relation to health services and to recommend to the Government what action should be taken.

I think it was most appropriate that, having done those preliminary reports, it was none other than Mr. Guerin in March 1979 who was specially appointed as Executive Commissioner and Chairman of the commission's executive committee to, among other things, initiate and implement action to remedy deficiencies and inadequacies identified. That work was got under way and I should have thought that the Opposition of the day would have found that extremely welcome and would have been pleased to see that an administrator of the background and standing of Mr. Guerin had been placed in charge of the committee.

One of the important things is that Mr. Guerin came from outside the Health Commission and had not been involved directly in health administration. This meant that he could bring to his task an objectivity and an ability to cut corners, to ask the right questions, which is often possible only for someone who has not been directly involved in the decision-making processes that had been taking place.

The very fact that that work was well done and was being implemented soundly and rationally can be testified to by quoting the words of the Minister of Health subsequently and, indeed, those of the Premier. They may have gone too far; I would say they certainly went too far in suggesting that everything that needed to have been done had been accomplished by Mr. Guerin. My colleague referred to the interview that the Premier gave to mark his first 100 days in office, when he said in relation to this that Mr. Guerin was put into that position by the former Premier for a limited period to bring about certain changes, to initiate developments, and he had done that.

He had done a lot but I do not think even Mr. Guerin would claim that all his work had been completed and that the task of administration and other rectification had been accomplished. Indeed, it had not, and the fact that we have this Bill before us today indicates clearly that it had not been done. We were in a position at the time of the change in Government where Mr. Guerin was appointed as Chairman of the executive group implementing the report. Mr. Guerin was appointed on 12 July as a deputy member of the Health Commission, which meant effectively that he was sitting in on all the Health Commission meetings and acting as a full and effective member of that commission, and it was very productive indeed.

One would have thought, looking at the rhetoric of the Government in the pre-election days, looking at its theme of waste, mismanagement and extravagance in Government departments, that, whatever else it did, it would have ensured that that work in the Health Commission would continue uninterrupted, not be interfered with by the Minister. However, unfortunately, such a hope was fairly soon dashed.

I think we had the first hint that all was not right on 20 October 1979, when the *Advertiser's* health and medical writer, Mr. Hailstone, pointed out in an article that the Government still recognised Dr. Shea as Chairman of the Health Commission. Indeed, in formal terms Dr. Shea was Chairman but, as part of the administrative arrangements and changes that had taken place, he was not actively operating in that capacity. He was on leave pending an announced return to private practice. The article stated:

Recent rumours in the South Australian Health Commission that he would return as Chairman were discounted by the 50-year-old psychiatrist who was elected President of the

Royal Australian and New Zealand Council of Psychiatrists at yesterday's meeting in Queenstown. I am not privy to any recent discussion that may have been held, Dr. Shea said. After 12 years in full-time administration I am starting to enjoy my refresher in psychiatry.

On 20 October Dr. Shea, the Chairman of the Health Commission, was unaware of any discussion about his return to active duty and his continuance in that active duty role until his announced retirement. He was not aware of what actions were being taken by the Minister or the Government in relation to the Health Commission, yet only a matter of days later he was hastily recalled from his New Zealand conference to preside over a meeting of the Health Commission (I say hastily recalled because there is certainly evidence of that). It was vital that he be recalled because the task of that meeting was to, in effect, recommend the dismissal of Mr. Guerin and his removal from anything to do with the commission, as an executive officer or as a Deputy Commissioner. It was vital Dr. Shea was there: otherwise the deputy member (Mr. Guerin) would have been there. It was also vital for Dr. Shea to be there so that a quorum could be maintained, because an important thing about that meeting was that Mr. Guerin, who had been a member of the commission actively involved in it, in fact carrying out the chief administration and executive tasks, was not aware of the meeting or of its purpose (a scandalous state of affairs) and nor, it appears, until his recall was Dr. Shea.

We questioned the Minister about this matter. On 7 November a report appeared in the *Advertiser* following a statement by the Minister that Mr. Guerin was being transferred. The article said:

The South Australian Health Commission is to revert to its statutory structure, following a meeting of the commission which decided to abolish the position of Executive Commissioner.

That was on the Tuesday, the day before the commission had met with Dr. Shea at its head for the first time in months and had made this decision that the position of Executive Commissioner was to be abolished and Mr. Guerin's services were no longer required. The Minister went on to say:

In view of the fact that the Government does not intend to give the position of Executive Commissioner statutory recognition, the commission has decided that the position be abolished.

What, I ask the House, are we doing here today, on 25 March, when on 7 November the Minister said that the Government did not intend to give the position of Executive Commissioner statutory recognition and when the person holding that position in a non-statutory sense had been dismissed? The Minister has come here today with a Bill to reinstate the Executive Commissioner in statutory form. What has happened to that intention? No doubt the Minister will say that this is a quite different position from the one Mr. Guerin held: after all, he is the Chairman as well, there is something fundamentally different.

I ask the Minister to explain precisely how different it is from the functions Mr. Guerin was performing prior to 6 November when he was dismissed, we are told, at the will and on the volition unfettered of the commission itself. Questions were asked and the Minister's method of answering questions, a minimum of information, a maximum of innuendo, went into operation. She said that the present Chairman was still in office, he had been regarded by the Government as being on leave, he had been recalled from leave, and there had been no haste in his recall. The fact was that he had been recalled from a conference of which he had just been elected President.

He cut his trip short, but there was no haste, the Minister said.

In fact, the next regular meeting of the commission was on the following Tuesday. For some reason this was an extraordinary meeting, a special meeting held a week earlier, but the Minister told us there was no haste. I think some explanation of that is required. It is clear, I think, to members of the House that the explanation was that that meeting had to be held out of schedule, earlier, so that Mr. Guerin and other employees of the Health Commission did not know anything about it.

It had to be held then so that they could be advised of the decision taken after the event, not before it when some change might well have been made. She says she was assured by the Executive Commissioner that most of the recommendations were in hand. That may well have been right. Indeed, Mr. Guerin had efficiently and swiftly moved to put those recommendations in hand, but there is no evidence that at any time the Health Commission, Mr. Guerin, or the commission's employees, felt that those recommendations had been fully implemented.

There was a lot of work to be done and they were getting on with it. They were interrupted, stopped in mid-stream. The Minister answered "No" to a question about whether any Ministerial direction or advice was given to the Commissioners. By answering in that way, the Minister was leaving us with the impression that this was a matter that was not discussed at all, that she was not privy to what the commission was going to do: this was something it simply did of its own volition.

If I were the Minister in that position, I would be asking a few hard questions. I would be asking the Health Commission, "What are you doing making a fundamental change in the administrative arrangements without consulting me?" Perhaps the Minister did indeed say that to the Health Commission, but I suspect that the real answer is that what the Minister told us in response to the question was wrong, misleading and untrue, because if there had been no Ministerial advice or direction given, if that decision had just come out of the blue, there was something seriously wrong with the Minister's administration of her portfolio.

She should have been fully privy to it. She should have been involved in the discussions and the implementations of that action, but apparently she was not. Yet, she recalled Dr. Shea for this special early meeting. She summoned him back from his conference. Did she do that just out of the blue, just for routine reasons? Did she say, "It is about time I saw Dr. Shea. Where is he? Get him back for me. I would like to have a chat to him." What absolute nonsense! She brought him back for that specific purpose. She knew that was what the commission was going to do. That is what it did, yet she told the House she had nothing to do with it.

As to Mr. Guerin's future, a man who has worked in this job for so long, who was tied up in the future of the Health Commission and the implementation of the recommendations, what was going to be done to him? The Minister simply washed her hands of it. "I do not know anything about that," she said. "That is a matter for the Public Service Board." That is a very nice thing for a Minister to say. The Minister in Parliament, in answer to questions, on Wednesday 7 November, was saying to the Parliament, "I did not know what the Health Commission was doing. It had dismissed Mr. Guerin and I do not know why it has done that. It certainly was not on my advice or direction, and what happens to him I do not really care about. Goodbye. He is being looked after by the Public Service Board." In response to that, we asked a few more questions the following day. Our first question was to the

Premier. I asked him:

Did the Minister—  
that is, the Minister of Health—

consult you concerning the abolition of the Executive Commissioner position and transfer of Guerin?

If what we had been told by the Minister of Health the day before was true, the Premier would have had to answer "No" to that, because the Minister did not know anything about it. But, his answer to that question was, "Yes, he was consulted." That told us two things: first, that the Minister had misled us when she said she had not been involved in that decision the day before, and, secondly, that she had gone further and had consulted, if not with her Cabinet colleagues, at least with the Premier himself, a quite proper thing to do, I might add, but one that certainly she should have been frank about the day before.

We followed that up with a question to the Minister, who simply said she did not mislead the House. The follow-up question, linking the Premier's reply to a statement of the day before, was one that she simply shrugged off and said, "No", that she did not mislead the House. She may have some convoluted and interesting interpretation of that question which, in her mind, lets her off the hook, but I would be very interested to see just how devious she could become in attempting to explain away that situation. She told the Deputy Leader that Mr. Guerin had a vote only when the Chairman was absent, and he was not told of the meeting. That is an extraordinary example of the way in which this senior public servant was treated. The meeting was one that he was not aware of, his dismissal was peremptory, and the Minister did not care where he went. That was a matter for the Public Service Board.

I note that the Minister has decided to leave the Chamber. I hope her ears are burning, as well they might be. Further, she said she had requested Dr. Shea to return from leave to advise on the future direction of the commission, not for a cosy chat but the future direction of the commission. In Thursday's *Gazette* the notice of Mr. Guerin's removal appeared. In other words, Cabinet on that Monday must have taken some steps in preparation for Thursday's Executive Council meeting, or that notice could not have been published. That cast even more doubt on the Minister's replies.

On 13 November she repeated her denial that she had consulted in any way about the removal of Mr. Guerin. All that is a sorry chapter of misrepresentation, misleading the House, untruths, and an indication of the total confusion of the administration of the Minister in this matter. We heard little more about it until the New Year. I refer the House again to the fact that the Minister had said one of the reasons why Mr. Guerin was removed was that the Government had no intention of statutorily recognising the position, so it came as a considerable surprise to everybody when on 1 February an article appeared in the *Advertiser* of that day saying that the South Australian health body had to change and the Government was going to make major structural changes to the Commission, one of which was to appoint a chief executive officer as a statutory officer who would be Chairman of the commission. What an extraordinary turn-around! Mr. Guerin had been hastily shoved off to the sidelines. All sorts of devious explanations and excuses had been given for both the change and the way in which it had been carried out.

Then, only two or three months later, the Government comes back and the Minister tells us it is going to do exactly what it said it was not going to do. Unfortunately, this has been reflected in too many other places and areas of administration for it to be unusual. This Minister does

not stand out in this sense. She is being fairly consistent with many of her colleagues who are showing the same kind of vacillating incompetence in terms of their administration. There was the announcement. I think it need not be made a matter of our political statements from the Opposition on our interpretation of that. We need only quote from the *Advertiser*, not the most renowned socialist or radical of journals but one with a fairly sober record that had been following this matter closely, and reported some of the Minister's contradictory statements. In its editorial it had this to say:

Only last November, Mrs. Adamson told us that the rearrangements of the management structure and all the rest were going swimmingly—so swimmingly, indeed that Mr. Guerin was no longer needed. As the Premier, Mr. Tonkin, later put it, Mr. Guerin had been put in to do a short-term job, and had done it. Plainly enough, that was not so, for we are now told that the management structure remains deficient and that the Government seeks yet more advice from Sir Charles Bright on what to do about it. But that is not all. When Mr. Guerin was dispatched from health administration in November, Mrs. Adamson said. . .

I will not quote this again, but she said that there was no need for the statutory position. The editorial continues:

Her latest statement is that the Government will amend the Health Commission Act to create the position of a chief executive officer who will be Chairman of the commission. This is to be a key element of the management reforms. The Government, it seems, has changed its mind, presumably on the merits of the case. This is commendable, but what persuades it now that did not persuade it then? We are not told; and there seems to be a marked reluctance to speak plainly and frankly about the whole business.

That is the burden of our complaint on this side of the House. The Minister will not speak plainly, frankly or honestly to us about this matter. There has been a change, but that change is, in a sense, a reversion to the *status quo*. It has already set back the career of a senior public servant but, more importantly than what it has done to an individual, it has set back for at least six months the major work of the reconstruction that was going on in the Health Commission.

The cause of improvements in our Health Commission has been severely jeopardised. Morale in the Health Commission, as a result of these changes and of the peremptory and behind-the-scenes manner in which Mr. Guerin was dealt with, is such that those officers are obviously going to find it very difficult indeed to perform as fully as they possibly can to the Minister's expectations, because they do not know when they, too, will get the chop and she will wash her hands of them, saying "That is a matter for the Public Service Board." That is not good enough. We will support this Bill, but we will support it making clear that it should not have been necessary to bring it in now. It could have been accomplished months ago, and it is a great pity that we have lost all this time in the course of the dithering, dallying and incompetence shown by the Government.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth):** I endorse the comments that have been made by the member for Napier and the Leader of the Opposition in supporting this Bill at the second reading stage. As my Leader has said, there is little doubt that this Bill, if it was to come in as part of the Government's policy, should have been in the Parliament last year. It is a classic example of the way this Government dithers and is totally unable to make any decisions. Only today in Question Time we saw two or three examples of Ministers saying that Cabinet had not made a decision on this or had deferred a decision on that,

and this is another example of the bungling inefficiency that racks this Administration.

**Mr. Keneally:** Yet she lectures on administrative ability.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Of course, the Minister is only too happy to lecture the Parliament about managerial expertise and that sort of thing at great length. It rather reminds one of the way she frequently puts out press releases, but at the same time does not concentrate on the real stuff of administration, the running of the Health Minister's office.

**Mr. O'Neill:** Value for the taxpayers dollar!

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** We are not getting much of that out of this Minister at present.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I suggest that the honourable member refer to the Bill.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Indeed, I will, Sir. This Bill, of course, puts into effect what we as the Corcoran Government were intending to do. The proposal that I had discussed with the Premier at the time that I was Minister of Health was to give effect to a structure quite similar to that which is now before us. There is one provision, however, in this legislation that I do not think we would have introduced, and that is the provision in clause 4 (d), as follows:

(3) Upon the commencement of the South Australian Health Commission Act Amendment Act, 1980, the offices of all members of the commission shall be vacated.

I was not proposing to include such a provision, because I basically believed that these people who had been appointed to the Health Commission were sufficiently expert in this area to give the Government all the advice on the administration of the health services that was necessary. It is interesting to speculate what the attitude of the then Opposition would have been if we as a Government had come to the Parliament seeking to sack the Health Commission as it then existed and to totally reconstitute the Health Commission as is now proposed, because that is exactly what this Bill does: it sacks the existing Health Commission, and there is no doubt about that. The proposal before the Parliament is that the Health Commission as it is now constituted will be totally abandoned. That is what the Minister is trying to do.

I believe that a new Minister has the right, with such an important body as this, to be able to have a clean start. I hope that, when we come back into office in three years time, this precedent will hold good with members of the Liberal Party when we seek to change important Government bodies of this sort in ways in which we see them as needing change. I believe that that is an important provision, and I do not decry the Minister the right to reorganise the Health Commission as she sees fit, but it would have been very interesting to see what the Liberal Party's attitude would be if we in Government had introduced such a provision.

The most interesting thing about the Bill is that quite obviously this Minister is depending very heavily on this reorganisation of the Health Commission to try to lift morale within the health area which under her administration has fallen to an all-time low. I think it is a very great risk she has taken because, with the introduction of this legislation, there is little doubt that the Health Commission's morale has been struck yet another blow. Morale in the Health Commission is now rock bottom. It is hard to imagine that it can go any lower, but I suppose that, under the continuing bungling administration of the Liberal Party, anything is possible.

I have had discussions with numbers of people in the health area over the past few months about the administration and about what progress has been made in implementing the Health Commission's Act, and it is



certainly a depressing story when one listens to the tales of woe that people tell in the health area. One only has to talk to people in the Minister's own office or in the commission itself to learn how low morale is. The Minister has totally demoralised the whole area by the way that she removed Bruce Guerin. She did remove Bruce Guerin; there is no doubt about that. It was one of the most ruthless and manipulating moves that we have seen for a long time, and for somebody who comes into this Parliament and parades as a paragon of virtue to act in the fashion she has acted is nothing short of hypocritical at its worst.

I think the morale of the Health Commission is not going to recover simply from a reorganisation of the sort proposed by this Bill. What really is needed is a change of Minister, of course, and there is little doubt that this is not going to be too far away, because my informants in the health area tell me that this Minister's workload is backlogged very substantially, that the administration is in utter chaos, that she spends most of her time writing press releases and spends virtually no time at all on the administrative day-to-day running of the department, and that as an administrator she is an absolute disaster.

**Mr. Keneally:** There'll be a witch hunt tomorrow.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I suppose there will be, but one of the informants that I have been talking to is no longer associated with the health area. His departure was directly related to what he saw as the Minister's incompetence, and he did not want to hang around wasting his time. That, of course, is Sir Norman Young. There is little doubt that he went from the health area because he just could not be bothered wasting his time with this inefficient Minister. It is a sad thing the Public Service in South Australia has lost the services of somebody of Sir Norman Young's talent. One would hardly describe him as a supporter of the Labor Party. He happens to be the Chairman of News Limited, but nonetheless we recognise good administrative talent when we see it, and that is why we sought his advice and his services as the Chairman of the Board of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. But he had to go, because he just could not see any benefit to be gained from wasting his time trying to achieve changes and an efficient administration at that hospital, when he was having to deal constantly with the Minister's administrative bungling.

I have mentioned the backlog of work in the Minister's office: one sees it on all sides. One has only to look at the Notice Paper to see the number of questions of the Minister of Health that remain unanswered. One has only to write to the Minister and see how long it takes to get a reply these days. One has only to speak to people who have tried to see the Minister to learn that she makes appointments months in advance or says that she will not see them at all. Quite clearly the Minister is an administrative disaster area and, whilst the veneer of favourable publicity she has tried to surround herself with has protected her from such scrutiny to date, I do not believe that this will last much longer.

This Bill may well be the beginning of the end for the Minister of Health. My prediction is that the only people in the Health Commission who are pleased to see this piece of legislation are the medical mafia, so-called (the people from the A.M.A.), because under the former Government they were losing their monopoly control over health services to the extent that the A.M.A. was concerned about their position. It was long overdue that the influence of doctors in the medical area should be reduced.

This Bill will be used to reinforce the position of the medical profession in the provision of health services, and

that is a tragic thing for the people of South Australia. We need in the health area common sense and a bit of expertise from those who use the system. I am always interested when I see in legislation such as this clauses providing the filling up of a certain body with experts. I see that the only change in the qualifications for members of this commission is the addition of the words, "or the field of business management".

Of course, that is all very well. The former Government was without that provision, using the services of Sir Norman Young and others in the administration of health services in South Australia, and it was done very well. Indeed, I would say that it was working well until the change of Government and the introduction of the administration of this Minister, whereupon the whole of the administration of health services in South Australia was put back many years.

The Leader of the Opposition dealt at some length with the way in which things led up to this legislation. Not so long ago, the Minister told us that we did not need any sort of executive officer. Now, we find that this Bill provides for an executive officer and a deputy. We were told that there was no undue haste to fill the position of Chairman of the Health Commission. Now, this Bill comes in with the provision for a Chairman.

What is most startling about the Bill is the about-face that the Government has undertaken in relation to Mr. Guerin's position. In one of the nastiest knife jobs that we have seen in the Public Service in this State for many years, Mr. Guerin was axed by the commission, no doubt with the connivance of the Minister, although she continues to deny that. I refer to the way in which the commission was called together at short notice, the Chairman was brought back, and Mr. Guerin was not told that there was a commission meeting. Although he had been to every commission meeting since his appointment as Executive Commissioner, Mr. Guerin was not told of this meeting. Obviously, someone had connived with the other Commissioners to make sure that he was not told of the meeting, because there cannot be a meeting of the Health Commission in the Health Commission building without people in the department knowing that it is being held.

It seems to me that this is simply an example of a very devious and a deceptive mind at work, and the Minister, who parades in this House as a paragon of virtue, has a lot to answer for in relation to the way in which she went about knifing Bruce Guerin—because that is all it was. Simply by putting this Bill before Parliament and going back to what the Labor Government was proposing to do in relation to the Health Commission will not remove that blot from her character, which is going to remain for a very long time. The other matter which I should like to touch on is that of—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! There is too much conversation to my right.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I refer to the change in the criteria for the appointment of health Commissioners. I believe that the Labor Party in Government would have amended that provision so that at least some of the Commissioners would have had experience as consumers of health services. This shows the woolly-headed thinking of this Minister, in that she has been prepared simply to continue with the existing situation plus the addition of the words "or the field of business management".

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** How rude you are to our lady.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The Minister is calling her a lady, not I.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I hope the honourable

member is not personally reflecting on a member of the House.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** No, Sir. If the Minister had shown any initiative at all in the way in which she operates as a Minister, she would have seen the need and necessity to appoint some consumer representatives to the Health Commission, and the fact that the Minister has not sought to do that is a real indication of the lack of initiative that she shows in these matters.

It is particularly interesting, as this Bill, although it does not say so on the surface, will clearly change fundamentally the role of the Health Commission. There is little doubt that this Commission that the Minister now appoints will operate as an advisory committee for the Minister. No doubt this matter will be dealt with in Committee, but I should like to know what the Minister intends to do with the advisory committee that is already in existence, because there is little doubt that this commission will simply act as an advisory committee to the Minister.

It is all very well to talk about having all the managerial expertise under the sun on a board that will meet once a month or once a fortnight. These people will not be the administrators in the department. The Commissioners will be simply part-timers, who will come in and give a bit of advice once a fortnight or once a month. Persons in those positions ought to come from a wide range of interests within the health field, including consumers of health services. I do not believe that the Minister has any idea of the fine details of how public hospitals work. I doubt whether she has ever used an out-patients clinic, or she has ever queued for hours with people such as those in my electorate who use the Lyell McEwin Hospital and have to wait for services.

I doubt whether the Minister knows very much at all about the delivery end of the services. There is an urgent need for the appointment of a person or persons with that type of expertise to the commission. It is all very well to say that we are all users of health services. Of course, that is true in a sense, but I believe it is possible to find people who are considerable users of health services to appoint to a commission such as this one. Possibly a quadriplegic or a paraplegic or someone who uses the services frequently could be appointed. That type of person would be of great value in providing the Minister with a bit of advice about what is happening at the service delivery end of the spectrum.

This Bill ought to be supported. It is long overdue, and I hope that the precedent of purging the whole Health Commission and axing the lot of them that has been set up by this Bill will be well remembered by this House. When the Labor Party gets back in office in three years time, the Opposition will not show duplicity in dealing with any similar measure that we put before the Parliament.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health):** One hardly knows where to begin in refuting some of the extraordinary statements that have been made by the Opposition. Suffice to say, the member for Napier and his Leader were more or less like Heckle and Jeckle: they repeated each other's arguments and even quoted from identical newspaper editorials. It has been a long time since the House has heard two Opposition members repeat themselves as frequently as did the Opposition spokesman for health and his Leader. It really was like a duet played in a flat key. The Opposition members did not seem to have their hearts in it. There was marked hesitation.

On the one hand, they were supporting the Bill, whereas, on the other hand, they seemed to be reluctant to

give it the wholehearted support that they would have liked to give it, despite the member for Elizabeth, my predecessor, saying that it was not unlike a Bill that he himself would have introduced had he remained in Government. It seemed to be a case of having a bob each way and of not knowing in which direction they wanted to travel. I assure the House that the Government knows the direction in which it wants to travel: it wants to create a Health Commission in line with the original recommendations of the Bright Report. Although it is true that the existing Act was based on that report, there is no question that the Act differs in many ways from the intention of the report, which was to create a lean, co-ordinating body, not a vast bureaucratic structure that relied heavily on collective decision making to implement its decisions and in order to administer. It is for that reason that the Government has introduced the Bill to create a far more effective management structure and, to do that, we need to restructure the commission.

I will deal, in turn, with some of the comments (I would not call them arguments) that the Opposition has advanced. I found the contribution by the member for Napier to be, to put it kindly, rhetorical nonsense. He went on repeating himself, and it is scarcely worth dealing with many of the things he said. Suffice to say that he laid considerable stress on the fact that the staff of the commission and boards of hospitals are demoralised. If there has been any demoralisation of the boards, it started when the Labor Government decided that it would remove from them the right to elect their own Chairmen. I know for a fact that it was that decision that had an extremely adverse effect on the honorary boards of hospitals, which had been looking forward with keen anticipation to incorporation and which believed that they would be given independent managerial authority. However, they suddenly found that that was not to be the case. They were to be treated like puppets by a Labor Administration, which wanted to exert ever-increasing control on the administration of hospitals. I do not believe that boards can recover easily or quickly from the hammer blows dealt to them by the previous Administration.

I am working towards giving as much independent managerial responsibility as possible back to the boards of hospitals. Certainly it is the Government's policy that boards shall elect their own Chairmen. I know that the boards appreciate this move, and that it has had a very good effect on morale. As for the staff of the commission, there is no denying that they have been through difficult times, which one can trace back to the establishment of the commission. One can certainly see that the Public Accounts Committee's report reflected badly on the commission and on its staff members. The action taken by the previous Government to introduce better management was somewhat belated. Had it set up a proper structure initially, many of the committee's criticisms would never have surfaced.

One thing made perfectly clear by the three Opposition Speakers who spoke was that they failed to identify the difference between an executive Commissioner and a chief executive officer. There is a profound difference, namely, that between what the previous Government proposed to do and what this Government proposes to do. The position of executive Commissioner was imposed on the commission on the instruction of the previous Government. The commission itself is the statutory authority that creates its own position. It was required to create that position on the instruction of the former Premier. Therefore, to suggest that, on the one hand, I said late last year that we did not propose to give statutory recognition to that position, and, on the other hand, that the

Government is now doing so is to misunderstand completely or fail to interpret the difference between an executive Commissioner and a chief executive officer.

This amending Bill creates a position at the head of the commission of one who has administrative responsibility and executive responsibility, who is also Chairman of the commission. As I have said previously, it is analogous to the position in private enterprise of a Chairman of Directors who is also a Managing Director. As his deputy, the Chairman will have a deputy chief executive officer, who could be likened in private enterprise to a general manager. That is not an uncommon position; in fact, it is reflected in statutory authorities in South Australia. The Opposition seemed absolutely obsessed with personalities. The member for Napier claimed that I was obsessed with Mr. Guerin. I think it is the reverse, because he and his colleagues seemed to be obsessed with Mr. Guerin and his position. He made the point that if Mr. Guerin was unacceptable—

*Mr. Kenelly interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Stuart has had a fair go at interjecting. I suggest that he desist.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** If the Opposition's claims that Mr. Guerin is politically unacceptable to this Government were true, it is hardly likely that he would have been given the extremely responsible position of being in charge of the Government Job Transfer Office, a job that he is fulfilling with his customary efficiency. I refute positively any suggestion that that decision was based on any underlying political motives of the Government. The three Opposition spokesmen criticised the delay in introducing this Bill, but I suggest that a decision as important as this one should not be rushed into.

I refuse to be bulldozed into hasty action without first having the opportunity fully to assess the consequences of that action. That is why last year Sir Charles Bright was appointed special adviser to the Government. It is noticeable that not one of the Opposition speakers referred to the Government's action in appointing Sir Charles, an eminent South Australian, who chaired the committee on which the previous Government's legislation was based, to advise the Government on the actions that it should take to ensure that the legislation reflected the recommendations of the original report.

I find it extraordinary that that key decision made by this Government has been totally overlooked and deliberately ignored by the Opposition. That is highly significant, and it makes nonsense of all the Opposition's claims that there has been a lack of proper management and a delay in decision making. The member for Elizabeth had the decency to acknowledge that any Government, on taking office, has a right to rearrange its administration in whatever manner it sees fit.

That is precisely what I have done and I have done so having, first, after due deliberation, considered what was the wisest action to take. In response to criticisms about delay, I make the point (and possibly members opposite are now aware of this) that one cannot pluck out of thin air in a matter of days, weeks, or even months, someone of the calibre to take up the position as head of a statutory body with a budget of \$400 000 000 a year and thousands of employees. Members opposite may not realise it, but people who could fill this position would certainly have to give considerable notice in positions they already hold.

In response to the question as to what is the likely date of appointment, the date announced was 1 July but, if it is possible to bring that date forward, I will certainly do so. The closing date for applications for this position has

passed and I understand that there are a number of applicants of high calibre. I hope it will not be long before I am in a position to make an announcement on who the new Chairman and Chief Executive Officer is to be. If it is possible for that person to take up the appointment earlier than 1 July, we certainly will be working towards that aim.

The member for Napier made the point that the concept of the Health Commission was designed to end the bureaucracy of the old Hospitals Department. Unfortunately, under the former Government's Administration that simply did not happen. One only has to look at the present Government's health policy and contrast it with the actions of the former Government to see that there is an enormous amount of work to be done to (and I can only put it in these words) unscramble the eggs. That is a difficult thing to do and it will take time. It will certainly take great resolve on the part of this Government and staff members of the commission.

The member for Napier also referred to the presentation of the Health Commission's budget to Parliament. I am surprised that he had the gall to make such a reference. The presentation of the Health Commission's budget to Parliament was the presentation designed by his Party. I agree that it was inadequate, and I can assure the honourable member that when the Budget is presented to Parliament this year the presentation will be different; it may not be as complete as I would like, but let me assure the honourable member that the Health Commission and Treasury are working on a method of presentation that will ensure that the kinds of question he had to put on notice in order to gain information will not be necessary. I emphasise it was not possible, within two or three weeks of coming to office, to completely restructure the presentation of a budget to Parliament. The honourable member has surely been here long enough to know that.

The Leader supported his health spokesman in what was simply a rehash of what the member for Napier had said. The Leader criticised me for indecisiveness, but I think I have answered that by saying that I had no intention of rushing in and making decisions for the sake of quick action without first having deliberated carefully on the consequences of those decisions. It was interesting to hear the Leader criticise me for the shortness of my answers to questions. I have heard him in this place criticising the Government and Ministers bitterly for their long answers to questions—it seems that there is no pleasing the Leader.

The Leader was in error in saying that Dr. Shea was hastily recalled from New Zealand; he was not recalled from New Zealand. So far as I recall, Dr. Shea had been in Adelaide for some time when he presided over the meeting of the Health Commission which decided to abolish the position of Executive Commissioner. In his allegations, the Leader demonstrated his ignorance of the Act, which states that the Health Commission itself creates and abolishes positions. It is only by amendment to the Act that positions such as the ones we are considering here today, namely, Chief Executive Officer and Deputy Chief Executive Officer, can be created.

As for the honourable member for Elizabeth, I had to sit here and smile at some of his remarks, particularly those referring to the manner in which the office of the Minister of Health is run. As the person who had to inherit the mess (and I use that word advisedly) that he left behind, I find it quite extraordinary that he should stand and be critical of the management of the Ministry at the moment. I found myself replying to letters which I, as an Opposition back-bencher, had sent to the Minister three

months prior to the election. It is worth putting that on the record.

**Mr. O'Neill:** I have been waiting for three months for an answer from you.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I found it an interesting irony to see that the backlog of work when I took over this portfolio was colossal, as was the backlog of correspondence. I pay a tribute to the officers in the Minister's office and in the Health Commission who had to work extremely long hours to overcome the difficulties caused by the previous Minister's, shall we say, informal approach to his job.

One thing I would like to refute is the suggestion made by the member for Elizabeth that Sir Norman Young was one of his informants. I find that suggestion quite odious, because I do not believe that Sir Norman would want to be cast in the role of informant to the member for Elizabeth. I think every member of the House would agree with me about that, and I think that the suggestion clearly implicit in the honourable member's comments should be refuted.

As for the reference by the member for Elizabeth to the need for consumer representation, he is right in saying that we are all users of the health services. I am not sure whether he was suggesting that one gives a chronically sick person a position as a part-time Commissioner. I doubt very much that that was what he was suggesting. I can assure him that, in appointing the part-time Commissioners, I propose to ensure that a wide range of backgrounds is represented on the Health Commission. It will not be an advisory body. It is, in effect, a body that is there to make decisions, and it will continue in that role.

I think that, all in all, the Opposition supports the Bill. It says that it would have introduced a similar Bill and, indeed, I have on file a copy of that similar Bill that had been prepared. I think that Opposition members have had little of real value to contribute to this debate, because they are in the difficult position of wanting to oppose for the sake of opposing but are bound to support because the action taken is not unlike an action the Opposition would have taken had it remained in Government.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Constitution of commission."

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Can the Minister say whether any of the existing part-time Commissioners will automatically become a member of the new commission?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** There is nothing to say that any of the five members be automatic appointees. These Commissioners were due for reappointment at the end of June and in that respect there is a time limit in this Bill. I regard continuity as being an important element in the management of the commission. Therefore, I certainly would not want to replace all those part-time Commissioners. For reasons of their own, some of the part-time Commissioners may wish to resign and that would create the opportunity to appoint new Commissioners.

However, I place value on the importance of continuity. I hope that some of the part-time Commissioners who have had the experience of performing in that role since the establishment of the commission will want to continue and, whilst I believe that there should be broadly-based representation on the commission, I think those part-timers who have already served for nearly three years have done an excellent job and I expect at least some of them to be reappointed.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Will the Minister alone make the final selection of the seven part-time Commissioners, or will she be seeking submissions from interested bodies to

submit names from which the Minister can make a selection?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I know that when the previous Government appointed the part-time Commissioners there was an exhaustive process of submission of names. I am always interested to hear from those who are willing to make a contribution in the health field. I do not propose to set up a formal submission process but I have asked Sir Charles Bright to talk to me about the kinds of people who could be put on. The health field is so vast that to try to select people who are truly representative in a comprehensive way of all the aspects of the health services is difficult, indeed.

One would have to look at maternity, infant health, mental health, dental health, care of the aged, and Aboriginal health. One has also to look at the contribution that can be made by academic bodies and by universities, and one has to look at rural health. The list is well known and encompasses the whole range of human behaviour. I would certainly be happy to discuss with the honourable member any suggestions he has as to how the Government can be assisted in making a choice of able people who can serve as part-time members of the commission.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** In the press release that the Minister gave on 31 January, the date for the appointment to these two new positions was given as 1 July, and I know that could possibly change. Will a selection of the part-time Commissioners be made after the names of the Chief Executive Officer and his deputy are made public?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I would think that, if the Chief Executive Officer is able to be appointed before 1 July, that would be fine, but as the matter stands at the moment those part-time Commissioners are there to serve until 30 June. The present incumbents will serve until that time. The Act comes into effect on a date to be proclaimed and from that time all the appointments can be made. Does that answer the question?

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Not really.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! In accordance with Standing Order 422, the honourable member cannot seek any more information on a clause.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** With respect—

**The CHAIRMAN:** I cannot allow the honourable member to proceed.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** I rise on a point of order. The Minister asked me at that time, in reply to my question, whether that was sufficient and whether I understood. I was going to seek clarification, sit down, and leave the remainder of the questions to my colleagues. The Minister did make the point.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I cannot uphold the point of order. It is not helpful for the Minister to attempt to change Standing Orders and the Minister cannot ask questions across the Chamber. The question is that clause 4 stand as printed.

**Mr. LANGLEY:** As people are now living longer and not being looked after as well as they should be, will the Minister give special consideration to care of the aged when she is making appointments to the commission?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I certainly take the member for Unley's point and I know that he would have a special interest in the care of the aged, as his own district contains such a high proportion of these people. As the Health Commission is presently constituted, one of its part-time Commissioners is Rev. Vernon Harrison, who is well known for his work in this area. The member can rest assured that I place great emphasis on that and I realise that the future planning of the Health Commission will have to take into account the points he raised. We would want to be able to call on all the expertise we can.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Chief Executive Officer and Deputy Chief Executive Officer."

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** For what period of time will the appointments of the Chief Executive Officer and Deputy Chief Executive Officer be made?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** By contract for seven years as specified in the Act. That section has not been amended.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

### SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 March. Page 1466.)

**Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition):** The primary purpose of this Bill is to improve the situation of those wishing to retire between the ages of 55 and 60, and to increase pensions for those who entered the scheme at older ages and retired between the ages of 60 and 65. The thrust of this Bill (and there are one or two other ancillary matters connected with it) is clearly aimed at early retirement, encouraging early retirement, making it easier for persons to retire at an early age and still get adequate superannuation benefits. There are, as the Bill demonstrates, quite reasonable increases in the percentage of final salary payable on retirement that will apply, as compared with the existing situation. We support this Bill at the second reading stage.

We will move an amendment in Committee, but broadly the objects of the Bill are something with which we would agree. It is an improvement in the scheme. The important thing, of course, about such provisions is that, while early retirement should be encouraged, clearly we do not want people to be placed in a position where early retirement is forced on them. If someone is still ready, willing and able to work and has not reached the statutory retirement age, we suggest that that person has a right to continue to that retiring age without undue pressure or direction being applied to him or her to retire.

On the other hand, I think we should welcome any provisions that would make it easier for those who feel that from the age of about 55 or so their period in the Public Service should terminate; some financial recompense for the years in which they have contributed to the superannuation scheme should be recognised. That is achieved by this Bill. Earlier retirement is something that is being promoted not just for the benefit of the individual. Certainly, there are major benefits to individuals.

I have seen statistics that suggest that the expected age of death of men who retire at 60 is in the 70's (74 or 75) and the expected age of death of persons retiring at the age of 65 is around 68 to 70 years. Surely, that is a fairly clear indication that in general, on average, earlier retirement, when one is healthier and in better condition to find alternative recreation pursuits, is to be favoured. Those who wait until the very last minute, until the deathknock, as it were, of their employment end up finding that the deathknock of their life may come more quickly than they expected.

Indeed, for the benefit of the individual, provisions which assist earlier retirement are to be welcomed, but I say this provision is aimed not only at that. Promotion of early retirement is also centred around the difficult economic circumstances in which we find ourselves.

Indeed, to create employment opportunities and promotion opportunities within occupations means that early retirement can have an effect upon the general economic situation.

Certainly, the employment future is looking grim. Job opportunities are contracting because of changes in work methods and technology. They are contracting, too, under the influence of some Government policies, which suggest that the public sector should be wound down, and that there should be a constriction on public employment. For the last two years of its term the previous Labor Government held Public Service growth at zero; that is, at replacement level. That policy is being continued by the current Government. It has probably gone a bit further in suggesting that it would see as desirable an actual and absolute reduction in the number of public servants employed. We argue that there is no case for that and that there is plenty of work in the public sector to be carried out.

If, indeed, early retirement is to be based in part on the opportunities for employment it creates, I would hope that it was the Government's intention to maintain that employment. If, on the other hand, persons are being encouraged to retire early, simply to speed up the natural wastage, and in fact not to increase employment opportunities in the work force, that would be a great pity. I would hope that the Government's somewhat ideological commitment to winding down the public sector does not take advantage of this provision to leave spaces empty when people take the option of early retirement.

In the second reading explanation, it is suggested that the number of persons who may take advantage of the new provisions will not be great, but it was a pity that the Treasurer, when introducing the Bill, did not go into somewhat more detail. I ask what is the estimate of the number who may take advantage of the new provisions. That is important, not only for financial considerations, but also for the other effects I mentioned. Has any survey been conducted to find out how many people, given the opportunity of early retirement, would wish to take advantage of it?

Apart from the promotion of early retirement, one must look at the cost involved. It is suggested that the overall cost will not be great. That, of course, depends on the numbers involved. I suggest that we should really be provided with that information. As far as the contribution of cost from revenue is concerned, according to the Treasurer's second reading explanation, the combined effect of the implementation of the three recommendations will be a reduction in the cost of benefits under the Act borne by the general revenue. This, it appears, comes about due to the regulatory proposal to make the fund in future bear 5 per cent of the cost of cost-of-living supplements.

Again, the second reading explanation is a bit short on figures. We are not sure what that sum is estimated to be in terms of current value; it would be interesting to know in trying to assess the actual cost of the increase. The fact that it is coming from the fund, rather than from general revenue, is something, again, to which we are not opposed, if it has been established actuarially that the fund can stand the increased costs. It appears from the Treasurer's explanation that that is so.

I say, however, that, in relation to this, it links up quite closely with the question of investments that the trust makes in order to generate income. While it is true that the cost of cost-of-living supplements will, in future, be borne from the fund to the extent of 5 per cent, it is interesting to note that, for instance, in the deal involving the acquisition of the Moore's building by the

Superannuation Fund and its use for law courts on lease to the Government, written into the provisions of that leasing agreement is the automatic indexation of the lease payments to allow for cost-of-living increases over the 40-year period for which that loan applies.

That means that, in an indirect way, the general revenue will indeed be paying for these cost-of-living supplements because, under its leasing agreement, in this particular case an investment by the trust where the lessor of a trust-owned building is the Government, the Government is guaranteeing that the cost-of-living adjustments will be paid in the form of payments to the trust through the lease, and they in turn will be passed on to contributors in terms of payouts by the trust.

So, indirectly I suspect there is an effect present in this Act of costs to the revenue. Now, of course, all the trust investments are not on that basis or with the Government, although a large number of them are. The trust's investment policy has been upgraded and made more flexible in recent years, and that is something to be commended. Certainly as a Government we moved to free up the trust in its investment policies so that it could maximise the value returned to it from contributors. So we have no quarrel with the transfer of this particular cost to the fund's responsibility rather than out of the general revenue, because it has been established that the fund can do it and, by giving the fund increased flexibility where it can invest, then clearly its capacity to do so in the future is enhanced.

However, I would like to comment on the investment policies of the Superannuation Fund of very recent years in respect of shopping centre development. Actually, in the case of Moore's, where it has acquired a building which is a retail centre, not for its preservation in retail terms but for courts used by the Government, we have been heavily and, I believe, rightly critical, and in that we have been joined by the small traders and many other organisations and groups in the community. It was a wrong and bad decision.

If the Superannuation Fund had acquired Moore's along the lines proposed by the developer Mr. Jack Wienert for use as a retail outlet, possibly combined with offices, then we would have no complaint, and, indeed, one of the suggestions made to get the Government out of its problem involving Moore's would be for the trust to do just that, to put up for tender the building it has acquired, for retail office development. We understand that in the private sector there would be a number of takers for that. It would certainly create considerable employment, and it would preserve that shop window on the square. This is relevant to the Bill, because it in fact relates to that investment policy of the Superannuation Fund. While in the case of Moore's there is a guarantee by the Government for the lease of the building, there is also the case of the building to be used by the Public Buildings Department. That is a building that was constructed using funds from the Superannuation Fund and subsequently leased by the Government, and that is something that was done in our day and is obviously a sound and worthwhile investment.

In a number of other areas the Superannuation Fund has gone quite heavily into shopping centre development. We as an Opposition, again, joined by many small traders and other organisations in the community, believe that there should be a temporary halt in shopping centre development and in the way it is taking place at the moment. There should be a moratorium, a time for reassessment, but it is obviously an area for quick investment. Where people were constructing houses, and particularly flats, they are now turning to small shopping

complexes and larger shopping centre development. The Superannuation Fund has been very much involved in this. Its long-term viability is questionable.

Already there have been suggestions that investments in major shopping centres, and one that the Superannuation Fund is involved in (the North Adelaide Village centre), are not as financially sound as was thought at one stage. The dangers of over-shopping and of too many retail outlets suggest that in that area of investment policy the Superannuation Fund should be fairly wary. I believe that a fund such as the Superannuation Fund must act with some form of social responsibility, and that it should look to investing in areas that do have some value for the community as a whole. Certainly, the area of providing money for housing loans would be one that would prove to be of great benefit and value, and I imagine that that sort of development has been looked at by the Superannuation Fund. However, I would question the way in which the Superannuation Fund seems to have gone heavily into this area of shopping centre development. I hope that it feels it is well advised in this area. Another point I make refers to clause 4, which deals with the membership of the trust.

In the past the investment trust of the Superannuation Fund has comprised the Under Treasurer and the Public Actuary; *ex officio* they are members of that. The amendments will provide that, if for some reason either of these officers is unable to serve as trustees, their place may be taken by a person nominated by them and approved by the Treasurer. I would suggest that to leave the clause open ended in that way is not quite desirable. The Treasurer will perhaps explain the intention of where he may see these nominees coming from, because he does not expand upon it in his second reading explanation. I suggest that to leave it open ended in the sense that the Under Treasurer or Public Actuary could advise of any range of people perhaps in the private sector, and subject to approval by the Treasurer they then become trustees, would not meet the purposes of the Act, and indeed may inhibit the investment policies of the Superannuation Fund.

I think it is most important that individuals who may be involved in developments or areas at which the fund could be looking to invest should not be part of the decision-making by the trust. It is all very well to say that in those circumstances one declares a fiduciary relationship and retires from the decision-making process, but I think it would be better if that could be avoided completely. I suggest that, rather than leave it open ended, any person may be able to be nominated in lieu of the Under Treasurer or Public Actuary. I think it is desirable that both those office holders should be involved. I think there should be some very strong compelling reason before they in fact hand over their position to someone else, but in that eventuality we would suggest that there be a restriction on the class of persons from which that nomination should come. I will be dealing with that in the Committee stage.

In summary, we support the Bill and approve of the improved benefits, encouraging not only early retirement for the individual but also the creation of employment opportunities. There are some areas where perhaps a little more information could have been provided, but by and large we feel that the Bill has an important purpose, and therefore we are pleased to give it our support.

**Mr. TRAINER (Ascot Park):** For a while the South Australian Superannuation Fund went through a difficult period a couple of years back, when there was apparently a lack of a comprehensive computer program, which made it difficult for the actuaries to make their calculations on the precise basis that was required. There was a lengthy

absence due to illness of the Public Actuary, Mr. Stratford, which reduced his ability to fulfil the requirements of the President of the South Australian Superannuation Board and to act as a member of the investment trust of that board. He took sick leave, as I understand, from July 1976 through until his retirement in November 1976, which was then followed by the appointment of Mr. Weiss as Public Actuary. Mr. Stratford's illness presented the South Australian Superannuation Fund with some problems, which were aggravated by staffing problems and, I understand, a personality difference with members of the Public Service Association. During these difficulties the current Premier, who was then the Leader of the Opposition, was highly critical of the operation of the South Australian Superannuation Fund and, according to a report in the *Sunday Mail* of 6 March 1977, he claimed that the assets of the fund were grossly under-valued and that \$34 000 000 was owing to members.

He said it was scandalous that the Government then had not ensured that the Public Actuary was able to carry out a valuation, and that the Government's failure to conduct a valuation was untenable. Despite the Public Actuary's illness, staff problems, and problems such as those I have just outlined, he said that the matter was so serious that the Government should have taken steps previously; and that—

It is scandalous the situation should have been allowed to arise. The Government should have provided additional and competent help to get the job done.

I find that statement made three years ago, calling on further action to be taken by the public sector, rather unusual in view of the attitude taken by the then Leader of the Opposition, now Premier, regarding the size of the public sector.

He was always highly critical of the size of the public sector, yet whenever the opportunity arose he always demanded that extra services be provided. This is just one example of that.

Anyway, it is good to see that a lot of progress has been made in recent years with regard to the Superannuation Fund to a stage where this sort of scheme can be introduced and the overall superannuation arrangements further improved. As the Leader has pointed out, there are one or two aspects of the Bill that concern the Opposition. I am sure that these matters can be raised in the Committee stage. As the Leader has already mentioned, we will move an amendment regarding the appointment of trustees.

I support the Leader's remarks regarding early retirement, but I have two doubts about that matter: first, whether in practice retirement at 55 will be truly voluntary; and, secondly, whether this early retirement of members of the Public Service will lead to increased employment opportunities or merely increase the natural wastage rate that occurs in the public sector, which would serve to achieve the Government's aim that it has made quite clear, that is, for an overall reduction in the public sector.

The reduction in costs to the public purse which is mentioned in the Bill is most welcome. It appears that the changes in benefits will be covered mainly from the investment of funds rather than from general revenue, which seems in the past to have been an ever-increasing provider of benefits paid out from the fund.

It seems that the percentage that has come from general revenue has been continually on the increase. Under the old scheme applying in 1974, 71 per cent of all pensions paid out came from general revenue. Under the new scheme that was introduced in 1974, the payout from the

public purse for 1974-75 accounted for 79 per cent of all superannuation benefits paid. For 1976-77 it had risen to 82 per cent. Mr. Edward Nash, Economics Editor of the *Advertiser*, in an article on 22 March 1978 drawing attention to this aspect of the proportion of superannuation payout coming from the public sector, stated:

What has to be understood is that the South Australian Government, unlike a private employer, does not set aside amounts each year to meet its eventual commitments to employees. Along with other State and Federal Governments, South Australia pays its pensions out of current revenue. Thus, future pensions will be paid for by future taxes just as present pensions for services given in the past are met by today's taxpayers. The critics of the superannuation scheme—

referring to the scheme as it existed in 1978—

predict that in a few years the State Government will be footing the bill for 90 per cent of pensions. By contrast, private employers generally contribute about two-thirds of superannuation entitlements to the employee's one-third.

However, Mr. Nash then warns that it may not necessarily follow that that upward climb of the percentage paid from general revenue will continue, and he goes on to say:

Actuaries whose intuitive judgment is that the scheme will not become a millstone around the State's neck do not see the rate of increase in pensions experienced since 1974 continuing. They argue that special factors had boosted this State's commitment abnormally.

He then goes into detail on a whole series of special factors that were in many cases one-off situations that had helped contribute to that upward climb of the percentage coming from general revenue. The Actuary of the fund today is apparently of the opinion, as I have mentioned, those changed benefits will stem from improved management of the funds rather than from general revenue, and this is a welcome aspect. However, the superannuation and pension situation in this country will never be completely satisfactory until such time as we have a genuine national superannuation scheme such as the one outlined last year by the member for Port Adelaide in the Federal Parliament, Mick Young.

This would be a national superannuation scheme which would cover every employee in the private sector and in the public sector and which would integrate all superannuation and pension schemes to provide one particular benefit, probably the greatest benefit of all that such a scheme could provide, namely, portability of pensions. An employee could then change his occupation and move from State to State, from Federal Government employment to State Government employment, or to local government employment, and move from company to company, or from the public sector to the private sector, without having to give a second thought to what happens to his superannuation payments that he has made or to what he will receive in benefits at a later date.

The very operation of the private enterprise system depends to a very large extent upon having a smooth operation of the labour force, in terms of mobility of labour: mobility of labour at the work force level and mobility of labour at the managerial level. At the moment it is perhaps possible for firms to attract people from another firm by means of bribing them with a superannuation arrangement, but that should not be necessary. A pension system with portability under a national superannuation scheme is what this nation really requires, but I am afraid that we will have to wait for that until the election of the Federal Labor Government. As the Leader has pointed out, the Opposition supports the Bill, but with reservations.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer):** I am

grateful for the support that has been intimated by the Opposition. Certainly, this is a matter which will enable a number of people contemplating retirement earlier than the age set down to take that step with some degree of security. I would like to place on record the gratitude of both the former Government and the present Government for the co-operation they have received from the South Australian Superannuation Federation, the South Australian Superannuated Government Employees Association, the Public Service Association and the South Australian Institute of Teachers. There have been detailed discussions on this matter with these bodies over a considerable period.

In reply to comments made earlier, there of course has been stimulus for this. An actuarial assessment has now been done, and this has led to the negotiations which have taken place. Two questions have been asked: first, how many people will be affected or are likely to take advantage of this. In the short term the answer is about 100 or 110 people—no more. Of course, in the long term it is almost impossible to judge, as it is very much a matter of individual judgment as to whether a public servant believes that he is able to afford to retire at a given stage.

The retirement levels at present are such that some 3 per cent of people retire between the ages of 55 and 58, and between the ages of 58 and 59, as they near the age of 60, about 6 per cent retire. Generally speaking, there will not be a great impact made by this legislation; it simply makes it a little easier for a few people who choose to retire at that stage. Clauses 6 and 7 involve some slight increase in Government expenditure, as the Leader has pointed out, but it must be borne in mind that those are two of three recommendations made by the Public Actuary and the Superannuation Board following the completion of the actuarial valuation, and those recommendations must be taken and read in conjunction with the third recommendation, namely, that the fund should bear 5 per cent of the cost of cost-of-living supplements in future. In taking those recommendations as a package of three, there is no question at all that the Government's expenditure will be reduced by a far greater amount than any increases which come out of clauses 6 and 7. Therefore, the cost is negligible.

The Leader referred to the question of Moore's building and to the investment policy of the Superannuation Trust. Misleading comments have been made in the media recently, emanating, it seems, from a document that came into the Leader's possession from the Chairman of the trust.

**Mr. Bannon:** It wasn't a document; it was a letter he wrote.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I acknowledge the Leader's sensitivity. A letter has come to him. That publicity totally ignored the involvement of the Government raising money from Loan funds, having to pay interest and service the interest on those Loan funds, and the expenditure over a 40-year period that would result. When one compares leasing with borrowing to build, there is not a great deal of difference in the long term. That matter was, unfortunately, apparently lost sight of in the remarks made by an alderman of the City Council.

The matter of trustees has been raised by the Leader. He asked what sort of people would be envisaged. It is not, as far as I am concerned, intended to make any variation in that provision. It would be the Public Actuary and the Under Treasurer, but there could be circumstances in which those officers were unable to act but in which I would envisage their deputies acting. However, the amendment which the Leader has foreshadowed in this regard, while I think it is generated from an excess of

caution, is nevertheless one that I would accept.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Membership of trust."

**Mr. BANNON:** I move:

After line 6 insert subsection as follows:

(1a) A person is not eligible for nomination as a trustee by the Under Treasurer or the Public Actuary unless he is an officer of the Public Service of the State.

My reasons for moving the amendment were canvassed in the second reading debate. I am pleased that, in the course of his remarks, the Premier indicated his sympathy for the thinking behind the amendment which was that, if those officers were unable to serve, their deputies would be the appropriate officers. I fully concur in that, but perhaps some flexibility should be left there. It should be constrained to an officer of the Public Service.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I have already indicated that the Government would be happy to accept the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5—"Trust to be exempted from certain rates, taxes, etc."

**Mr. BANNON:** In the course of the second reading explanation, the Premier referred to this clause, but I did not refer to it in my remarks. It appears that the purpose of this provision is to give us some bargaining power, as it were, with the Commonwealth Minister for Finance, and I fully approve of the thought behind that. Can the Premier say how much has been lost in revenue? He referred to a considerable sum in his explanation.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** It is entirely because of that loss of revenue from Commonwealth sources that we are concerned. In 1978-79, \$115 000 was involved—not a sum we can regard with any equanimity.

**Mr. BANNON:** The clause is stated to be part of the bargaining process with the Commonwealth. Indeed, a *quid pro quo* is involved, namely, that, if we make the fund's investments liable to tax under State law, he might be induced to do the same with the Commonwealth ones. The second reading explanation states that he might be influenced. Can the Premier indicate whether there has been any indication, either formal or informal, on the success of the negotiations, and whether this will remain negotiable in the sense that it will not have effect until we find some matching action has been taken by the Commonwealth (in other words, we are not going it alone, as it were)?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Until the legislation is passed, it is difficult to undertake any bargaining with the Commonwealth on this matter, but it will certainly be taken up at the first opportunity. We are looking in the first instance at land tax and stamp duty on the conveyancing of property. A number of these taxes could well be brought within ambit, and this will be taken up with the Commonwealth at the first opportunity. Obviously, at this stage we are not in a position to have anything to bargain with at all.

**Mr. BANNON:** Can the Premier assure me that regulations will not be made in terms of this clause until such time as we have a firm undertaking from the Commonwealth?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** That goes without saying.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (6 to 8) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.



### BOATING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 4 March. Page 1381.)

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Adelaide):** This is a small but certainly not insignificant Bill. It is a Bill which I believe in all probability is overdue, and in those circumstances the Opposition supports it.

I believe that this Bill is needed. There is evidence of this throughout the River area, where we are aware that accidents have occurred. Anything that can prevent accidents obviously needs to be supported. The Bill has much merit, although I do not think that the Minister's second reading explanation gave the Bill enough recognition. I searched the explanation again today to ascertain whether I could find something in it worthy of comment. Whilst this is only a small Bill, I think that the Minister could have been much more explanatory, so that people outside the House would be aware of what the Government was doing about trying to prevent accidents in the River area.

The legislation is designed specifically to prevent accidents and to give safe passage to those people who want to ski, go boating, fish or swim in the river. I know that the previous Minister (Hon. G. T. Virgo) was contemplating legislation in this area and had signalled to the Government of the day that that legislation was in train because, as I understand, similar legislation was being considered some 12 months ago, and no doubt the new Minister has picked up the threads. People I have talked to about this matter (and I do not know a lot of people who go fishing, ski-ing or boating) have informed me that this legislation is required for people's safety and protection and to give people more confidence when engaging in these activities. Whatever their choice, there is little doubt that this legislation is not only needed but is also acceptable to the people concerned.

I want to refer briefly to an unfortunate accident that occurred to a Mrs. Elzie Quinn in January of this year. Mrs. Quinn was struck by a boat and killed. Councillor Hahn of Blanchetown was quite vociferous in his condemnation of that accident, and so he should have been. He evidently knew the lady well, and she was a popular and well accepted member of the local community. For such a tragedy to occur, especially in such a small, closeknit community as Blanchetown, is a tremendous shock to the local people of a township, and my sympathy goes to those people and particularly to Mrs. Quinn's family. Councillor Hahn was outspoken about the need for zoning speeds on the river, and he is reported in the *Advertiser* of 12 January 1980, as follows:

A Blanchetown councillor has called for zoning of the Murray River following the death of a woman while swimming in the river on Thursday. Councillor N. Hahn said yesterday he was amazed more people had not been killed on the river. Power boats and ski-ers often used the same sections as swimmers.

It is a ridiculous situation when swimmers, power boats and ski-ers are all using the same area, not taking a great deal of notice of each other and thinking that there is no reason for concern and that the other person will watch out. That is obviously how these terrible accidents occur. The report continued:

Councillor Hahn said he would raise zoning at a meeting of the Truro District Council on Monday.

The report then referred to Mrs. Elzie Quinn's unfortunate accident and to the fact that a police report was being prepared. It continued:

Mrs. Quinn and her husband Jack were among 10

Blanchetown people who won first prize in a \$1 000 000 lottery in 1977. Councillor Hahn said yesterday Murray River zoning was long overdue. Separate areas should be set aside for boating, ski-ing, fishing and swimming.

"One guy might want to fish in front of his shack and one guy might want to ski two shacks down but that's bad luck," he said. "Zoning is the only way to cut down on the number of accidents in the river."

Councillor Hahn said Mrs. Quinn had been popular in Blanchetown.

I suggest that that particular information comes from an expert, someone who has obviously lived in the River area for some time and is cognisant of the requirements regarding zoning in that area. I believe that notice should be taken of local people when they make points about these issues. There is little question that Mr. Hahn knows exactly what he is talking about and what is required in that area. Another point of view was put forward by a person who was obviously concerned about this matter and who had been interested in river activities for a long time. That person wrote a letter to the *Advertiser* on 24 January 1980 after this matter was first announced in the press, and I draw the Minister's attention to that letter, because it is important to consider the points made by this person, a Mr. Shrubbs of Edwardstown, who is obviously competent and expert in this field. He has every right to comment on this matter, because I think some of his points make it clear that the Minister and his department need to be careful about how regulations are drawn. One could almost say that this is a Bill administered by regulation, because nothing is really spelt out in the Bill giving the Minister and his department power to formulate regulations consistent with the safety of people using the river. Mr. Shrubbs is reported as follows:

I was interested to read about speed zones on the Murray River (*Advertiser*, 16/1/80). While the idea has some good points, it also has a few bad ones.

These are the points I want to draw to the attention of the Minister and his department:

If the speed limit is to be eight km/h past shacks and landings, the people ski-ing will not get a fair go as there are so many shacks on the river. Could not some area be closed off for swimmers such as was done on the beaches when I was a child? Surely, this would be a lot safer? As a ski-er, I have often seen people swimming in the middle of the river. This is extremely dangerous and a little common sense could avoid a lot of accidents.

In the first week of this year I saw two incidents that could have ended in tragedy. Six men swam in a group to the middle of the river when there were about 30 boats in the area. Everyone could see the swimmers at that stage, but then some of them began to dive under the water for a while before all six split up and swam in different directions. No-one could see all six at the same time. Who would have been at fault if even one of those men had been hurt?

The other incident involved children swimming unsupervised right where boats and ski-ers were landing. All swimmers should observe one rule. If you see a boat approaching, raise your hand so you are clearly visible to the driver. It is a lot easier to spot you then and gives the boat time to steer away.

Those are the conclusions of a man who has obviously had a great deal of experience as a competent and frequent skier on the river. I believe the Minister should take notice of what Mr. Shrubbs has said, especially about difficulties in straight-out zoning and about setting aside areas for certain people.

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

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I had almost completed my remarks prior to the dinner adjournment. The Opposition, in the main, supports this Bill. The measure has a lot of merit and it is important, and it will receive our support through the second reading stage. However, the Opposition disagrees with the Government in relation to the powers given to the Director under clause 5 of the Bill. I know that I cannot talk about the amendment now, but I foreshadow that the Opposition believes that the Director, not the Minister, should have power under that clause. The Opposition supports the Bill, but the amendment is required. We ensure the Bill's safe passage through the House.

**Mr. WHITTEN (Price):** I also support the Bill, and I do so briefly. I compliment the Minister for his attention to the public safety. The Deputy Leader cited the serious accident that occurred at Blanchetown with the resulting loss of life. I do not know whether the Minister is aware that a week later another serious accident occurred at Berri in similar circumstances. People were injured in that case. I use the Murray River extensively and I am concerned that there are no zones and that some irresponsible people who drive boats and some skiers interfere with those who wish to use the river for the quiet sport of fishing. At times, when I have been buffeted by skiers, I have felt that I would like to throw a bottle in front of the ski-boat, but I know that would be irresponsible.

I am pleased that the Minister has introduced this amendment but I would like it to go further. The Minister, in his second reading explanation, mentioned only ski-ing; the Bill should allow for fishing and swimming zones, as well as ski zones. The Minister talked only about water sports, but the Bill should go further. In his second reading explanation, the Minister referred to control on the Murray River, but other areas should also be considered. In West Lakes, I believe that a certain area should be set aside for fishing, as is the case with non-powered boats. I support the Bill and I compliment the Minister for his bringing forward this amendment.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Minister of Marine):** I thank the Deputy Leader and the member for Price for their remarks. The Deputy Leader pointed out that, in his opinion, the second reading explanation was too brief, and perhaps it was. I am sure that the Deputy Leader would not want me to launch into a long spiel now, but I want to comment on some issues which are associated with the Bill and which have been referred to by both the Deputy Leader and the member for Price.

The Bill is a little ambiguous; the second reading explanation states that it makes amending provisions to the principal Act that would allow greater and more effective control to be exercised over water sports on the Murray River. The Bill intends to control the areas where people congregate for water sports, places like the seaside, West Lakes or Lake Fellmongery at Robe, which is very scenic and for which special powers by proclamation have been given. I assure my colleague that, if he goes to Lake Fellmongery he will not be fellmongered. Provision has also been made regarding Tumbly Bay. I point out to the Deputy Leader that this Bill has been considered in depth and that district councils on the Murray River have been consulted. It was at Blanchetown that the death of Mrs. Quinn, referred to by the lead speaker from the Opposition, occurred.

This unfortunate accident did not bring the matter to a head because the introduction of this Bill had been considered by the previous Government last year. District councils have been asked for input of local opinion about

the regulations that will be brought down, which will be wide in their ambit and wide in their application, and will cater for the special needs of the area that is to be zoned by the Director. The Deputy Leader said that interest has been shown by people throughout the State. Correspondence has come from far and wide.

There was a preponderance of correspondence earlier this year from Renmark. Complaints were made about the irresponsibility on public waters, where people go to relax. A letter was received from Mrs. Joyce Healey, from Renmark, who stated that she owns a houseboat on the Murray River at Renmark and who suggested that, if possible, certain areas should be designated for houseboats and speed boats. She says that it is almost impossible to fish in the stream because of the boats whipping up the water; this makes conditions unpleasant and people cannot enjoy other forms of recreation. This lady suggests that a five-mile area should be designated for skiers and another five-mile area should be set aside for other purposes. That is a local opinion from a housewife on a houseboat.

Another letter was received from the Dalton family of Largs Bay, and was in relation to boat speed zones by the department on the Murray River. The letter stated that the area on the riverfront from Murray Bridge north-west upstream to the extremity of Long Island for 50 metres should be rezoned. It was stated that there are about 50 holiday homes on the north-west bank, and many inhabitants have signed an appeal for rezoning, or for borders to be placed 50 metres from public landings. Speed boats and skiers come within a few metres of swimmers, landing craft, mooring craft and landings, and a high percentage of speedboats and skiers ignore the rule about 8 m.p.h. and come within 30 metres of any moored vessel on the public landing.

It was pointed out that there have been two deaths in recent years. She says that every week the South Australian Shack Owners Association receives alarming information as to accidents involving adults and children on this stretch of the Murray River. This letter was signed by 50 signatories, and is a sample of the letters that have been sent to the department and to me concerning this matter.

Regarding the comments of Mr. Shrubbs mentioned by the Leader, I have looked at those and that highlights the point that there was a real need to have this matter legislated for and, indeed, the Department of Marine and Harbours has looked not only at the Murray River but also at waterways, a matter raised by the member for Price. That member said that there should be swimming zones, paddling zones, and fishing zones, and it is not the province of this Bill to do anything about fishing zones, and without—

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** That will come with regulations.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** It will come in regulations, as the Deputy Leader indicates. I do not want to get off the track, other than to say we will be having a look at fishing zones later in the year, along similar lines to those in this Bill. I thank the Opposition for its support. I do note what the honourable member has to say about an amendment. Like he, I do not want to canvass that at this stage. We look forward to this Bill becoming a Statute and doing all of those things which have been asked for, and which all of those letters that we have on file are demanding. I hope that this time next year these areas will be defined and that we will have the surveillance officers to see that full effect is given to the things that have caused those untimely deaths and are giving so much concern to pleasure seekers who use the State's waterways and water services.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Regulations."

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I move:

Page 2, line 4—Leave out "Director" and insert "Minister".

I am not out to criticise public servants and say that they are not capable of doing their job in this regard or any other. I have a tremendous regard for most public servants. However, what I do think is happening by this particular clause of the Bill is that the Minister is giving away power that I believe he ought to possess. If the Director asserts the power, I believe that the Minister will not be giving full force to the regulations that will be brought into operation.

It is a simple fact of life to me (and my experience as a Minister suggests it) that there are some circumstances in which one can delegate that power to a public servant, but the Minister has told us how important he considers this legislation. The Opposition likewise considers the measure is in order and is good. It is legislation for which one must find support. However, to allow the power to go out of the Minister's hands could mean, in my view, that the Minister will not know, unless he takes a particular interest, what the Director of the department is doing in setting the regulations for the zoning of these particular areas of the river.

I believe it is central to the whole of this legislation that the Minister, not the Director, should have the authority in this area. If it so concerns the Minister that he wants to involve his Director, I see no complaint about that; but primarily the course of this measure rests fairly and squarely with the Government, and the Government in the circumstances of this clause is the Minister controlling the legislation. I am hopeful that the Minister has given some thought to this matter over the dinner adjournment. I mentioned to him earlier that I intended to move this amendment. It is not in any way destroying the legislation. In my view, it is enhancing it. It is giving the impetus. I am reminded by my honourable colleague that it is giving the legislation the necessary clout, and I am sure he wants it to be recognised and accepted as his legislation.

I do not see how it can be accepted in that way unless the Minister is the controlling factor in this area. I am hopeful the Minister has given some consideration to this amendment. It in no way endangers the Bill. If I was trying in any way to detract from the Minister's power, I would think the Minister would have an argument to come back with, but I am trying to give the Minister power that he now wants to designate to a public servant. I again make the point that I am not critical of a public servant who would manage this area and, if the Minister wants to delegate that power to the Director, provided that the Minister has the overseeing rights regarding this clause, I see no objection. I ask the Minister to earnestly consider and accept this amendment.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The Deputy does me great honour talking about my clout and my great powers. I am sorry to have to disappoint him. He did that to me on simple amendments, although I am not saying this is a simple amendment. The Director will be working under regulations that have been 14 days on the table of this place and they will have been subjected to all the processes. They will operate on waters under the control of the Minister. I ask the Committee to suppose that the marker buoys that will define these zones have to be shifted for very good reason. It would be necessary for the Minister to be contacted and asked to sign the piece of paper to authorise that, while the Director, with his delegated powers to his officers, could do that forthwith.

There is power of delegation, and for that reason the amendment would be cumbersome. We will want decisions on the spot. Members may argue that the Minister can give decisions on the spot. A lot of thought has been given to how the Bill has been drafted, and I cannot accept the amendment.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I am surprised to hear the Minister. I am sure many of his colleagues would also be somewhat surprised to hear what he has said. I should have thought it was an important and fundamental principle that all powers that are delegated or given, granted if you like, by this Parliament should, wherever possible, be given to a Minister of the Crown, not to a public servant, who is not elected.

That does not stop the Minister in the exercise of his discretion from deciding to delegate those powers to the Director. I think it is an important principle that, when this Parliament grants powers of this type to an individual within the administration, they should be granted in the first instance to the Minister, so that the Minister can then decide whether he wants to be exercised by a public servant and, if so, which one.

I recall the embarrassing situation that arose in the consumer affairs area as a result of a reorganisation of the administration. The proposal that the Minister has put before the House is that the power would be given to the Director of Marine and Harbors. It may well be that this Government, or another Government in the future, will decide to amalgamate the department. It might be that we will have a Marine Department, or that we will set up a super department with a Director-General of Marine Affairs, or some other title. If the Director referred to in the Bill is referred to by name, one is getting into an unfortunate situation where one has to bring the Bill back to amend it for that sort of reason.

If the power is referred to the Minister, it means that in all circumstances it is the Minister to whom the Act has been committed by the Executive Council. I think those are two good reasons why Parliament, as a matter of principle, should only refer these types of powers for exercise by the Minister, who, in the Administration, is the elected representative of the people. As I have said, that does not stop the Minister from delegating the power to any particular officer of his own volition.

The situation to which I referred was the one which occurred when we formed the new Department of Public and Consumer Affairs. All of the administrative powers under the Prices Act at that time and now are delegated by the Parliament to the Commissioner for Prices. Many of those powers are a good deal wider than just dealing with the very limited question of price control itself. Various powers set out under that Act deal with more general matters relating to consumer affairs. It was desirable that the head of the department be the one who exercised the power in those circumstances, not the person further down the line who at that time was Prices Commissioner.

Unfortunately, because of the rigidity that had been laid upon the system by the legislation, we were unable to do anything about that so we had the situation where the Director-General of the department, in effect, had to go cap in hand to one of the members in the lower echelons asking him to do things. I think that is an unusual situation. If the power is granted to the Minister, then from the very top one can make the appropriate administrative arrangements and delegations. I think that is a reasonable argument. Obviously, it is not a matter of great moment and, if the Minister is not prepared to accept it, I do not think anybody will be crying on this side of the House. However, I think it is a matter of some

principle to which the Government might like to give consideration.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** Mr. Chairman, I seek your guidance on this point: whilst we are discussing an amendment, am I in order in asking questions at this time on this clause?

**The CHAIRMAN:** I think it would be appropriate if the honourable member waited until this amendment was dealt with. Then he will have an opportunity to seek information from the Minister.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** I have listened carefully to the learned opinion of the member for Elizabeth, and I take on board what he has said. As I pointed out in reply to the mover of the amendment, the Director will be acting under regulations that will be laid down by the Bill, and the Government does not see any problems arising from this. To borrow a phrase from the member for Elizabeth, I assure him that if we get into trouble we will not hesitate to bring it back to perhaps put some more teeth into the Act. This matter has been very carefully considered and the Government is happy about having the Director of Marine and Harbors, and that he will be able to enforce the regulations that will be part and parcel of this Bill.

**Mr. LANGLEY:** I think every member always addresses letters to the Minister. Under this scheme, I do not know whether I will have to address my letters concerning these matters to the Minister, or to the Director-General from now on.

*Mr. Mathwin interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** The member for Glenelg is out of order.

**Mr. LANGLEY:** The member for Glenelg can have his say, but I have always written letters to the Minister concerned. Now that his powers have moved away I think I will have to address my letters to the Director-General.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The question before the Chair is that the amendment be agreed to. Those for the question say "Aye": those against say "No". I think the Noes have it.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** The amendment is carried?

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Noes have it.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** You said the Ayes have it.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! If the honourable member disputes the Chair, he knows—

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** I'm calling for a division. The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Abbott, Lynn Arnold, Bannon, Max Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, Millhouse, O'Neill, Payne, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright (teller).

Noes (22)—Mrs. Jennifer Adamson, Messrs. Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda (teller), Russack, Schmidt, and Wilson.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Corcoran and McRae. Noes—Messrs. Tonkin and Wotton.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** How does the Minister intend to have this provision policed? What other devices, apart from markers and buoys, does he intend to use?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** I have always looked on the member for Price as being one of the most imaginative members. I would not like to suggest that he is having us on, but strong investigations will be conducted into this matter. Those half a dozen men referred to by the Deputy Leader as swimming in the middle of the river will be in real trouble after these areas are defined, because there will not be people swimming in the river with their hands up or their heads under the water. There will be

surveillance on the river, and areas will be defined and marked by markers and buoys.

**Mr. Whitten:** What is the other prescribed manner?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** We do not want 101 prescribed manners. The Marine and Harbors Department is skilled in deciding demarcation. The areas will be clearly defined and prescribed as to whether one can swim or walk on the water, as some people suggest they can do. Speed-boating and ski-ing areas will be clearly defined in concert with people in local government areas, as was properly put forward by the Deputy Leader. I see no problems in this regard and I ask the imaginative member for Price to have a little faith in me.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** I would have hoped that the Minister would say, "We have means, other than buoys, to put in the water." I hoped that he would say that he would do the same as the Fisheries Department has done, namely, erect a large sign on the gum trees bordering the river; that would be a logical thing to do. In many places in the river where I envisage that there will be zones, buoys will not be placed. I had hoped that the Minister would have shown enough initiative to say to me, "We'll put posters and signs on gum trees as is done in the fishing areas," instead of having a laugh at my expense.

**Mr. HAMILTON:** Great play was made during the campaign last year, in the District of Albert Park, on the lights at Football Park, and mention was made as to whether speed boats would be next on the lake. Can the Minister categorically assure me that no speed boats will be permitted on the lake at West Lakes?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** I have even seen electoral posters on gum trees. I can assure the honourable member that clearly marked placards will point out to the public what obtains in certain areas, including perhaps large area maps, and that the matters he has referred to will be catered for. With regard to West Lakes, it would be a brave man who would say what he would do there, but I do not think that we will see hydroplanes interfering with the environs, as one of my Federal colleagues calls it, in the hallowed West Lakes areas. It is a wonderful waterway and I would be the last person to suggest that we should be allowing power boats to operate there. We would seek everyone's opinion before doing such a thing.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** In reply to my colleague the member for Price, the Minister referred to surveillance on the river. That will obviously be a cost factor. Can he explain what type of surveillance he or his Director now has in mind (following the defeat of my amendment) and the estimated cost involved in carrying out this surveillance?

I remind the Minister that when the Labor Party was in office it was always being criticised for introducing legislation that could bring about new cost factors. I realise that cost factors will be involved, but can the Minister tell me what sort of surveillance he has in mind and what is its estimated cost?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The experience the honourable member had as a Minister would have shown him that the best budgets one can draw have holes in them or can fall short of what is expected of them. It is proposed that extra officers will be appointed to carry out surveillance in these areas, but I assure the honourable member that there will not be an officer at every waterhole. Indeed, those people breaking the law may experience an element of surprise. I am not going to make a commitment about what will happen next year, but every step will be taken to see that the public is protected.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I am not satisfied with that answer. The Minister told the member for Price that there would be surveillance. Surely, he must have thought about

this matter and taken into consideration the cost factor when preparing this legislation. I think that the Opposition is entitled to know what that cost factor is and how many extra people the department is going to employ. These are quite reasonable questions, and I think the Minister ought to answer them.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** I have told the honourable member that there will be adequate supervision. I am not going to give a figure or number at this stage. The Murray River is an important area and, although I stand to be corrected, I think there are three boating officers on the river at present. That number will have to be increased. Further, police officers have wide powers, and if the need is there it will be met.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I must persist with this question. I know that the Minister is not going to answer now, but will he give me an assurance that, when his Director decides how many extra staff will be required and how much expenditure is necessary, the Minister will give us the details?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** That is a reasonable request. We will be bringing down a Budget in due course, and at that time the honourable member can ask his question again.

**Mr. HAMILTON:** I draw to the Minister's attention the implied promise made by the Liberal candidate for Albert Park prior to the election last year that speed boats would not be allowed on the lake at West Lakes. If the member for Glenelg will shut his mouth—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member will withdraw that remark.

**Mr. HAMILTON:** I withdraw it, Mr. Chairman. Will the Minister honour the promise to which I have referred?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** I would not want to see speed boats on the lake. It is a lovely waterway and, if I have a say in the matter, there will be no power boats on the lake at West Lakes.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** Will the Minister say whether the matter of additional staff for Murray River surveillance was taken into account when considering the 3 per cent cut announced across the board by the Government in respect of all departments?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** We are getting into a superfluous area now. No, I have not looked at that area. There were some areas we saw when we came into Government where there was a lot of fat, and there were other areas where there was a lot of lean. I do not think it would be difficult, in an examination across the board, to justify the appointment of half a dozen inspectors undertaking surveillance in such an important area as this where lives are at stake.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The Minister has hinted that there are areas of fat in his department. I would like to hear where those areas are.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** In answering an earlier question, the Minister said that there would be increased surveillance on the Murray River, and that part of that increased surveillance might be carried out by the Police Force. Will the Minister explain just what role the Police Force would play in the surveillance of craft on the Murray River?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** This is an academic question that will arise when the need calls for it. I am not going to stand here and answer aunt sallies. If there is a need, action will be taken. I hope that satisfies the Opposition, because that is all I am going to say tonight.

**Mr. HAMILTON:** Has the Minister had any discussions with West Lakes Limited about the use of speed boats or about other sporting activities on the lake? Has he had discussions about how the use of speed boats would be policed if it should occur? One would not like to see a

situation arising similar to the one involving lighting at Football Park.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** No, I have had no discussions with West Lakes Limited about this, and I do not expect that there will be any need for discussions regarding speed boats.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** Mr. Chairman—

**The CHAIRMAN:** I point out that the honourable Deputy Leader has spoken three times in this debate.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I thought the number of times a member can speak is unlimited.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Standing Order 422 states:

In Committee, except when an Appropriation Bill or a Public Purposes Loan Bill or a Supply Bill is being considered, no member other than the member in charge of the Bill or motion shall speak more than three times on any one question nor for more than 15 minutes on any one occasion and the debate shall be confined to the motion, clause or amendment before the Committee.

The Minister of Marine is the member in charge of the Bill.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** Does the Minister envisage that the officers who are based at various points along the river and who are employed by the Department of Marine and Harbors to patrol the river, say, from Loxton to Kingston, will be able to police the Act? More than one officer may be needed. I could know at what time the department's craft travelled through a certain section of the river and the time of its return. Skiers could also estimate at what time the officer will travel through a certain section of the river.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The honourable member highlights the need for vigilance. I have been asked to provide facts, figures and estimates, which I am not in a position to produce at this stage. Boating inspectors will have the authority and will generally have charge of surveillance in the first instance and will see that provisions of the Act are adhered to.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I am somewhat bemused. We have been told that boating inspectors will have the responsibility to interpret this legislation. Earlier, the Minister stated that police officers may be used for the purpose of, in his own terms, surveillance. Apart from the fact that this action would give authority to persons other than boating inspectors, an item of expenditure is involved. Police officers have many duties to perform and I presume that what is proposed will be an additional duty. It may be that additional officers will be needed. If the Minister thinks about this, he will realise that all members are entitled to some explanation as to how many officers will be involved. The Minister introduced the term "surveillance".

I believe that we are entitled to an explanation about what is in the Minister's mind. We are not privy to that information. The Minister introduced this Bill, and we are entitled, as representatives of the people of this State who will use the river under the conditions laid down in the amendments, to expect an explanation about how many police officers may be used (or whether none will be used, as the Minister seems to be backing off), and the likely cost.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The operative word is "may"—police officers may be used. I am sure that the member for Mitchell can understand that.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I am not happy with the Minister's last answer. Are we to understand that at any time, if the Director or Minister so decides, a member of the Police Force will be empowered to make random checks on operators on our rivers so that, if a person is on the river, he cannot be sure whether the gentleman in blue is a

friendly police officer or one who can apprehend him for something that is under the control of the appropriate inspector? That situation is not fair to the Police Force or to the community. I should be interested to know what was the reaction of the Commissioner of Police when the Minister discussed this matter with him. I do not believe that any Minister of the Crown would be so foolish as to make a statement such as was made in a Parliamentary debate without first having discussed this matter with the Commissioner of Police. If the Government does not intend to use police officers in this role (and I hope that that is the case), the Minister should say so. I should be happy to accept the Minister's assurance that some 20 minutes ago he used a rather throw-away line that police officers would be used. It would be simple for the Minister to confirm what I believe to be the truth—that he will not use police officers and never had any intention of doing so.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** I may, and I leave it at that.

**Mr. ABBOTT:** Has the Minister discussed with the Commissioner of Police the duties that police officers will be required to carry out?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** No.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** I did not want to enter the debate because, quite frankly, water frightens me, but what the Minister has said frightens me even more. He said that police officers would be used to control activities on the Murray River. When questions were put to the Minister about how many police officers would be used and about whether discussions had taken place, he suddenly dried up and refused to answer. This matter is important. Since the Government's election policy included the use of more police officers to reduce crime, one would have thought that it would be a bad thing for our hard-pressed Police Force to be used to control the waterways of the Murray River. I ask the Minister to be frank and to answer my question—has he had any discussions with the Commissioner of Police about how many police officers would be used, and in what categories they would be used? Has he had any consultations with the Police Association; if not, was his previous statement about using the Police Force to control the Murray River a figment of his imagination?

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Perhaps the Minister intends to use the water police on the Murray River. If that is the case, he should tell us. I hope the Minister, when he replies to the Deputy Leader, or when the Budget lines come before us for surveillance, will be able to say what is involved in this additional surveillance on the Murray River. Salaries of inspectors would be set by the Public Service Board, so getting that information presents no problem.

What sort of craft will the Minister buy? Is it craft similar to that used by the Department of Marine and Harbors to take the Minister, the member for Rocky River, and very fortunately me out to the Port Pirie river the other day? If that is the case it is a very expensive craft. If the craft was not going to be so sophisticated, the Minister ought to be able to tell us. This is a fundamental question that is related to surveillance. The type of craft that would be used on the Murray River is not inexpensive. This would be a substantial input into the lines that the Minister will be submitting to his Cabinet colleagues for approval when the Budget is determined. I hope that the Minister is able to enlighten me, because I am not permitted to have another opportunity to question him on this clause. I ask him to give me a full reply.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

## CRIMES (OFFENCES AT SEA) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 March. Page 1466.)

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth):** This Bill comes to the House after a very long and colourful passage with which I have had the pleasure of being associated since about 1975. The legislation is a continuing part of the State-Commonwealth co-operative arrangement to overcome the case, which was decided in the High Court in 1975 or 1976, called the seas and submerged lands case. The result of that case was that it was decided that the boundaries of the State ended at the low-water mark and not at the three-mile limit, the situation that everybody had believed was the law almost since the beginnings of the State as a colony of Great Britain.

As a result of that case in 1976 the Parliament, when I was Attorney-General, considered a measure, which it was thought would overcome the problem, by simply applying the State's laws specifically to the three-mile limit. Unfortunately, in a case in 1977 known as *Robinson v. the State of Western Australia*, the High Court again found that the law was deficient in this area. In a matter involving the Western Australian Act, which purported to vest in the possession of the Western Australian museum all wrecks found within the three-mile limit off the Western Australian coast, that law was held to be invalid on the basis that it was not necessary for the peace, order and good government of the State of Western Australia.

So the laws of the land and the sea between the low-water mark and the three-mile limit were again thrown into some confusion. As a result of that, a meeting of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General set up various working parties to try to overcome the difficulty that had arisen. In relation to crimes at sea, the position had become most serious indeed, since it was thought possible that the act of killing another person, for example, off the coast of South Australia at that time would not be an offence. Great concern was expressed about this.

There were a number of ways of potentially overcoming that difficulty. Three judges of the High Court in the seas and submerged lands case made clear that in their opinion the Commonwealth Parliament had the power, pursuant to section 51 of the Constitution, to pass laws under the foreign external affairs power that would provide the necessary laws off the coast of Australia. Therefore, the Federal Parliament would simply have passed legislation either applying the appropriate States' laws to the three-mile limit or, alternatively, it could have passed its own criminal law to apply from the low-water mark to the three-mile limit. That seemed to the Government to be an easy solution to the problem. However, for political reasons, that was not to be. Mr. Bjelke-Petersen and his gang in Queensland being State righters to the boot straps, saw any passage of Commonwealth legislation of that sort as an infringement on what they believed were traditional States' rights, and they refused to agree to any scheme or arrangement for co-operation with the Commonwealth on that basis. So we were then forced to try to find another alternative method.

Again, it would have been possible for the Commonwealth to pass legislation, in effect, delegating its power to the State Parliaments to pass laws for such eventualities, and to pass laws applying to the area from the low-water mark to the three-mile limit. Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The situation was that that possibility again was unacceptable to Queensland because of the fact that it saw that as a delegation of the Commonwealth's power to the State which could be withdrawn possibly at any time, and it was not prepared to

agree to that. That left the third and undoubtedly the least desirable method of dealing with this problem, and that is the one that is now before the Parliament.

It would have been possible for the Commonwealth to pass laws to do exactly the same thing and apply the State criminal laws to the area between the low-water mark and the three-mile limit without the need for this Bill and without the need to take up the time of Parliament tonight but, because of the States' rights, head-in-the-sand attitude of the Queensland Government, unfortunately the rest of Australia has been forced to go along with this incredibly complicated scheme to overcome the hiatus.

In some respects, although I am critical of this scheme ever having been brought into effect, it should be noted by Parliament as an important development, because this co-operative scheme between the Commonwealth and the States over this matter has developed as a result of a great number of meetings of both Attorneys-General and Solicitors-General, and of various officers of the Attorneys, throughout Australia over a very long period. Some people say that the meetings of Attorneys and other Ministers and the co-operative exercises that they undertake are a great waste of time and that they never lead to any fruitful results. However, I think that this particular measure does in a very real sense give the lie to that allegation, and it is an example of a successful conclusion of a co-operative exercise.

I think that there are interesting aspects to it, particularly the problem that was perceived as possibly occurring as a result of the fact that the Commonwealth may at some stage extend the territorial sea to the 200-mile limit, and not simply have an economic zone, which I understand it has agreed to at the moment and which could lead to a number of problems. However, that matter is not before Parliament tonight. The Bill itself has not only been drafted by our Parliamentary Counsel in South Australia but is part of a co-operative scheme, and for that reason obviously it is quite undesirable that any amendments be moved, even if one was mindful to move amendments. Therefore, the Opposition, having been in Government when the whole of this exercise went ahead, is happy to support the measure. In fact, I note from the comments of the Attorney-General in another place that he readily admitted to the Legislative Council that he was not familiar with this matter, that it was a technical and complicated matter and that he had simply, in effect, put his hopes and trust in his officers and was placing the Bill before Parliament.

**Mr. Keneally:** He might care to read your speech.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** If he reads my speech tonight he will get a very clear understanding of what the whole matter is about.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** If you read his, you'll find he understands very well.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Of course I am sure that his second reading explanation was prepared by the Parliamentary Counsel, and his comments in Committee were somewhat less erudite. However, I do not wish to go into those matters. The Opposition supports the measure, and we hope that it will pass into law quickly. We hope that all the other States will pass similar legislation quickly, and then the whole scheme of application can be brought into effect to clear up, once and for all, this unfortunate hiatus that has developed.

One other aspect which I think is important is that the scheme will ensure that at least in Australian territorial waters the laws of Australia and not the laws of the British Imperial Parliament will apply. I note the interesting comments of the Privy Council in Robinson's case to the effect that one might be somewhat surprised at the

proposition that, when the British House of Commons was dealing with the passage of the British legislation that applies to crimes on ships at sea, they were also legislating for ships travelling between Melbourne and Hobart.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** Was that the Theft Act in 1968?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Yes, it was the British Theft Act of 1968. Of course, the law is a weird and wonderful and strange mistress, and this is just another example of the way it operates in strange ways. As I have said, I hope that the legislation will have a speedy passage into law, and that means a speedy passage in the other seven Parliaments of the nation, so that I hope we can solve this problem once and for all.

**Mr. CRAFTER (Norwood):** I also support this measure. It is a matter of considerable importance to the proper administration of the criminal laws of this State that this situation be clarified and determined once and for all. The matter comes to this House as a result of some conflict among the Legislatures of Australia, the Attorneys, and the courts. This conflict is not in the interests of the community as a whole; certainly, it is not in the interests of the people of this State, and it must be clarified. As the member for Elizabeth has just explained, this is probably the most difficult and least desirable of the various options that were open to the States in clarifying this matter. It is my view that in fact the existing law would have adequately protected the people of this State, although there was sufficient doubt, I think, to warrant that it be clarified once and for all.

I say that, because we have taken legislative action in this State, whereas some of the other States have not. However, it is desirable that we seek uniformity amongst the States, particularly with respect to the criminal law. I think this is one example of the need for uniformity in many areas of Government activity in this country. We find that we have a number of States with diverse laws, and it is confusing, bearing in mind the small population that we have in Australia. It is an undesirable situation, and I am pleased to see that the Government, unlike its counterparts in other States, is prepared to accept a centralist philosophy of the law with respect to the criminal law applying to offshore areas.

I have been involved in the conferences of the Attorneys-General in Australia for seven or eight years and have watched this matter with some interest. It comes to this Parliament not just as a result of discussions that have taken place among the State and Commonwealth Attorneys but also as a result of the international deliberations that have been taking place for a number of years with respect to the law of the sea.

Throughout the world, we are finding that clarifications are being brought about with respect to the laws that apply to the sea. I am somewhat concerned to see that the States are, by means of this mirror or complementary legislation, being given some extra duties, as it were, with respect to the administration of the criminal law. In Committee, I will be interested to take this matter further with respect to the arrangements that have been made between the Commonwealth and the States so that this administration can be carried out equitably and efficiently.

However, this is a matter of importance that applies to the residents of this State who travel off shore as well. I cite the example of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act where some harm is caused to residents of this State in that area which has previously been in some doubt, if not in this State, then in other States, and these are the sorts of things which, given some tragedy or unforeseen circumstances, can have enormous consequence for a large number of residents of this State or for people journeying

to the State, and there must be law to cover these circumstances. I support the measure and the concept of uniformity, particularly with respect to the criminal law in Australia, and hope that this is the forerunner of further joint ventures between the Commonwealth and the States to bring about uniformity in this respect.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Arrangements with Commonwealth."

**Mr. CRAFTER:** Regarding the arrangement that may exist with the Commonwealth with respect to monetary compensation to the State for the administration of this joint venture, namely, the administration of mirror legislation in this regard, I point out that there could be circumstances in which considerable burdens could be placed on the courts, the legal services and the investigative services of the State, that should, in law, be borne by the Federal Government.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** To the best of my knowledge, no formal procedure has been negotiated as yet with the Federal Government, but there is provision to provide for any supplementary regulations or conditions as may be decided on.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 13) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### OFF-SHORE WATERS (APPLICATION OF LAWS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 March. Page 1528.)

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth):** I support the Bill.

**Mr. CRAFTER (Norwood):** I, too, support the Bill. This is, once again, another important measure that comes before the House, and it is probably one of the few opportunities where this Parliament can give the Federal Parliament some directions with respect to its legislative authority. Whilst the State Parliaments have the paramount force of legislative control within this country, they rarely have the opportunity to exercise it, because of the financial restraints imposed on the States.

This is another measure that has come about as a result of consultation between the States and the Commonwealth, particularly the Standing Committee on Attorneys-General. The Bill will clarify this area as well so that there remains no doubt that particularly the Judiciary can be clear of the law in this regard when conflicts arise. I similarly support the passage of this measure.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education):** I move:  
*That this Bill be now read a third time.*

In moving this motion, I acknowledge the spirit of friendly co-operation that has prevailed between Attorneys-General, at both State and Federal levels, and both past and present, in enacting this legislation to remove a number of anomalies from past pieces of legislation covering crimes at sea. The work of the former Attorney-General has already been acknowledged in the other place by the present Attorney-General.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### CONSUMER TRANSACTIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr. SLATER (Gilles):** Early this year the Minister of Tourism made an announcement which was reported in the press under the heading, "New look at our tourism ordered". The report states:

A review of interstate promotion of South Australia as a tourist area has been ordered by the tourism Minister, Mrs. Adamson.

That announcement was supported by persons in the tourist industry, by myself as Opposition spokesman for tourism, and by the Australian Hotels Association. In the A.H.A. journal the *Hotel Gazette of S.A.*, an editorial headed "AHA welcomes tourism 'revamp'" states:

The Association's Chief Executive Officer, Mr. W. F. Connelly, said the A.H.A. would willingly assist the review, independently and through the bodies it was closely associated with or part of.

Little did we all know just how disappointed we were going to be when perhaps only three weeks ago the Minister released a report on the South Australian tourist industry. The report came to this House in a most unexpected or most unusual way. We expected it to be of some significance to the tourist industry in this State. Knowledge of the report did not come to us by way of a Ministerial statement or press announcement, but because of an answer to a question asked by the member for Fisher. One can only say that the reply given to that question (and the report itself) I suppose can be termed a real fizzer. As it turned out, it was just a bit of political gimmickry by the Minister, because in her reply the Minister went to great pains, and great lengths, in denigrating the efforts of the former Government, and suggested that the report was an indictment of that Government for its neglect of tourism over recent years.

The Minister claimed that South Australia was lagging in aspects of promotion expenditure and made comparisons with other States. The report commissioned by the Minister carefully chose a period between 1973-74 and 1978 to make these comparisons. The real facts are that, during the whole period of Labor Administration from 1970 to 1979, expenditure on tourism in South Australia rose by 500 per cent and was, comparably, higher than for any other State except Western Australia. The report itself contains a series of contradictions. Let us look at the introduction to the report. Part of the introduction states:

Many of the recommendations put forward in this report can be seen as short-term measures designed to show a rapid response . . .

I have studied the report closely and it does not make any recommendations. It comes to what I would call a few vague conclusions. The first conclusion states:

Clearly, tourism is already of major significance to the State's economy. On a longer-term basis, with increasing real incomes and increasing living standards, the demand for and the ability to participate in travel will expand and the potential for further growth within the tourist industry in South Australia is quite evident.

That is not much of a recommendation. Let us look at some of the other conclusions in this report. The next states:

Since 1973-74 South Australia has experienced a significant decline in its share of national tourist activity, a decline that



has been evident in each of the intrastate, interstate and international areas of overall tourist activity.

I would not call that a recommendation. Again, it is a pretty vague sort of conclusion. The last conclusion states:

South Australia has witnessed a marked deterioration in its capacity to implement strong advertising and promotional strategies in the tourism market since 1973-74 in view of its small expenditure base compared to other States.

There is not a recommendation in the report. I might also mention that the figures in this report are mainly lifted from various sorts of surveys. The report itself classifies them, in many instances, as public surveys. It is apparent that the report is a disappointing document to the people involved in the tourist industry in this State. It does little or nothing of constructive value to lift the tourist industry in South Australia. In comparing South Australia with other States, it must always be remembered how disadvantaged we are in many respects regarding tourism.

One aspect of concern is air travel. Adelaide is the only mainland capital city without an airport facility of international standard, and 82 per cent of tourists arrive at or depart from the Eastern States. The additional cost of travel to South Australia from Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane makes us seriously disadvantaged regarding international tourists. If we are to get our share of tourists, one of the first concerns is a number of aspects of the aircraft industry including revision of domestic air schedules (an important aspect), air fares and, of course, an international airport.

I ask what the Minister is doing about this. What constructive ideas has she suggested in her term as Minister of Tourism? Little or nothing! Instead, she commissioned a report that takes the opportunity only to carp about the declining tourism in South Australia. It makes no constructive suggestions or comments whatever about this important matter. Regarding an international airport, I noted a press report of 12 February 1980 titled "Inquiry into airport in South Australia." This press report indicates that the Minister for Transport, Mr. Hunt, agreed to a preliminary inquiry into the feasibility of an international airport north of Adelaide. However, a few weeks later, another report indicated that the Premier of South Australia was disappointed with Mr. Hunt because he knocked back approaches that had been made by the Premier. It would appear that the Federal Minister has not taken seriously the Premier's approach.

I agree with the Premier's approach for an international airport, and I am doing something that I think is constructive to promote this aspect of tourism: a petition has been circulating for the past few weeks and already 2 000 to 3 000 signatures have been collected, because South Australians are deserving of, and they expect, a fair go when it comes to travel.

**Mr. Becker:** Where do you want the international airport?

**Mr. SLATER:** I suggest in the petition, which I am sure you will sign, the northern Adelaide Plains, Virginia and Two Wells area.

**Mr. Becker:** That's old news.

**Mr. SLATER:** It is not. You are one of the biggest knockers regarding Adelaide Airport. You do not want an international airport there and neither do I. I ask you to sign the petition, because we agree for once, and perhaps the Minister of Tourism might sign it. If we are to improve the situation in South Australia, what we need for interstate tourists is not a survey in South Australia. There must be an interstate survey to find out why people do not come to South Australia and what can be done to improve conditions so that people will come here. This will assist the tourist industry in this State. The Minister should be

more constructive. The report is destructive to the South Australian industry.

**Mr. ASHENDEN (Todd):** I refer to the world car concept. Recently, some members of the Opposition have raised this matter but have unfortunately not been particularly accurate in their statements, and although it would appear that the member for Salisbury has done some research, he has based his arguments, expressed both in this House and in the press, on false premises. For example, the substantive part of his speech begins with the assertion that we have in Australia a market of 400 000 vehicles per year and that this is the minimum economic scale for vehicle manufacture. That is supposed to be a minimum figure for two assembly plants, one manufacturing plant, and several component manufacturers.

As a general statement, whilst it may be true that 400 000 is the appropriate figure, it is very dangerous to assume that the same minimum economic scale figure applies to all aspects of vehicle manufacture, or that what was historically so will be the same in the future. Consider, for example, the manufacture of engines: the pace of engine development is such that an engine design may now only have a life of five to seven years (in the interests of fuel economy), whereas in the past it would have been 10 to 15 years. Therefore, all other things being equal, the minimum economic scale has probably doubled in recent years from about 150 000 to 300 000 engines per year for very sophisticated designs, or 75 000 to 150 000 for others.

Therefore, the drawing of economies of scale arguments from the historical experience of other loosely comparable countries is no longer a very valid argument for the Australian situation. I would also like to point out that the member for Salisbury's market figure of 400 000 vehicles is in error as the Australian market is about 575 000 per year.

The next area in which the honourable member is misleading is in the potential for exports, and the example of Volvo is used. Volvo produce upper middle price range cars for a world market, but it needs to be remembered that its major markets are Europe and the U.S. In both cases, Volvo is able to supply through a very efficient shipping system that we do not have. Just because we are close to a potential Asian market does not mean that we can supply to those markets. Australia does not have a mortgage on economic chauvinism, and the Asian countries operate their own assembly industries under plans to protect their own employment. This, as much as price, has been a factor in our loss of these countries as export markets. The manufacture in these countries is dominated by the same type of company that operates in Australia. We surely cannot assume that an independent Australian industry would be able to supply components to these markets, as that would require international manufacturers to buy from an Australian source at the expense of one of their own company-owned sources.

Claims that we can manufacture for world markets ignore the economic protection measures of potential export markets and the high cost of transport from Australia. Also, the statements on bus design are irrelevant to the argument on motor vehicles, because any expertise that we had was in body building, not in the manufacture of engines, suspensions and transmissions. What we were supposedly good at was the low volume batch operations that can be easily duplicated in almost any country with the advantage that each country is able to develop designs to fill particular local needs. These skills are largely irrelevant to the volume production of passenger cars.

The member for Salisbury then cited the involvement of

foreign Governments in their vehicle industries but ignored the motivation of that involvement. In most of the examples that he cites, he does not acknowledge that Governments became involved because of economic and political difficulties rather than because it was a rational way of facilitating the development of the industry. Government rescue operations are primarily concerned with political considerations and are largely at the expense of economic efficiency or the long-term future of the industry. The British Government's activities can hardly serve as a model for restructuring.

The honourable member then speaks of rationalisation and the need for Government to facilitate this. To quote the example of Brazil, where the arrangements were established under a military dictatorship, is in itself a source of some amusement. As presented, the example is also incorrect for, whilst the companies cited share production facilities, this does not mean that it results in a sharing of design costs, as in fact each company sources its design input from overseas; and, secondly, it does not lead to economies of scale in assembly unless there are very low wages so that labour costs are less important.

In Brazil there is a 100 per cent local content plan and a system of market controls on purchasers that would be totally unacceptable in any truly democratic country. The member for Salisbury also cited General Motors in the U.S. as a company that produced many different models with common parts. So does the Australian industry, with companies like Borg Warner supplying the same basic transmission for use in different manufacturers' cars.

I also believe that the honourable member indicates little understanding of the basic principles of tariff policy and conventions such as GATT. If Australia followed the general theme suggested, it would suffer massive retaliation in other areas of trade that would negate any increased employment in the motor vehicle industry.

Having dealt with the specific issues raised in the honourable member's speech, I would like now to make some general comments. First, in accepting that the Australian market of about 575 000 vehicles is only sufficient to justify either one or two manufacturers, it does not follow, on economic grounds, that Australia should reduce the number of manufacturers to one or two. Such a policy would reduce the employment opportunities in the industry and would significantly disadvantage South Australia as a manufacturing centre. Whilst it is true that we have some disadvantages if we attempt to manufacture the total content of a motor vehicle, this is not true of all components that make up a vehicle. The economics of manufacture are determined by economies of scale and the cost of input factors relative to overseas. I wonder whether honourable members realise that the United States' auto manufacturers will spend an estimated \$60 billion in the next 10 years on new technology. Are we to reject that technology and try to go ahead on our own extremely limited resources?

In many product areas, components can be manufactured in Australia at competitive prices, even with the limited Australian volumes, due to the nature of the component, or the factors of production that are required to make that component. The solution to the Australian industry's problems, therefore, is not to attempt to make all the components that are required to build a car, but rather to specialise in those things that we can do well.

If we make those things that we can competitively, and export some of these to other markets, whilst at the same time importing those things that we cannot produce efficiently, the total level of activity in Australia will be maintained and cars will be priced at a realistic level that consumers can afford.

Secondly, the concept of a totally Australian car industry is economically unrealistic and it is based upon a number of myths about the Australian industry. The first Holden car is often cited as the first truly Australian car. Whilst this car was solely for the Australian market, it was not Australian designed. This car was developed for the Australian market through design expertise from the United States parent and the same proposition is true of most other vehicles that have been manufactured in Australia. In fact, there have only been three cars solely designed in Australia for the Australian market—the Chrysler Charger, the current Ford "Blackwood" models, and the Leyland P76.

Thirdly, Australia has always been part of the world car industry, as many of the development activities have always had to be shared over different models in different markets. This sharing of development costs has assumed greater significance with the need to develop new fuel efficient technologies. Many of these developments would be denied to an Australian industry if we do not participate in the world car, or they would have to be adopted at a considerable cost penalty, and this would result in an increase in the real cost of Australian cars with a consequential loss of sales and employment.

The Australian consumer has clearly demonstrated that he wants to be able to choose between a wide range of makes and models. Any scheme that restricts this diversity (and that is a natural consequence of the member for Salisbury's theme) will deny consumers the right of free choice, and it will result in a loss of jobs. He may be happy to drive around in the obsolete designs of the Korean Hyundai or Turkish Anadol but most Australians would not.

The rationalisation of the car industry into fewer manufacturers must lead to fewer jobs, particularly in South Australia. This will not be alleviated by export markets, as the world-wide structure of the industry will not give the Australian industry any great opportunity to export built-up vehicles. The world car concept will, on the other hand, allow us to have the same choice as consumers, whilst at the same time allowing us to have an efficient industry because we will be exporting those things that we can do well.

The current problems of the car industry are just another example of the fact that Australia is part of a world economy, and we cannot afford to live in isolation. With the world car concept, Australia will be able to play its part in the world economy, if our industry makes the investment decisions required to exploit our areas of comparative advantage. That is the purpose of the assistance measures adopted by the South Australian Government.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin):** Having made certain commitments to people in relation to what I want to talk about tonight, I shall not comment on the speech we have just heard; I shall leave the member for Todd to my colleague the member for Salisbury. I suggest that after the member for Salisbury has finished with him, whoever prepared that brief may have some questions to answer to the member for Todd. I want to begin by posing a little puzzle to members, along the following lines. Let us suppose that somewhere or other in this country was a Labor Government which, for reasons of its own, wanted to spend a considerable sum of money in a town in a dead safe Liberal electorate. Because of what I have just said, there would be not politics in that decision because the electorate was nice and safe for the Liberal Party, and the decision obviously would have been made on other grounds, whatever they may be.

Let us suppose that that Labor Government loses office and there comes to power a Liberal Government, the members of whom this electorate has voted for for many years, and further, that their local member is a member of that Liberal Cabinet. Would you not imagine that that train of events would strengthen the chances of that money being spent in that electorate at that particular point? What would be the reaction of this Chamber if in fact what happened was that once the Liberal Government came to power, with the local member a member of that Cabinet, the local people were told, "Sorry, the deal is off"? Would you not regard this as being somewhat Quixotic? In fact it has happened and it forms the subject of my comments this evening.

The Labor Government had committed itself to a programme of development at Victor Harbor that was a modification of what had originally been called the South Coast notional educational development plan. It was a plan that had originally been drawn up by the South Australian Council for Educational Planning and Research, and it was commissioned by my predecessor in the Labor Government as Minister of Education (Hon. Hugh Hudson). I came in as Minister about the time when this report was hitting people's desks, and I subjected it to some fairly close scrutiny. I did not accept the report in its entirety. It was scaled down somewhat in certain particulars.

What the report was all about was building or rebuilding, on the common site of the Victor Harbor High School and of the corporation buildings, a joint community education development; if you like, a very mini Parks. This had the support of the corporation and of the people in the town, and it certainly had the support of the Labor Government. As I indicated, we did not endorse all of the proposals. One of the proposals was that there should be convention facilities as part of this total complex. We rejected that. We believed that the South Coast is already well endowed with convention facilities.

I do not suggest there were not problems, either. One of the things which was part of the scheme (although the scheme could have gone on without it less effectively) was that a proportion of the Inman Valley road should be closed so that there should be a continuity of buildings from the corporation, across through the high school, to the oval, with the traffic being diverted another way into the Inman Valley. That matter had not been completely resolved. The Government had shown its commitment to the project, first, by announcing that some work would begin in 1981, and, secondly, by paying, in effect, half of the salary of a person who worked for the council and whose job it was to generate enthusiasm for the project, thus getting the community working towards the project's fruition. What really happened was that the Department of Further Education and the Education Department each provided for one-third of the salary, but of course the corporation, as the employer, had to provide certain other costs as well as its one-third of salary; so it was about half and half.

Thirdly, I had appointed to the committee, which was developing this whole scheme (I will talk a little more about this later), two very high level officers of the Education Department and the Department of Further Education, Dr. Mayfield and Mr. Kent. These people had not been fobbed off with middle level public servants; they had been given people very close to the top. Although there had not actually been any work done in the sense of bricks and mortar, these people had a commencement date, they had a committee, they had a person who was part-funded by the Government, they had high level public servants on that committee, and they were already

working towards it themselves. For example, a community library was part of the whole scheme. The corporation is to obtain a mobile library shortly. On 8 January 1980, the Mayor of the District Council of Victor Harbor received a letter along these lines (I do not have time to quote all of it):

The Government has reviewed the position and after careful consideration has decided not to proceed with the community complex as originally proposed in the plan. A number of factors, including argument as to the need to close the Inman Valley Road, questions concerning transfer of certain properties and cost implications were considered in arriving at the decision.

The Government has also decided, as a consequence, that—

- (a) The Interim Management Committee should be disbanded.
- (b) The necessary future redevelopment of the Victor Harbor High School is to proceed on the basis of progressive upgrading of facilities on the existing site in accordance with regional priorities; and
- (c) The Government will not continue to subsidise the salary paid to the Community Liaison Officer, Mr. D. M. Rogers, after the conclusion of the current financial year.

I would be pleased if you would convey this decision to your council and to the interim committee, and at the same time inform those concerned of the Government's appreciation of the work carried out by council, the committee members and Mr. Rogers.

Yours sincerely,  
(W. A. Rodda),

Acting Minister of Education

The Interim Development Committee mentioned is the committee to which I referred earlier. That letter was more than simply saying that the Government would not proceed with the community complex as originally proposed in the plan, because point (b) makes clear that nothing will happen except what might have happened anyway, if there had been no plan. In fact, what is to happen is that the high school will get its gutter painted when the regional director thinks he can work it on to the minor works programme.

The people down there were very upset about this matter; they came to see the Minister in a deputation (I saw them in the gallery), and they were told by the Minister—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will not refer to the gallery.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Certainly, Sir. I believe they were in the precincts of the building, and they were told that the matter would be reconsidered. Last week, the high school was contacted and told to set up a meeting of the school council so that the Regional Director could come down and explain to the school why the scheme could not proceed. These people have come to the Minister for a reply but, as far as I can see, he has not been game to give them one. He has fobbed them off with, "Yes, we will reconsider it." Then, finally, they do not get a reply from the Minister at all: the poor old Regional Director is going to have to carry the can. He will have to go to Victor Harbor and face these people and say, "Sorry, folks, but we have been given orders from up top that the project cannot proceed."

That is just not good enough. Common courtesies have not been observed in this matter. More than that, the Government is passing up an opportunity to implement a good plan that would be cost effective. The Victor Harbor corporation is prepared to put money in the Minister's

pocket if he is prepared to go along with some semblance of the original scheme. How much do you think they are prepared to do in the light of what they have been told and the way in which they have been treated? It is a sham, and it is a shame. There are no politics in this matter; the Liberal Party will not lose the seat of Alexandra just because it has not built some facilities at Victor Harbor, or anything like that. But it has left some people hurt, badly

bruised, and badly out on a limb. I think that in all decency the Government should reconsider its disgraceful decision in this matter.

Motion carried.

At 9.38 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 26 March at 2 p.m.

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 25 March 1980

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

## PAY-ROLL TAX

285. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier: Has consideration been given to allowing concessions on pay-roll tax to employers of handicapped persons and, if so, what decision has been reached and what are the reasons for it and, if not, will the Government consider the matter and when?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The Government has considered exempting employers from payment of pay-roll tax on the wages of handicapped persons whom they employ, but has concluded that it would not be an effective means of obtaining equal opportunity in employment for handicapped persons. Such a scheme would be difficult to administer and would not ensure that handicapped persons gained employment. The high cost of such a scheme would not achieve comparable benefits to the handicapped. The Government is well aware of the problems faced by the handicapped and proposes introducing legislation later this year to protect their rights and to provide machinery for investigating complaints about discrimination generally, including discrimination in employment.

## GOVERNMENT NURSERIES

518. **Mr. ASHENDEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Are heads of Government departments presently instructed, or have they ever been instructed, to purchase plants for use within their departments, from Government nurseries?

2. Have heads of Government departments ever issued instructions to public servants either verbally or in writing, within their departments, to purchase plants from Government nurseries?

3. Has the Highways Department ever been requested, either in writing or verbally, to purchase roadside plants from Government nurseries without the calling of public tenders and, if so, why?

4. Has the Engineering and Water Supply Department ever been requested, either in writing or verbally, to purchase plants from Government nurseries without the calling of public tenders and, if so, why?

5. What has been the total cost of all forms of advertising used in promoting Government nurseries in each of the months from January to October 1979?

6. Are private landscapers who are successful tenderers to carry out Government work presently instructed to purchase their plants from Government nurseries or have they ever been required to do so and, if so, why?

7. What are the unit costs charged for plants sold by Government nurseries to Government departments, private enterprise and to the general public, respectively?

8. Are plants grown for use in Monarto now being offered for sale to the general public?

9. Are plants grown for use in Monarto now being sold in any part of South Australia from trucks on roadsides or in various other situations in country towns?

10. When Government departments are required to purchase plants, what is the Government's policy in relation to determining from whom such plants will be obtained.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. No. The Supply and Tender Board has, however, awarded a contract to the Woods and Forests Department to issue plants to Government departments on request. Any trees or shrubs required, not shown on the Woods and Forests Department's price list, can be purchased from any other supplier as a "private purchase" transaction and would normally be obtained by quotation.

3. The Highways Department purchases its requirements through the Woods and Forests Department.

4. There has been no written or verbal request for the Engineering and Water Supply Department to purchase plants from Government nurseries without the calling of public tenders (See also 1. and 2. above).

5. Cost of advertising used in promoting Government nurseries.

1979		\$
January . . . . .	Woods and Forests	1 519
February . . . . .	Woods and Forests	3 269
March . . . . .	Woods and Forests	1 339
April . . . . .	} Woods and Forests (combined)	6 205
May . . . . .		
June . . . . .	} (combined)	3 244
July . . . . .		
August . . . . .	Woods and Forests	3 422
	Dept. of Environment	777
		<hr/>
		4 199
September . . . . .	Woods and Forests	1 694
October . . . . .	Woods and Forests	2 607

6. The Woods and Forests Department has never issued such instructions.

7. Unit costs charged for plants sold by:

(1) Woods and Forests Department—published annually in the *Catalogue of Nursery Stock*.

(2) Department for Environment—General Public

	\$
Common seed line (tube) . . . . .	.60
Common cutting line (container) . . . . .	.80
Rare seed line (tube and container) . . . . .	1.00
Rare cutting line (containers) . . . . .	1.50

State Government departments, local government bodies, landscapers and kindred institutions are offered the following discounts.

Purchase of between one and 49 plants—no discount.

Purchase of between 50 and 99 plants—5c per tube discount.

Purchase of over 100 plants—10c per tube discount.

8. and 9. No plants from Government nurseries, grown for use in Monarto, are being sold in this manner.

10. The Supply and Tender Board requires departments to place purchases according to the board's contract book, as with all other materials.

## MILTABURRA AREA SCHOOL

522. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What type of school buildings will be erected in Miltaburra and what is the time factor involved?

2. Will consideration be given to making sure the buildings erected will be suitable for the climatic conditions?

3. What other facets will be provided at the school, e.g., a community library?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. In a letter of 20 November 1979, Mr. Gunn was

advised that the buildings would probably be of solid construction and that it was planned to commence construction in mid-1981 with availability at the beginning of 1983 subject, of course, to the maintenance of funding at present levels. There has been no change in this planning.

2. Yes. While it is current policy to air-condition new schools, there is Government policy to provide as far as possible for natural ventilation to ensure economy of operation and conservation of resources. The honourable member can be assured that every effort will be made to ensure that comfortable working conditions will exist in Miltaburra Area School.

3. A planning committee has been convened to develop the brief for the new school. It is not possible at this stage to be definitive about the facilities but the committee will seriously consider, on the basis of need, available funds and assured contributions, all submissions for facilities which are not standard.

**PARKS COMMUNITY CENTRE**

523. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. When was the Parks Community Centre opened?  
 2. Since that date has any damage been caused to it by vandalism and, if so:—

- (a) what damage has been caused and when;
- (b) what is the estimated cost of repairing the damage in each instance;
- (c) has the damage been repaired and, if not, why not; and
- (d) what action, if any, has been taken to prevent damage by vandals at the centre?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Various sections of the Parks Community Centre have been opened between July 1978 and December 1979 with some sections still yet to be opened.

2. (a) Some furniture frames have been broken, seat covers slashed, laminex peeled off, 15 toilet seats broken, several doors broken off their hinges, some windows and light fittings broken, and an exhaust fan removed. One illuminated sign was broken with some damage to the block-work housing it. Some break-ins have occurred. It is not known when all instances of vandalism have occurred.

(b) The cost of vandalism is impossible to itemise but overall would total about \$5 000 for materials.

(c) Part of the damage has been repaired, some is in process of being repaired, with the remainder to be completed on the appointment of maintenance staff.

(d) Extra police patrols have been provided and internal security controls are carried out. Any case of forced entry is attended to immediately and damage repaired. Electronic surveillance is also provided. Security lighting has been improved.

**HIGHWAYS INSPECTORS**

524. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What were the reasons for sending large numbers of Highways Department inspectors to Ceduna at the beginning of harvest in November 1979?

2. Who authorised these officers to go to the Ceduna area?

3. Why were they advising graingrowers that they were only allowed a 20 per cent overloading tolerance on their

vehicles when on 23 October 1979 the Minister made a press statement informing the public that the 40 per cent overloading tolerance would be operating for this harvest?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. No large number of Highways Department inspectors was sent to Ceduna at the beginning of the harvest in November 1979. One inspector only with an assistant were in the area and they are permanently stationed at Ceduna.

3. Following my direction on 23 October 1979, the Road Traffic Board at its next meeting on 5 November 1979 issued instructions not to enforce the current law until such time as the policy was legally altered (*Government Gazette* of 29 November 1979). No growers were prosecuted if their vehicles were found to be carrying up to 40 per cent over their vehicles' gross vehicle mass or gross combination mass since 23 October 1979 for the 1979-80 harvest.

**M.V. TROUBRIDGE**

525. **Mr. WHITTEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What is the estimated time that the *Troubridge* will now be able to be used on the Kingscote-Port Lincoln-Port Adelaide service?

2. What was the cost of the recent work on the *Troubridge* to enable its useful life to be extended?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

- 1. Ten years.
- 2. \$800 000.

**APPRENTICES**

526. **Mr. WHITTEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. How many new apprentices have been employed in South Australia for each of the years 1978 to 1980?

2. How many new apprentices were employed in the metal trades in each of those years?

3. How many new apprentices were employed in each classification in the metal trades for each of those years?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The replies are as follows:

- 1. 1978 2 983
- 1979 2 432
- Figures for 1980 are not yet available.
- 2. 1978 1 302
- 1979 1 150
- Figures for 1980 are not yet available.
- 3. 1978—See table hereunder.
- 1979 } These figures are not yet available.
- 1980 }

**RETURN SHOWING 1978 APPRENTICE INTAKE IN TRADES**

Trade	Total
<b>METAL TRADES</b>	
Blacksmithing trades	
Blacksmithing .....	1
Moulding and/or coremaking trades	
Moulding and/or coremaking .....	13
Steel construction trades	
Boilermaking and/or structural steel working .....	161
(includes welding 1st class if combined apprenticeship)	
Welding 1st Class .....	10

RETURN SHOWING 1978 APPRENTICE INTAKE IN  
TRADES—*continued*

Trade	Total
Sheetmetal trades	
Sheetmetal working 1st class (includes tin smithing)	76
Metal spinning or polishing	1
Fitting and machining trades	
Fitting-turning-machining, inc. toolmaking	478
Patternmaking	10
Electroplating Trades	
Electroplating 1st class	7
Mechanics and repairing (except electrical and precision instrument repairing)	
Motor mechanics	398
Motor cycle mechanics	5
Aircraft mechanics (airframe)	1
Aircraft Mechanics (engine)	4
Refrigeration mechanics and servicerment	34
Mechanics and repairing other	4
Precision instrument making and repairing	
Watch and clock making and/or repairing	4
Optical mechanics	8
Metal Trades n.l.a.	
Metal trades not listed above (e.g. safe and strong-arm making, locksmithing, gunsmithing, gas-meter making, scale making, window frame fitting saw making and sharpening, etc.)	9
Total	1 224

## SUBURBAN RAIL CARS

529. **Mr. WHITTEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What arrangements, if any, have been made to lease State Transport Authority suburban rail cars to the Victorian Railways, and if arrangements have been made—

- (a) how many are to be leased;
- (b) what is the period of the lease; and
- (c) how much will be paid for their use?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** Although Victorian Railways has had discussions with the State Transport Authority, no arrangements have been made to lease suburban rail cars to them.

## BUDGETS DISCUSSION COMMITTEE

530. **Mr. WHITTEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: When was the School-based Funding Review Committee established, what is the purpose of the committee and who are its members?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** It is assumed that the honourable member is referring to the School Managed Budgets Discussion Committee. The committee was established by the previous Minister, pursuant to section 10 of the Education Act. The purpose of the committee is to investigate and monitor proposals for additions and/or amendments relating to school-based funding arrangements. The committee consists of representatives from the following organisations: South Australian Institute of Teachers, South Australian Association of State School Organisations Inc., Education Department of South Australia, and High School Councils Association of South Australia.

## TICKET COLLECTORS

531. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is it the intention of the S.T.A. Rail Division to cease using ticket collectors on suburban rail services at weekends and, if so, why?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** No. Ticket collectors are provided where necessary on suburban rail services at weekends.

## ROLLINGSTOCK

532. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What are the delivery dates for each of the S.T.A.'s 12 2000 class rail cars and 18 2100 class trailers?

2. What is the anticipated cost of a rail car and a trailer, respectively?

3. What are the reasons for any delays in the delivery of the 2000 class rail cars and what additional cost was incurred as a result of such delays?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. One 2000 class power rail car and two 2100 class trailer rail cars were delivered on 31 January 1980. The delivery of the remainder will be spread over the next 12 months.

2. Power car—\$1 075 000, trailer car—\$480 000. These figures include cost escalation estimates up to the expected final delivery date.

3. Delays incurred by the contractor included: a fire in a subcontractor's stainless steel mill; defective electrical cables supplied by a subcontractor; faulty bogie bolster and frame castings supplied by a subcontractor; and industrial disputes. The additional cost resulting from these delays has not yet been determined.

## S.T.A. TICKETING

533. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Does the S.T.A. intend to alter the present ticketing system for the Bus or Rail Divisions and, if so, when?

2. What investigations have been carried out by the State Transport Authority with respect to the pre-selling of tickets at other than the current ticket sales outlets for the Bus and Rail Divisions?

3. Does the S.T.A. plan to introduce such a system and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Not at present.

2. State Transport Authority officers have considered a number of schemes for 'off-vehicle' ticket sales but none is currently being pursued. The authority's officers are aware of the work being done in this area by manufacturers of ticket-cancelling equipment and are in touch with them.

3. There are no plans at present but the situation will be kept under review.

## TRAIN GUARDS

534. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Does the S.T.A. plan to run any metropolitan rail car express services without a guard and, if so, from what date and what specific services will be affected?

2. Is it the intention of the Rail Division to appoint 15 new guards to operate suburban services and if so, when will these positions be advertised through the *Weekly Notice*?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. There are no current plans for metropolitan rail car express services to be operated without a guard.
2. No. The services of railway guards engaged on the State Transport Authority's metropolitan railway passenger services are made available to the authority by the Australian National Railways Commission. The commission advertised in its Staff Notice 24 dated 29 November, 1979 for 10 guards for metropolitan services and in Notice No. 25 dated 13 December, 1979 for an additional guard. In *Staff Notice* No. 4 dated 21 February 1980 the commission announced the appointment of 11 persons to these positions.

#### BUS TICKETS

535. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

Has the S.T.A. considered introduction of automatic fare collections in the Bus Division and if so—

- (a) when will such a system be introduced;
- (b) at what metropolitan localities would such a system be installed; and
- (c) what is the anticipated cost of such a system?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The State Transport Authority conducted trials several years ago with a kerbside ticket issue and change-dispensing machine. As a result of these trials it was decided not to proceed with this method of ticket sale.

#### ADELAIDE RAILWAY STATION

538. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What is the name of the firm of architects involved in providing final estimates for the reconstruction of the northern half of the Adelaide Railway Station building and what is the agreed fee for the estimates?

2. Will the Minister supply the plans and estimate figures for the upgrading of the building?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. A consortium of consultants, led by Lucas Parker and Lake, was appointed to prepare design development options, detailed plans and an accurate estimate of the cost of redeveloping the northern half of the Adelaide Railway Station building as the headquarters of the State Transport Authority. The cost of this work was \$260 500.

2. The consultants' estimate of the cost of the redevelopment was \$8 120 000. No decision has been taken to proceed with the work and the authority is currently investigating possible alternatives at a lower cost.

#### S.T.A. RAILCAR DEPOT

539. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. When will the modifications to the fibreglass area ventilation at Regency Park workshops be completed, what is the cost of such modifications and what are the names of the firms carrying them out?

2. What are the projects to be carried out during the rebuilding of the S.T.A. Railcar Depot and what is the anticipated cost, commencement date, completion date and name of the firm involved for each project?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The work was completed by McNiece Mechanical

Services Pty. Ltd. in December 1979 at a cost of \$268.

2. An investigation is being conducted into the servicing facilities carried out by the railcar depot. A decision with regard to rebuilding will be made after completion of the investigation.

#### ROLLINGSTOCK

540. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

Is it a fact that the S.T.A. new rollingstock programme entails the expenditure of \$30 000 000 and if so—

- (a) for what period will this expenditure provide;
- (b) what specific rollingstock will be purchased;
- (c) what firms have been granted a contract for the building of this rollingstock; and
- (d) when will this expenditure be commenced and completed?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** Thirty new railcars comprising 12 power cars and 18 trailer cars are being constructed by Comeng Aresco Pty. Ltd., of Dry Creek, at a cost of about \$22 000 000. The expenditure on this contract commenced in September 1978 and is expected to be completed by April 1981.

#### RAILCARS

541. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What specific refurbishing will take place on the "300" and "400" class rail cars under the S.T.A.'s planned expenditure of \$7 000 000?

2. When will this project be commenced and when will it be completed?

3. Will this project be undertaken by private or Government workshops, and, if private, what are the names of the firms involved?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Improved lighting. New floor covering and interior panelling. Recladding of exterior where necessary and repainting.

2. One railcar will be upgraded to enable a full assessment of the refurbishing required to be made. Work on this car is expected to commence by June 1980 and to be completed within three months. A further review of the programme will then be made.

3. Should the programme be approved, public tenders will be called.

#### ALBERT PARK TRANSPORT

542. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Has the S.T.A. any proposals to provide a co-ordinated bus and rail service from the Albert Park Railway Station to the West Lakes area to cater for—

- (a) regular commuters in this area;
- (b) patrons attending football matches at Football Park; and
- (c) people attending any other sporting or musical fixtures at Football Park or at the lake,

and, if not, how does the S.T.A. plan to cater for these needs?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The authority has no proposals at this stage to provide a co-ordinated bus and rail service from the Albert Park railway station to the West Lakes area. Regular commuters in the West Lakes



area have access to bus services on a similar basis as applies generally throughout the metropolitan area, except that evening services are not available. Special services are provided by the authority for major sporting and entertaining activities held at Football Park, where it is considered that the patronage warrants the provision of such services.

#### RAILCARS

543. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is the Minister aware that the capacity of suburban rail cars operated by the S.T.A. is insufficient to cater for the use of commuters during peak periods and if so, will he still permit the leasing of rail cars to the Victorian Railways should they still require them?

2. If the rail cars are not required by the Victorian Railways, what are the reasons?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The State Transport Authority has sufficient railcars to cater for traffic requirements during peak periods. Loading standards that represent a compromise between passenger comfort and economy of operation provide for a proportion of standing passengers on some trains during peak periods. On completion of the delivery of 30 new railcars on order, the authority will have a number of spare railcars which could be leased to the Victorian Railways, should they still require them.

2. The honourable member should direct this question to the Victorian Railways.

#### FREE TRAVEL

544. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is the Minister aware that S.T.A. has now granted free travel on all modes of public transport within the metropolitan area for all S.T.A. employees but has excluded those A.N.R.C. employees who are "made available" to the S.T.A. and who are fully occupied in S.T.A. duties and, if so, does the Minister support the decision?

2. Will the Minister direct the S.T.A. to provide the same privileges to the aforementioned employees and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. No. State Transport Authority and Australian National Railways Commission employees work under distinctly different conditions of employment. Each organisation is responsible for the conditions which apply to its own employees. Free travel on all State Transport Authority public service vehicles has recently been extended to all the Authority's employees and is consequently a condition of employment enjoyed by them. The Commission's employees, on the other hand, enjoy a number of conditions of employment, including certain travel concessions, which do not apply to employees of the Authority. There is no justification for current State Transport Authority privileges to be extended to "made available" personnel.

#### S.T.A. UNIFORMS

545. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Will the Minister advise whether it is the intention of S.T.A. to provide consistency of uniforms for all S.T.A. employees and also for those staff "made available" to S.T.A. from A.N.R.C. and, if not, why not?

2. If consistency of uniforms is intended to include both S.T.A. employees and those staff "made available" from A.N.R.C., is this the first step towards a complete separation from A.N.R.C. in the staff area?

3. What is the Government's policy with regard to consistency of privileges such as free travel to and from work for S.T.A. and the A.N.R.C. staff?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. It is considered desirable that all personnel engaged in operating the Authority's bus, rail and tram services in metropolitan Adelaide wear the same State Transport Authority uniform whether they are directly employed or "made available" personnel. This is not regarded as a step towards complete separation from the Australian National Railways Commission in the staff area.

3. State Transport Authority and Australian National Railways Commission employees work under distinctly different conditions of employment. Each organisation is responsible for the conditions which apply to its own employees. Free travel on all State Transport Authority public service vehicles has recently been extended to all State Transport Authority employees and is consequently a condition of employment enjoyed by them. The Commission's employees, on the other hand, enjoy a number of conditions of employment, including certain travel concessions, which do not apply to the Authority's employees.

#### RAILWAY SIGNALMEN

546. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is the Minister aware that, as a result of a recent dispute between signalmen, who are members of the Australian Railways Union, regarding the manning of centralised traffic control operations, the S.T.A. threatened to close all weekend metropolitan rail services and, if so, did the Minister support the proposed action and, if so, for what reasons?

2. What action will the Minister take to prevent S.T.A. making future threats of this nature?

3. Will the Minister give the travelling public an undertaking that weekend metropolitan rail services will not be discontinued?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Due to recent temporary staff shortages railway signalmen have been working an unusually large number of shifts per fortnight, for which they are paid overtime rates. The Signalmen's Union recently threatened to refuse to work more than the normal number of shifts. In these circumstances, they were advised by the State Transport Authority that it would be necessary to reduce train services as a consequence and that reduction in weekend services, being the least patronised, would be the most appropriate.

2. Threats were not made to the signalmen, they were merely advised of the practical consequences of their refusing to work as rostered.

3. There is no plan to discontinue weekend metropolitan rail services. Their operation is, however, dependent on sufficient staff being available.

## RAILWAY STATIONS

547. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What does S.T.A.'s planned expenditure of \$2 500 000 for the refurbishing of suburban railway stations entail and when is it anticipated that this refurbishing will be commenced and completed?

2. Will this work be carried out by Government or private enterprise and in the latter case, what are the names of the firms involved?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The State Transport Authority has included a preliminary estimate of \$2 500 000 in its major works estimates for the years 1979-80 to 1983-84 for refurbishing metropolitan railway stations. As yet, there is no approved programme, but to enable the work to be assessed it is planned to upgrade one station as a pilot project. The scope of upgrading will vary, but generally the work will include: new passenger shelter facilities; new platform seating; improved platform lighting; improved station identification and other signs; resurfacing of platforms; improved car parking areas; landscaping; storing of bicycles.

2. Should the refurbishing programme proceed, it is intended that tenders will be invited with some work being carried out by the Authority's resources.

## RAIL COMMUNICATIONS UPGRADING

548. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What does S.T.A.'s planned expenditure of \$28 400 000 for the modernisation of signalling and communications involve? When is it anticipated that this project will be commenced and completed, what type of modernisation will take place and what firms and Government departments will carry out this project?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The State Transport Authority has under consideration a proposal to resignal and upgrade the communications system for the metropolitan rail system. For planning purposes a preliminary estimate of \$28 400 000 for this work was included in the Authority's five year major works programme. Proposals have been received from consultants to investigate and recommend the extent of upgrading required, the type of equipment to be used and the sequence in which this work should be undertaken. However, I repeat that the proposal is still under consideration.

## ADELAIDE RAILWAY STATION

549. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What does S.T.A.'s planned expenditure of \$2 250 000 for the redevelopment of public areas on the Adelaide Railway Station involve, when is it anticipated that this project will be commenced and completed and what firms and Government departments will carry out this development?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The programme includes rebuilding the public toilets to modern standards, improving the appearance of the station concourse, replacing existing signs with improved standard signs and other repairs and renovations to facilities within the building complex. A report recommending in broad terms the redevelopment considered necessary, has been prepared by a consortium led by a firm of architects. However, the Authority has not yet given approval for any part of the proposals to proceed at this stage.

## ASBESTOS

552. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: How many schools in South Australia are known to have blue asbestos used in their construction, which are these schools and what precautions, if any, are being taken against asbestosis?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** There are two South Australian schools known to have blue asbestos in their construction. The schools are the South Australian School of Art where the asbestos was used in sprayed form as fire protection to the structure, and Penola High School where the asbestos was used as sprayed insulation on the ceilings of the activity hall and in two plant rooms. Air samplings in both schools show that the rate of air-borne asbestos dust is extremely low and in the opinion of the Health Commission there is no risk to health.

Precautions being taken to remove any possibility of asbestosis are—

(a) The Department of Further Education is being advised by the Public Buildings Department to remove the asbestos from the ground floor structure during the proposed alterations to the ground floor. Tests are currently being carried out by the Commonwealth Experimental Building Station to determine whether there is a suitable spray to seal the asbestos fire proofing on the other levels. In the meantime instructions have been given that there is to be no access to the ceiling spaces.

(b) The present plans for Penola High School are that all sprayed asbestos is to be removed during the May school holidays. The Public Buildings Department has given instructions that no ball games are to be played in the activity hall until the asbestos is removed and that access to the plant rooms is to be restricted to authorised personnel.

## MORPHETT VALE PRIMARY SCHOOL

553. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Is the old Morphett Vale Primary School site, currently housing the Karuna Community Centre, for sale and if so, why and what provision is being made for the future housing of those groups currently using the Centre?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The property is not for sale. There is a current agreement for its use: an agreement which expires at the end of 1980 when the future of the property will be reviewed.

## PENOLA HIGH SCHOOL

554. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Is the Penola High School recreation centre currently being fully utilised and, if so, what advice has the school obtained contrary to that tendered by the Public Buildings Department as reported in *The Advertiser* of 9 January 1980 and, if not, what plans are in hand which will allow basketball, volleyball and other such sports to be played in the centre?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The Penola High School hall is not being fully utilised at present as the school has been instructed not to undertake any vigorous activities in it. The school has not received any advice contrary to that

tendered by the Public Buildings Department as reported in *The Advertiser* of 9 January 1980. A full report following tests carried out on 19 February 1980 will be forwarded as soon as possible to the school. A contractor is being sought for the removal of the ceiling material. To avoid disruption to the school programme it is planned to carry out the work during the May vacation.

No plans are envisaged to allow basketball to be played in the centre. The Penola High School complex is not a recreation centre but a multi-purpose hall. It meets all the curriculum requirements with enough uncommitted time to permit some community use when necessary. Basketball and volleyball are not played in it as it is not designed for these activities. A complex at McCorquindale Park is being built. The school will have access to this stadium as some funding from the school is being put towards this.

#### CURRICULUM COMMITTEES

555. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many curriculum committees are currently operating within the Education Department and what is the function and membership of each?

2. What changes of function and/or membership have occurred in any of these committees in the last twelve months, at whose initiative and for what reason?

3. Are any further changes in prospect and if so, what are they, when are they likely to take effect and for what reason?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. In 1980 the following 40 committees have been appointed with the number of members indicated in brackets: Aboriginal Schools (5), Aboriginal Studies (11), Reception to Year 7 Art (9), Years 8-12 (9), Design (11), Dance (13), Reception to Year 12 Drama (14), R-12 Film and Television (10), R-12 Health Education (17), R-12 Italian (16), R-12 Modern Greek (11), R-12 Music (7), R-12 Physical Education (22), R-12 Religious Education (15), R-12 Road Safety and Driver Education (24), Special Education (18), R-7 Alternative Handwriting (11), Early Childhood (25), R-7 Language Arts (14), R-7 Mathematics (12), R-7 Science (14), R-7 Social Studies (20), Agricultural Studies (11), Ancient Studies (15), Commercial Studies (14), Consumer Education (6), Economics (10), Geography (14), History (17), Home Economics (14), Legal Studies (11), English (11), 8-12 Mathematics (13), Foreign Languages (19), Natural Resources Management (8), 8-10 Science (20), Physics (9), Chemistry (11), 8-12 Social Studies (12), Technical Studies (12).

2. The function of committee is generally indicated by their name. In relation to their specific subject areas or areas of study, they develop courses and support materials and prepare course guidelines and syllabus statements for schools. Courses include statements of underlying philosophy or rationale of the subject area and the aims and objectives of teaching it. Course content is outlined in detail and activities and approaches for teacher and student use are suggested. The committee also suggests ways of evaluating or assessing the effectiveness of the courses and support materials that it provides for schools. It is expected that half the membership of curriculum committees should be teachers from schools. Representatives from independent and Catholic schools and various organisations closely involved in the specific area of study are also included. No major changes of function have occurred.

3. Any changes will be subject to advice as they occur.

#### GOOLWA WATER SUPPLY

558. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: What is the reason for the peculiar odour in the Goolwa town water supply?

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** The odour encountered is attributed to the growth of anabaena in the Goolwa channel of the River Murray. At this point there is no flow, and consequently turbidity and colour are low—6 NTU 8 HU respectively. Under these conditions growth of algae is facilitated. Being aware of the problems encountered and to ensure that the water is safe for human consumption, the practice is and has been to maintain a relatively high chlorine dosage rate.

The proportion of water supplied to the Goolwa-Port Elliot, Victor Harbor area from this source is being progressively reduced, being replaced with water from Hindmarsh Valley Reservoir. By mid-March the effect should be evident in the township of Goolwa. Hindmarsh Valley reservoir is not able to meet the needs of the area alone during the summer months, and pumping from Goolwa is necessary to maintain supplies. The reservoir is presently holding only 122 megalitres representing 26 per cent capacity. To meet the additional demand imposed on it, by reduction in pumping from Goolwa, it is necessary to transfer water from Myponga reservoir. This is now in process, and as the holding in Hindmarsh Valley reservoir increases, the supply from the River Murray at Goolwa will be progressively reduced.

#### HOLIDAY HOUSES

560. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: How many holiday houses, as the term is used on page 96 of the Murray Valley Planning Study, currently exist on the Murray River?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** A survey undertaken in 1978 showed that there are 3 040 holiday houses along the Murray River.

#### MURRAY VALLEY PLANNING STUDY

561. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Does the Government support the recommendations with respect to areas in need of protection outlined on pages 60-64 of the Murray Valley Planning Study and, if so, what is being done, or what is planned to be done, in relation to those areas, particularly the mouths of Currency Creek and Finnis River, the eastern end of Hindmarsh and Mundoo Islands and associated channels, the Narrung Narrows and the area to the East and South East of Pelican Point?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** Yes. The Currency Creek, Finnis River and other areas referred to in the honourable member's question have all been delineated as conservation zones within the appropriate development plans. The recommendations of the study in relation to these areas have been incorporated into the three development plans affecting the river from the border to the mouth. These are the Murray Mallee Planning Area development plans and the Western Murray Lakes supplementary development plan for the outer metropolitan planning area. These plans delineate the areas identified in the Murray River Planning Study as conservation zones, and contain planning and environ-

mental management policies framed to ensure that the particular qualities of each zone are retained.

### FRUIT FLY

566. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. How many outbreaks of fruit fly have occurred in the Adelaide metropolitan area this summer?

2. What methods are currently being used by the Department of Agriculture to contain the spread of fruit fly?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** The replies are as follows:

1. Seven.

2. (a) Border quarantine checks located at Ceduna, Port Augusta and Port Pirie, Cockburn, Yamba and Pinnaroo.

(b) Surveillance of commercial consignments of fruit from interstate.

(c) Early warning lure traps.

(d) Eradication measures on outbreak which include the removal of fruit from infected trees and the spraying of an attractant bait.

(e) All householders in an outbreak area are notified by pamphlet of the measures to be taken. They are encouraged to use their fruit but not to remove any from their property unless cooked or otherwise processed.

### SCHOOL GYMNASIUMS

567. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Will the Minister support the provision of Federal Government funding in co-operation with State and local governments under a cost sharing arrangement to provide gymnasiums in the school system that will be available to students in school hours and to the public at other times?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** Depending on the details, I would consider favourably any such proposal.

### COMPANIES

568. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How many companies have ceased operations in South Australia from September 1979 and what are their names?

2. What was the average number of persons employed by the companies in the 12 months prior to ceasing operations in South Australia?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The replies are as follows:

1. The Corporate Affairs Commission does not have a record of companies which have "ceased operations" in South Australia. The registers of the Corporate Affairs Commission disclose only information where companies are wound up, struck from the register, or, where foreign companies, that they have ceased to carry on business in South Australia.

2. The Corporate Affairs Commission has no statistics on numbers of persons employed by companies.

### HANDICAPPED PERSONS

570. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What provisions currently exist in the electorate of Florey for the rehabilitation and employment of

handicapped persons?

2. What courses of action are open to handicapped persons in the electorate who desire to obtain rehabilitative training and/or employment?

3. What legislation is being proposed by the Government to provide greater protection and opportunities for handicapped persons?

4. What allocation of funds has been made for investigation into ways of improving existing provisions?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Institutions are available within the electorate of Florey for the rehabilitation of handicapped persons as follows:

(a) Ingle Farm Community Health Centre;

(b) Eastern Regional Geriatric and Medical Rehabilitation Service;

(c) Northfield Wards/Morris Hospital;

(d) Hillcrest Hospital;

(e) Enfield Hospital.

It is important to note that services of this nature are provided on a State-wide basis and not on an electorate basis.

2. Handicapped persons may consult their own doctor who would be able to refer them for assessment by the Commonwealth Employment Service, the Commonwealth Government Rehabilitation Service conducted by the Department of Social Security and (in the case of mental handicap), the Diagnostic and Assessment Clinic, 2 Prescott Terrace, Toorak Gardens. Although the electorate itself does not contain any rehabilitative training or employment institutions, handicapped persons in the electorate may attend a number of such organisations including Bedford Industries Vocational Rehabilitation Association, Phoenix Society Sheltered Workshops, St. Margaret's Felixstow, Campbelltown Sheltered Workshops.

3. The Parliamentary Counsel is presently drafting a Bill which is designed to protect physically handicapped persons against discrimination.

4. Funds have been allocated to permit the appointment of a liaison officer to the Eastern Regional Geriatric and Medical Rehabilitation Service to undertake such an investigation for the region. The Government will be allocating resources to ensure that 1981, The International Year for the Disabled, will be successful. In addition, the Health Commission is to conduct a review of the provision of services to the intellectually retarded in South Australia.

### H. C. MEYER

572. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What inspections have been carried out on the dredge *H. C. Meyer*?

2. Have these inspections cast any further light on the tragedy of 2 October 1979 and, if so, what extra information has been gleaned?

3. Will the dredge be returning to service and, if so, when?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The replies are as follows:

1. The hull has been inspected by the Department of Marine and Harbors Senior Ship and Engineering Surveyor.

2. Yes. The location, nature and dimensions of the hole which caused water to enter the hull of the dredge have been investigated. The committee of inquiry has not yet reported its findings.

3. The original designers of the *H. C. Meyer* have been retained to carry out a feasibility study to determine whether it is practicable to return the dredge to service.

#### INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

573. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What form will the inquiry into the feasibility of an international airport north of Adelaide take?

2. Who will conduct the inquiry?

3. When are the results of the inquiry likely to be known?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The inquiry will examine demand projections, costs and timing.

2. Steps are now in hand to establish a State airfield's committee which will consist of State and Commonwealth officers who will conduct the inquiry.

3. The results of the inquiry are likely to be available before the end of this year.

#### SELF HELP HEALTH SCHEME

574. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What tangible benefits to community health and fitness are likely to accrue from the \$500 000 National Pilot Self Help Health Scheme recently launched in Adelaide by the Federal and State Ministers of Health?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** In mid-1979 the Commonwealth Minister of Health announced the allocation of \$500 000 during 1979-80 for a National Health Promotion Programme. The majority of this sum is being spent on the development and evaluation of the promotional programme which commenced in both Adelaide and Canberra on 24 February. Apart from the publicity and promotional aspects of the campaign, a wide range of courses, workshops and programmes have been organised to allow people to participate in activities which are aimed at developing healthier lifestyles.

The campaign is directed specifically at adults and deals with such common lifestyle issues as stress, weight reduction, nutrition, smoking and alcohol in a manner which will promote a positive, healthy approach to life. It is considered that this campaign is an important initiative which will result in tangible benefits to the community. It is indicative of the change in emphasis from the management of sickness to the promotion of health which is the goal of forward-looking Governments and health administrations in the 1980's.

#### MOSCOW OLYMPICS

576. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Does the Government support a boycott of Australian athletes attending the Moscow Olympic Games?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The Government, together with all people concerned to preserve freedom, condemns the Russian invasion of Afghanistan, and will support any move which will lead to the withdrawal of Russian troops from that country.

#### FAULDING TAKEOVER

577. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Is the Government aware of the pending takeover of the South Australian firm F. H. Faulding and Co. Ltd. by the U.K. based Glaxo group of companies?

2. What benefits can be expected to follow such a takeover?

3. What non-beneficial results can be expected to follow such a takeover?

4. What are the likely consequences of the Faulding wholesaling operations, after a Glaxo takeover, being sold to the Zuellig Group of Switzerland?

5. What are the likely future employment prospects of current Faulding staff?

6. What details are available on the ownership of Selpam (Australia) Pty. Ltd., which is understood to be a likely co-owner with Zuellig in order to provide a 40 per cent Australian ownership of the Faulding wholesaling operations and will this 40 per cent target actually be reached?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. and 3. Statements on the benefits and non-benefits have already been made by the Minister of Industrial Affairs.

4. The Zuellig group have not indicated to the Government its intentions for the Faulding wholesaling operations, should such a takeover and transfer proceed.

5. This depends on whether F. H. Faulding and Co. Ltd. are taken over or whether there is some other rationalisation of the Australian pharmaceutical industry.

6. These matters are for the Foreign Investment Review Board to determine.

#### ROAD ACCIDENTS

578. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What were the details of the "good news on the road toll . . . since the Minister took office . . ." reported in the summer 1979 edition of the Road Safety Council of South Australia's *Road Alert* magazine?

2. What steps were taken by the previous Government to reduce the road toll and what degree of success did they meet?

3. Is it correct that the death toll on S.A. roads in 1978 was the lowest for eight years?

4. What steps has the Minister taken to which any further improvement could be directly attributed?

5. What further action does he propose?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON** The replies are as follows:

1. The same paragraph in the magazine from which the question is taken goes on to point out that in the early part of 1979 road fatalities were well above comparable 1978 rates but that in recent months the situation had improved. In fact, when the magazine went to press in the first week of December, the latest monthly figures showed that the road toll in November 1978 was 24 killed as against 12 in November in 1979.

2. Steps taken were:

(1) The provision of a Road Safety Instruction Centre at Oaklands Park.

(2) Increasing the number of field officers to provide for more instruction to members of the public.

(3) Provision of additional funds by allocating \$1 per annum from driver's licence fees for road safety purposes.

(4) Extension of instruction for children by way of the children's centres at Elizabeth, Millicent, Port Pirie and Whyalla.

The road toll was reduced from a high of 382 in 1974 to

291 in 1978 with a subsequent rise in 1979 to 309.

3. Yes.

4. There has been a marked increase in publicity through the media in road safety to heighten public awareness of the issue, for example, by the special anti-drink driving advertisements run during Christmas/New Year holiday period and other announcements on the road safety policies by the Government.

5. (1) The introduction of provisional drivers' licences.

(2) Broadening the provisions of the Road Traffic Act with respect to the application of breath tests by public officers and empowering the police to conduct random breath testing campaigns on specified days and on specified roads.

(3) The introduction of compulsory seat restraints for children.

Other matters under consideration being:

(a) Provision of additional instruction centres especially for children.

(b) Provision of additional instruction staff, subject to available resources.

(c) The encouragement of drivers to take advanced driving courses.

#### SUBURBAN TOURS

580. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Has the Minister, in conjunction with the Minister of Tourism, any plans for operating—

(a) a Sunday morning tram service to Glenelg; or

(b) a 10C bus to Morialta,

that might be attractive to tourists wishing to use public transport?

2. Has the Minister, in conjunction with the Minister of Tourism, considered the publication of a guide to metropolitan and near-metropolitan tours which can be made using public transport, as is done in some States?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. There is no plan to operate Sunday morning trams to Glenelg or buses to Morialta. There is, however, a Sunday morning bus service to Glenelg.

2. No. However, publicity brochures for the State Transport Authority's "Day Tripper" tickets for tourists and family travel on its rail, bus and tram services contain several suggested tours which can be made in the metropolitan area using these tickets.

#### TODD ELECTORATE OFFICE

581. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. Has the electorate office of the member for Todd had its signs re-done since the election of 15 September?

2. Is it correct that the member for Todd would not accept the operation being done by the Public Buildings Department and insisted it be done by private enterprise and if so—

(a) were his wishes met and if so, what was the cost;

(b) what was the P.B.D. quote for the job; and

(c) what did the private contractor quote for the job?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The replies are as follows:

(1) Following the election, the signs on the Hope Valley Electorate Office in Todd were re-worded.

(2) No. As the Public Buildings Department's sign-writer was engaged on other offices at the time and considering the urgency of the work a quotation was

sought by the Member for Todd from a private contractor following consultation with the Department as to the procedure to be followed.

(a) the cost of the work was \$120.00.

(b) \$109.50.

(c) See (a).

#### POLICE FILM

583. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Are there any plans for the recent police film on child molesting entitled "You Can't Always Tell" to be dubbed from the 16 mm film version onto videotape so that, through the free duplication system of the Educational Technology Centre, it can be made more readily available for use with students, teachers and parents in South Australian schools?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** No. Sufficient prints of the film are presently held by the S.A. Film Corporation to meet current demand.

#### T.A.B.

584. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: What alterations have taken place with respect to the minimum betting unit at the T.A.B. and how does this compare with similar betting operations in other States?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** There has been no alteration to the minimum betting unit of \$0.50 for T.A.B. betting in South Australia. Minimum betting units in other States are as follows: Victoria, \$1.00 for Trifecta, \$0.50 for all other forms of betting; New South Wales, \$1.00 for Trifecta, \$0.50 for all other forms of betting; Western Australia, \$0.50 for all betting; Queensland, \$1.00 for Win and Place, \$0.50 for all other forms of betting; Tasmania, \$1.00 for Fourtrella, Treble Feature Consolation Doubles and Trifecta, \$0.50 Win, Place and Daily Double; A.C.T., \$0.50 for all betting.

#### ELECTORATE OFFICES

586. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. How many Members' electorate offices were affected by the recent decision to remove any reference to party affiliation of Members included in the painted signs on the windows?

2. How many Members of each party were affected by the decision?

3. Have all windows and signs involved been altered to the satisfaction of the Minister?

4. What was the cost of each such alteration and what was the total cost involved?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The replies are as follows:

1. Five (5).

2. Five (5) members of the Australian Labor Party.

3. Yes.

4. Cost—\$2; \$2; \$9; \$3.50; \$9; total, \$25.50.

#### P.A.B.X.

587. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. When will the Government re-issue the general telephone directory of all major personnel in Government

departments connected to the P.A.B.X. system?

2. Can similar directories be compiled of those who are not connected by P.A.B.X.?

3. Would such directories be provided to electorate offices to assist members in helping constituents with problems relating to lack of information on services that are available to them from Government departments?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The replies are as follows:

1. The P.A.B.X. Telephone Directory compiled by Public Buildings Department is due to be re-issued in April/May 1980.

2. The majority of Government Departments not connected to the P.A.B.X. produce internal telephone directories.

3. Electorate Offices are on the distribution list for the P.A.B.X. Telephone Directory.

Directories referred to in (2) would be available from the individual departments upon request.

### EYES

588. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Is it correct that patients, many of them elderly, encounter waiting periods of up to four hours on Mondays and Thursdays at the Ophthalmic Section of the Flinders University Medical Centre?

2. Does this waiting period make it very difficult for patients who have not driven a car to the medical centre to make arrangements with relatives for a lift home?

3. Are all patients advised through their appointment slips that they must be at the clinic by 2 p.m. although on arrival they then have to join a waiting list which can mean that their actual appointment may not eventuate till close to 6 p.m.?

4. Does this wait apply even to patients who are only in attendance to pick up a pair of glasses prescribed on a previous visit?

5. Does a similar situation apply at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, where patients are told to arrive for a 9 a.m. appointment when they may not actually be seen till mid-afternoon or later?

6. Will financial cut-backs by the present Government further aggravate this situation?

7. Does the Minister have any proposals to remedy the situation?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. It is true that, despite efforts to the contrary, some patients attending an eye clinic encounter long delays prior to their treatment being completed. Many patients require pre-treatment such as eye drops, etc., which involves a minimum waiting period of 30 minutes for the drops to take effect, before they can be seen again by the doctor. In addition to the normal "booked" patients attending an eye clinic, many other patients are referred to the clinic from the Accident and Emergency Department and elsewhere for emergency eye consultations and treatment. In most instances these patients have to be given priority treatment.

2. The hospital has no information that it is causing the difficulties described. Public transport is readily available and free taxi transport is available at all times for those patients who are eligible for this service.

3. No. Patients are booked into the eye clinic on an appointment basis commencing at 2.00 p.m. with the last booking being made at 4.00 p.m.

4. No.

5. Eye clinics are conducted at the Royal Adelaide

Hospital each morning and afternoon, Monday to Friday. Patients reporting to the morning clinic are required to attend at 9.00 a.m., and at 1.00 p.m. for the afternoon clinic. Because of the large number involved, all patients are requested to attend at the commencement of their respective sessions to enable pre-treatment to be administered before examination by the ophthalmologist. Patients referred from the Accident and Emergency Department receive priority treatment at the eye clinics.

6. Financial cut-backs have not adversely affected the Eye Department. In fact, the situation should improve with the recent establishment of the Lions Chair of Ophthalmology and the proposed early appointment of a full-time ophthalmologist.

7. See 6. above.

### DRUG COMMITTEE

590. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Has the Ministerial committee into drug problems met and if so, how often and if not, why not?

2. What specific lines of action have emerged from these deliberations?

3. What initiatives have been undertaken as part of the "major campaign" against drug abuse announced by the Premier on 12 December 1979?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The replies are as follows:

1. The committee has met on four occasions.

2. and 3. It is anticipated that the committee will make a number of recommendations in March 1980 and that initiatives will soon thereafter be announced by the Premier.

### YEAR 12 CLASSES

591. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many Government high schools are there in South Australia and how many of these do not have year 12 classes and which schools are they?

2. How many Government area schools are there in South Australia and how many of these have year 12 classes and which are they?

3. How many new year 12 classes have been established for 1980?

4. What plans are in hand for the establishment and/or disestablishment of year 12 classes in any schools?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. As of February 1980 there are 101 Government high schools in South Australia. (This figure includes Reynella East High School, a holding school of 68 Year 8 students, which will be opened in 1981.)

All high schools, except Reynella East, have year 12 classes.

2. As of February 1980 there are 45 Government area schools and the following 19 have year 12 classes:—Brown's Well District, Burra Community, Ceduna, Cleve, Coober Pedy, Coomandook, Cummins, Eudunda, Keith, Kingscote, Kingston, Lameroo, Lucindale, Maitland, Meningie, Oakbank, Wudinna, Yankalilla, Yorketown.

3. Year 12 classes have been established in the following schools in 1980:—Kapunda High School, The Heights School, Wirreanda High School, Coober Pedy Area School.

4. Karoonda Area School will cease to have a year 12 class in 1980. There are no other plans to disestablish year 12 classes in the near future.

**SCHOOL ENROLMENTS**

592. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many Government schools have accepted their initial enrolments this year, where are they and what is the size of each of these enrolments?

2. How many administrative, teaching and ancillary staff have been appointed to each of these schools?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Six new primary schools opened in February 1980. One high school (Reynella East) accepted enrolments in February 1980, but will not be opened until 1981 in its own buildings. Currently it is housed in the Reynella East Primary School. The schools and their opening day enrolments are shown below:

	Pupils
Salisbury West Primary School—on Salisbury North High School Campus, Waterloo Corner Road, Salisbury North .....	150
Salisbury Heights Primary School, Target Hill Road, Salisbury Heights .....	134
Moana Primary School, Schooner Road, Moana .....	192
Sheidow Park Primary School, Adams Road, Sheidow Park .....	110
Yetto East Primary School, Matison Road, Morphett Vale East .....	158
Mount Barker South Primary School, Charles Street, Mount Barker .....	230
Reynella East High School—on Reynella East Primary School Campus, Malbeck Drive, Reynella .....	68

2. The table below shows the allocation of administration, teaching and ancillary staff to the above schools.

Administration Staff includes only Principals and Deputy Principals.

Teaching staff includes seniors and assistants. The ancillary staff allocation has been made in terms of numbers of hours. (There is some difficulty in converting this to full-time equivalent staff numbers as the number of hours worked per week can be 37½ or 40).

School	Administrative Staff	Teaching Staff	Ancillary Staff (No. of Hours)
Salisbury West Primary .....	2	10.2	70
Salisbury Heights Primary .....	1	8	55
Moana Primary .....	2	9	75
Sheidow Park Primary .....	2	6	75
Yetto East Primary .....	1	8	60
Mt. Barker South Primary .....	2	10	80
Reynella East High .....	1	7	140

Note: Salisbury West Primary School has been staffed to allow for marked growth to occur during the year.

**SCHOOL ENROLMENTS**

593. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What was the total enrolment in all South Australian Government schools at the end of the first week of the current term?

2. What was the total enrolment in each of the following categories—

- (a) junior primary schools;
- (b) primary and rural schools;
- (c) area and special rural schools (junior primary and primary classes only);
- (d) area and special rural schools (secondary classes only);

- (e) high schools; and
- (f) all others?

3. What were the comparable figures for the end of the first week of the 1979 school year?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The total enrolment in all South Australian Government schools on the opening day of school, 1980 was 220 418.

2. and 3. The following table presents a breakdown of the opening date enrolments according to the required categories. The 1979 figures are for 26 February 1979, not first day figures and are not strictly comparable with the 1980 figures. The 1980 enrolments for the end of February will not be available until mid-March.

	1980 (first day)	1979 (end of Feb.)
(a) Junior primary schools .....	13 528	15 152
(b) Primary and rural schools .....	114 168	114 757
(c) Area and special rural schools (junior primary and primary classes only) .....	9 242	9 329
(d) Area and special rural schools (secondary classes only) .....	4 751	5 284
(e) High schools .....	74 157	76 253
(f) All others .....	4 572	4 353
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>220 418</b>	<b>225 128</b>

“All others” includes Aboriginal schools, speech and hearing centres, special schools, special classes, correspondence schools (nett) and Port Augusta School of the Air.



### TRANSITION PROGRAMME

594. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Has the Government yet made a submission to the Commonwealth under the Commonwealth's \$150 million school to work transition programme and if so, what are the contents of that submission and if not, why not?

2. Does the Government support New South Wales Premier Wran's contention that the scheme has not started because the money has not been provided by the Commonwealth or, alternatively, does it support Commonwealth Minister Fife's rejoinder that the delay arises from the States' dilatoriness in sending their submissions to Canberra?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The Government has submitted for transmission to Canberra proposals for programmes to support endeavours in school to work transition.

The actual projects approved by Cabinet were—Educational Programme for Unemployed Youth; Foundation Courses; Pre-vocational Programme; Teacher Training and Development; Integrated Years 8 to 12 Curriculum; Identifying "at risk" school leavers; Transition classes; Evaluation; Administration and Clerical support plus salaries for teachers, resource material, etc.; Co-ordinating and Course Curriculum evaluation; "Awareness" publicity; "Re-entry" Programmes for those who desire to upgrade skills etc.; Link Courses; Vocation Referral Centres; Research—Co-ordination; School Leavers Handbooks.

A further task of the Standing Committee will be to develop a response to the Commonwealth Government for 1981 and beyond.

2. No. The submission to Canberra was delayed in order to ensure adequate co-ordination and inter-departmental co-operation.

### INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS POLICY

597. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Do the members of the Government have the willingness to communicate at all times with workers that they were advised to develop in a paper to the Liberal State Council's annual meeting reported in the *News* of 12 February?

2. Will members of the Government be showing the concern and interest for workers that the same paper advised them to show?

3. Will Government members also be acting on the paper's advice to be better informed on the working conditions of unionists?

4. Will they also accept the advice to not be afraid to support any legitimate union claims?

5. Why were the members of the Government advised by the same paper not to establish formal consultative links with trade unions?

6. Did the report explain why Liberal endorsement of candidates in union elections would prove counter-productive for such candidate's chances and if so, what reasons were given?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The Government's Industrial Relations policy has already been announced. Further statements as to the implementation of the policy will be made as appropriate.

### NUCLEAR ENERGY

598. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier:

1. How does the French A.R.C.'s gaseous diffusion method of uranium enrichment used in the Tricastin plant in the Rhone Valley differ from the centrifuge enrichment system used by the British/Dutch/German consortium Urenco and which of the two systems has the greater output?

2. How does the French system compare with American enrichment methods?

3. Is France a signatory of the nuclear weapons non-proliferation treaty?

4. Did a truck load of yellowcake destined for France recently end up in Libya?

5. Is it a fact that, although some uranium is imported from Niger and Chad, the bulk of France's supplies come from Namibia in contravention of a United Nations resolution prohibiting such imports from that South African controlled territory?

6. Has the South Australian Government expressed any eagerness to have a French enrichment plant in this State, as reported from Paris on page 16 of the *Australian* of 9 February?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The replies are as follows:

1. The Tricastin Enrichment Plant uses the gaseous diffusion process developed by the United States and is based on uranium in the form of gaseous uranium hexafluoride being compressed and injected through a porous membrane or barrier through which the lighter isotope U235 penetrates more easily than the heavy isotope U238. The gas is kept passing through a succession of barriers to enrich the uranium hexafluoride from 0.7 per cent U235 content to 3.4 per cent content.

The URENCO enrichment system involves the gaseous hexafluoride being injected into centrifuges rotating at very high speed with the lighter isotope concentrating on the peripheral surface.

The enrichment capacity of a single centrifuge is small and many machines are required to provide the output of a commercial plant. A commercial diffusion plant has to be built to serve a large number of nuclear reactors and requires a large power supply. In the case of the Tricastin plant, power is supplied by four nuclear reactor stations. A centrifuge enrichment plant can be constructed economically to serve 3-5 reactors at about one-tenth of the cost with a power demand of only 4 per cent of that of the diffusion plant.

Diffusion plants produce over 90 per cent of the world's enriched uranium.

2. The French system is the same as the U.S.A. diffusion system which provides enrichment services for over 150 reactors in the U.S. and other countries.

3. No, but France is a signatory to the Nuclear Suppliers Group and only supplies nuclear materials to countries that are signatories of the N.P.T. or countries that have accepted IAEA safeguards in their nuclear activities.

4. The yellowcake in question was supplied by Niger to Libya which is a signatory of the N.P.T. It was supplied under IAEA safeguards from the French supply allocation in the Niger uranium operation.

5. No. France does not obtain uranium from the Rensing Mine in Namibia which is controlled largely by U.K. interests. France obtains uranium from Niger. Chad does not supply uranium to France.

6. The French Government Uranium Authority has approached the South Australian Government to consider a proposal for an enrichment plant in South Australia.

## TELETEXT

599. **Mr. TRAINER (on notice):** asked the Minister of Education:

1. Has the Minister seen the report in the *Australian* of 9 February concerning the Federal Government authorising ATN-7's introduction of Teletext?

2. Have officers of the Education Department considered a pilot scheme for one or more local television stations to conduct a trial with Teletext for information distribution purposes with the regional offices of the department?

3. Have the rival Videotext of Telidon systems of information distribution been investigated as alternatives and if so, how do they compare?

4. Have any Ministers engaged in any consultations on the potential for such "electronic newspaper" systems of information distribution?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. I am aware of the report and the related press release.

2. Yes, since early 1977.

3. Yes. They are superior.

4. As far as I am aware there has been no consultation upon "electronic newspaper" systems outside the Education Department.

## PETROLEUM PRICES

601. **Mr. TRAINER (on notice)** asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. What budget alterations have taken place in Government departments in allocations towards the operation of Government vehicles?

2. Has the auditing system for departmental travelling costs for Government vehicles been altered so that allocations which previously covered oil and petrol costs must now also cover such items as tyres and repairs?

3. Do the current travel allocations allow for the approximately 50 per cent increase in petrol costs since the previous year?

4. Is it an overall consequence of budgetary reductions, auditing alterations and petrol price rises, that the use by public servants of Government cars has been reduced?

5. Does this reduction mean that engineers, consultants, advisory teachers, welfare officers and other public servants are unable to serve the public, or other sections of Government departments, if the task requires them to leave their office?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The replies are as follows: Honourable members would be well aware of the effects of rising petrol prices on personal and organisational budgets. Measures to achieve an immediate reduction of 10 per cent in liquid fuel consumption in all Government departments and statutory authorities were initiated last year. The only exceptions are the operational requirements of the State Transport Authority, Police, Fire Brigade and other essential services. The Government has asked senior officials to oversee this reduction and to recommend any further measures deemed necessary. In addition, the Government is currently considering the report of the Motor Vehicle Utilization Committee's investigation of economies and forms of energy conservation in the operation of the Government's fleet of motor vehicles.

Fuel savings are already being achieved by such methods as better driving habits, rationalization of motor vehicle usage, improved maintenance and the purchase of more economical vehicles. Together with other economies being made in the State's Budget, the reduction in liquid

fuel consumption has enabled the increased oil and petrol costs to be absorbed within departmental budgets. There has been very little effect on the services provided to the public or to other sections of Government departments.

Each department maintains its own records of travelling and vehicle expenses, including costs incurred on particular items such as tyres and repairs where appropriate. Motor vehicle reimbursement rates were reviewed in October last year.

## STURT TRIANGLE

602. **Mr. TRAINER (on notice)** asked the Minister of Environment:

1. What plans does the Government have for the future of that section of land enclosed by South Road, Marion Road and Sturt Road known as the "Sturt Triangle"?

2. What is the current state of ownership of that land?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The interdepartmental committee established in October 1977 to consider the future recreational development of the "Sturt Triangle" land has yet to formulate its recommendations.

2. The Commissioner of Highways holds an area of 19.74 ha within the "Triangle".

According to Departmental records, there are at least eight other landowners holding land in the area.

## COLOUR TELEVISION FIRES

609. **Mr. TRAINER (on notice)** asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What where the makes and models of the colour television sets involved in—

(a) an explosion and fire which killed two people in a Torrensville flat on 25 November 1979;

(b) a similar fire in Gawler at about that time; and

(c) a similar explosion and fire, in Cabramatta, New South Wales, reported in the *News* of 28 November?

2. Were these sets of the "instant start" variety in which a small filament is heated by an electric current, unless the power is completely disconnected, so that a picture is obtained straight away without a warm-up period after operating the on-off control at the front of the set and if so, were the fires or explosions related to this "instant start" facility and if so, will the Chief Secretary consult with the Minister of Education regarding the large number of colour television sets in schools, some of which may have this "instant start" facility, to see if any action needs to be taken regarding the heating elements being left on over weekends or during lengthy holiday periods?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The replies are as follows:

1. (a) Autovax 25", model 2685AV, fitted with a Westinghouse tube, model A67-140x.

(b) Sanyo 14", model TP103.

(c) Pye 24", black and white. (No further details available.)

2. The "instant start" facility was present in sets (a) and (b) but not in (c). There is no conclusive evidence that the instant start facility contributed to the fires.

However, it is a general safety recommendation that any electrical appliance be disconnected at the power outlet when not in use for an extended period.

## "LAY-BY" SERVICES

610. **Mr. TRAINER (on notice)** asked the Minister of Health:

1. Which of the major retailing chains trading in this State still provide a "lay-by" service for customers?
2. Do any of them impose customer charges for this and if so, of what magnitude?
3. If any retailing chains, in all or some of their stores, have withdrawn this "lay-by" service, on what dates did this occur?
4. Has the Minister, or the Department of Consumer Affairs received any representations on this matter?
5. Does the policy of any retailing chain regarding "lay-by" in its stores in this State, vary from the chain's policy in other States and if so, why?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. A lay-by service for customers in this State is provided by the following major retail chains: Myer S.A. Stores Ltd.; David Jones (Aust.) Pty. Ltd.; John Martin & Co. Ltd.; Woolworths (S.A.) Ltd. at Rundle Mall and Parabanks; K Mart (Aust.) Ltd.; Venture Stores Ltd., and Big "W" Discount Stores.
2. No.
3. Target Discount Shopping Centres withdrew its lay-by service Australia wide in July, 1978. Several smaller Woolworths stores withdrew lay-by services about five years ago.
4. No.
5. It is understood that the policy is uniform Australia-wide, with the possible exception of New South Wales, which has lay-by legislation with which to comply.

#### PHYSICAL EDUCATION

611. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Has the Physical Education Branch collected evidence on the value of physical education on a daily basis at the primary school level?
2. What resource materials have been prepared to support such a programme and how many schools have adopted it?
3. Has an evaluation of such materials shown a lack of material to assist primary teachers in presenting gymnastics and dance aspects of the course?
4. Did the Physical Education Branch plan some audiovisual material to overcome such a deficiency and was particular emphasis given to ethnic folk dances?
5. Was a pilot study conducted in conjunction with the "Come Out" festival and how successful was it?
6. Was it proposed that approximately \$2 000 be budgeted for a further 30 half-hour videotape programmes to be produced by the Department of Further Education at Kilkenny?
7. Did the South Australian Film Corporation veto the proposal on the basis that the work should be done by private enterprise and if so, what is the estimated cost a private firm would charge for such a series of 30 programmes?
8. Could the Education Department readily budget for such a sum or would the cost for the programme series be such that it could never be sponsored by the Department?
9. Does the Minister have any proposals to ensure that necessary resource material of this nature is made available?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Evidence has been collected and interim reports indicate significant increases in fitness levels with no apparent loss of academic performance.
2. Only a limited supply of daily lessons has been prepared but 297 out of 637 (45 per cent) Government

schools are involved in daily fitness programmes in some way.

3. Teachers have expressed a need for more specific training in areas of dance and gymnastics and have made requests for "workshops" and audio visual resources.
4. Yes.
5. A pilot study video tape was prepared and proved successful.
6. Yes.
7. It is my understanding that the S.A. Film Corporation did veto the proposal. This issue has already been taken up by the Directors-General of Education and Further Education and the Director of the Film Corporation. Cost comparisons are difficult as my officers are unaware of commercial studios in existence which have the same facilities as at Kilkenny. However, it is likely that a private firm would not be able to provide competitive prices for the work required.
8. Budgeting for funds to produce a dance film through the S.A. Film Corporation would have to be done from within the amounts made available to the Education Department by the Government Film Production Committee. The dance programme would be in competition with but not necessarily eliminated by other requests for films on various curriculum topics.
9. There have been proposals that Education Department in-house, specialised films made with resources already available to such groups as the Physical Education Branch should receive special consideration by the Film Corporation.

#### EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

613. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What duplication of administrative structures has taken place as a result of the Education Department's policy of regionalisation?
2. What is the estimated cost of the regionalisation programme—
  - (a) in rural areas; and
  - (b) in the metropolitan area?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. There has been no duplication but rather a process by which regions have completely taken over tasks which were formerly handled by central office, especially in the staffing, special services and facilities areas.
2. The cost of regionalisation is difficult to establish clearly because a number of the costs have been simply relocated from central to regional office.  
For instance travel and salary costs for a large number of people including principal education officers, guidance officers, speech therapists and curriculum advisers would be incurred whether there were regions or not.

#### ELECTORATE OFFICES

614. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. What progress has been achieved towards the establishment of an electorate office within the Electorate of Mallee?
2. What progress has been achieved towards the establishment of an electorate office within the Electorate of Brighton?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The replies are as follows:

1. No formal request has been received from the member for Mallee to establish an Electorate Office.

2. It is anticipated that the new office for the Electorate of Brighton will be ready for occupation by the end of March.

the Recreation Grounds Taxation Exemption Act, 1910.

3. Local Government Charges

No exemption, but subject to (a) 3 (2) above.

**RECREATION CHARGES**

616. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

What exemptions from State Government or local government rates and charges are given to—

- (a) sporting grounds;
- (b) racecourses; and
- (c) entertainment centres?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

(a) Sporting Grounds

1. Land Tax

(1) Eligible for partial exemption under subsection (1) (a) (i) of Section 12a of the Land Tax Act.

(2) Full exemption if the land qualifies pursuant to the Recreation Grounds Taxation Exemption Act, 1910.

(3) Full exemption if the land is owned by the Crown or a local government authority.

2. Water and Sewerage Rates

(1) Exemptions from assessment only, if the land qualifies pursuant to the Recreation Grounds Taxation Exemption Act, 1910. A minimum water rate is levied and all water used is charged at current prices applying. A charge for each water closet connected to the sewerage system is levied.

(2) Local Government owned lands are similarly exempt pursuant to Section 65 of the Sewerage Act, except that the charge per water closet is lower.

3. Local Government Charges

(1) Exemptions apply only to any land under the provisions of the Recreation Grounds Taxation Exemption Act, 1910.

(2) However, upon the application of any person or body that uses ratable property for the purposes of providing facilities for children or young persons and not for the purpose of securing pecuniary profit, a council has a discretionary power under Section 267b. (2a) of the Local Government Act, 1934-1979, to remit the payment of rates in respect of a property or any part thereof, or a fine, or any part of a fine imposed in respect of the rates.

(b) Racecourses

1. Land Tax

Eligible for partial exemption under Sub-section (1) (a) (ii) of Section 12a of the Land Tax Act.

2. Water and Sewerage Rates

Exemption to any racecourse in terms of (a) 2 (1) above pursuant to the provisions of the Recreation Grounds Taxation Exemption Act, 1910.

3. Local Government Charges

No exemption, but subject to (a) 3 (2) above.

(c) Entertainment Centres

1. Land Tax

(1) Eligible for partial exemption under Sub-section (1) (a) (v) or Sub-section (1a) of Section 12a of the Land Tax Act.

(2) Eligible for full exemption under Sub-section (1) (e) of Section 10 of the Land Tax Act if owned by an association in receipt of an annual grant or subsidy voted by Parliament.

2. Water and Sewerage Rates

Entertainment centres where sporting activities predominate would be considered for exemption in terms of (a) 2 (1) above pursuant to the provisions of

**PARA PADDOCKS**

618. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Does the Premier agree that the section of land set aside for recreational purposes in the area known as The Paddocks, bounded by Bridge, Kesters, Main North and Maxwell Roads, Para Hills West, was originally undertaken to be purchased by the Government, by the then Premier Mr. Dunstan in acknowledgement of the insufficient recreation areas then existing in Para Hills and that the then Premier made a public undertaking to this effect at the time?

2. Is the Premier aware that the costs of purchase of the recreational lands at The Paddocks was met by the S.A.H.T. from its own funds and not the Government?

3. Can the Premier advise why the Government has not repaid the appropriate portion of the S.A.H.T. outlay in The Paddocks area?

4. Is the Premier aware that the S.A.H.T. is now seeking to recover in the order of \$200 000 of its capital expenditure from the Salisbury Corporation?

5. Does the Government claim that Salisbury Corporation or any statutory authority other than the Government ever undertook to meet the capital cost of the recreational land in The Paddocks or any part thereof?

6. Will the Premier give an undertaking that no pressure or indirect penalty of any kind will be placed upon Salisbury Corporation if it declines the payment sought?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The replies are as follows:

1. (a) The Premier of the day, Mr. Dunstan, was reported by the *Advertiser* on 19 September 1972 as having announced the previous night that a Governor's warrant had been issued to buy for more than \$500 000, 280 acres of land in the Para Hills area, half of which would be open space.

(b) As the land presently known as the Para Paddocks was already held by the South Australian Housing Trust well before 1972 it is difficult to know whether the statement alleged to have been made by the then Premier was accurately reported.

2. See 1. (b).

3. The previous Government had eight years to resolve this matter following the alleged statement reported in 1 (a) above.

4. Yes.

5. No.

6. As a result of discussions between the honourable member, representatives from the Salisbury Council and the Minister of Local Government, I have instigated inquiries into (1) the former Premier's reported statement and the former Government's commitments, if any, and (2) the possibility that the land might be acquired through the Public Parks Fund.

**NUCLEAR ENERGY**

619. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Premier: Is the Government currently negotiating with any company or companies, concerning the construction of a nuclear energy plant or nuclear enrichment plant, in South Australia?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The Uranium Enrichment

Committee of the South Australian Government is continuing the discussions with URENCO-CENTEC regarding the possibility of the construction of an enrichment plant in South Australia, and with British Nuclear Fuels regarding the related matter of the possibility of construction of a uranium refinery in the State. These discussions were initiated under the previous Government. The Committee also monitors the interest of other organisations interested in setting up uranium refining and enrichment facilities in Australia.

#### URANIUM REFERENDUM

621. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Premier: Why is it not the policy of the Government to permit the people of South Australia to decide the question of the mining of and treatment of uranium by way of a referendum?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The question of the mining and development of South Australia's mineral resources, including uranium, was a major issue at the State election, in September, 1979. The Government is quite satisfied with the result of that election.

#### MOTOR VEHICLE CONCESSIONS

622. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Will the Minister undertake to investigate the scheme recently introduced in Victoria whereby the majority of aged, invalid and widowed pensioners have to pay only half motor registration and third party rates, and advise whether the Government will introduce such a scheme in South Australia in the near future?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** Since 1971 certain pensioners, holders of concession cards and incapacitated persons have been granted a 50 per cent concession in motor registration fees. This concession does not apply to more than one vehicle and one trailer owned by the same owner. Those eligible include holders of the State concession card issued by the Department of Community Welfare, or a pension entitlement card issued under any Act or law of the Commonwealth entitling them to travel on public transport in South Australia at reduced rates. Also eligible are those owners of motor vehicles who in consequence of the loss of one or both legs are permanently unable to use public transport.

Compulsory third party insurance premiums are set by an independent committee chaired by a judge of the Supreme Court. The amount of the premiums is set to cover the cost of claims made against insurance companies as a result of motor vehicle accidents. The Government is examining the existing structure of compulsory third party insurance for injuries received in motor vehicle accidents.

#### LEGAL SERVICES COMMISSION

625. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Can the Minister advise of the total number of matters assigned to the legal profession by the Legal Services Commission, what percentage were related to—

- (a) criminal matters;
- (b) family law matters; and
- (c) all other matters?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows: The total number of State and Commonwealth funded matters assigned to the legal profession from February 1979 to January 1980 is 7 708, divided into the following categories—

		Per Cent
(a) Criminal Law.....	3 782	49
(b) Family Law .....	2 073	27
(c) All other including Civil Law .....	1 853	24
Total .....	7 708	100

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

626. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Is the Minister aware that the Legal Services Commission has currently claimed a reserve in the order of \$400 000 and was he aware of any such reserve at the time of the debate on the Appropriation Bill (No. 2)?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The Legal Services Commission Balance Sheet as at 30th June 1979, shows an amount of \$417 407 as prepaid grants from the Commonwealth Government (\$92 390) and the State Government (\$325 017). This information was known to the Government at the time of the debate on the Appropriation Bill (No. 2).

#### SCHOOLS

628. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Can the Minister advise the total number of teachers employed—

- (a) in the Education Department; and
- (b) in private schools,

this year and for each of the preceding seven years?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:—**

Year	Government	Non-Government
	Schools	Schools
	Total	Total
	Teachers	Teachers
1972.....	11 191	1 722
1973.....	11 846	1 777
1974.....	12 927	1 819
1975.....	13 668	1 899
1976.....	14 320	1 989
1977.....	14 900	2 070
1978.....	15 101	2 152
1979.....	15 174	2 295
1980.....	15 134	Not available
	(estimate)	

#### STUDENT ENROLMENTS

629. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Can the Minister advise how many students enrolled for the first time in—

- (a) State schools; and
- (b) private schools,

this year and further advise the total number of each for the preceding seven years and the projected total numbers for each of the ensuing seven years?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** (a) In February 1980, 7 878 students enrolled for the first time in State schools. This figure includes only students who have not previously been enrolled in any school system.

(b) Comparable non-government figures are not available. The Secretary of the State Advisory Committee on non-government schools, Mr. John Reedman, believes that such information could only be obtained through a survey of all non-government schools.

The following table presents actual and projected enrolments in government and non-government schools for the years 1973 to 1986. 1973-1979 figures are taken from the A.B.S. publication *Schools* (Catalogue number 4202.4) while 1980-1986 figures are estimates prepared by the Enrolment Projections Group in the Planning Section of the Directorate of Research and Planning.

Year	Government Enrolment	Non-Government Enrolment
1973.....	231 786	37 735
1974.....	232 479	38 617
1975.....	234 712	38 885
1976.....	233 614	39 299
1977.....	233 210	39 446
1978.....	230 455	39 441
1979.....	224 525	39 972
1980.....	219 100	40 200
1981.....	213 400	40 100
1982.....	209 100	39 900
1983.....	204 700	39 700
1984.....	200 600	39 400
1985.....	196 200	39 200
1986.....	191 300	39 400

Note: All figures exclude pre-school students. The actual and projected enrolments are for August for each year.

**M.A.T.S. PLAN**

633. **The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Has the Government undertaken a review of the M.A.T.S. Plan and if so—

- (a) what is the purpose and extent of the review;
- (b) why has there not been an official announcement of the review;
- (c) has the Minister informed councils about the review;
- (d) what input to the review will residents, councils and community groups be allowed; and
- (e) before taking any action in relation to the findings of the review, will the Minister guarantee full public debate on the benefits of such action?

2. Are homes in the area of the M.A.T.S. Plan still being purchased by the Government?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. No. However, consideration is being given to an investigation of the transport needs of the western and south-western suburbs in relation to a range of proposals that have been made and to the Government's transport policy, which includes the widening of South Road, extension of Morphett Road, construction of a by-pass road at Morphett Vale and improvements to the Glenelg tram, as well as resolution of the possible use of land held by the Government's transport departments and agencies.

2. Yes. The Government has continued the policy of the previous Government.

**GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES**

634. **The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. Has the Government transferred any employee away from his or her home base without the approval of that employee?

2. Does the Government intend to transfer employees away from their home base without the approval and agreement of the employee?

3. Will the Minister make it clear that no employee will be transferred from home base unless suitable arrangements can be made with that employee?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The replies are as follows:

1. Arrangements adopted to implement the Government's policy on redeployment of existing workers to areas of need within the public sector have been negotiated in detail with the United Trades and Labor Council. In these arrangements it is stipulated that no individual will be required to accept a position which will involve him in travelling an unreasonable distance from his home or previous workplace or require him to relocate his home.

As the honourable member will be aware, it has been normal practice for certain employees of the State to be subjected periodically to transfer from one workplace to another. These are predominantly people employed on construction work within major departments. Such workers are made aware of this requirement when they are recruited.

2. The Government intends to abide by the arrangements agreed with the United Trades and Labor Council.

3. The arrangements have been made public and details have been distributed to all weekly paid employees on an information sheet. This sheet has been made available in English, Greek, Italian, German and Serbo-Croatian.

**TAPLEYS HILL ROAD**

635. **The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

Does the Highways Department intend to widen Tapleys Hill Road near the Highways Department Depot and if so—

- (a) will it be necessary to acquire homes in that vicinity;
- (b) has the council been informed of these plans and if not, why not;
- (c) have the home owners been advised of the Government's intentions and if not, why not; and
- (d) will the Government guarantee that before any decision is made, the council and resident and community groups will be given the opportunity for consultation and if not, why not?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

Assuming that the Honourable member is referring to the Telecom Depot on Tapleys Hill Road near Anzac Highway, duplication of Tapleys Hill Road between Burbridge Road and the River Sturt is scheduled to commence in 1981 subject to the availability of resources. Alternative proposals have already been prepared for the eventual upgrading, and these are presently on public display in the Highways Department caravan which is located in the Glenelg North area.

- (a) Some of the alternative proposals would require acquisition of homes.
- (b) Yes.
- (c) Yes.
- (d) The community is currently now able to offer comment on the alternative proposals.

**PREMIER ROADLINES**

636. **The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is the Minister aware that Premier Road Lines provides only one bus service per day through Old Noarlunga, at 7.32 a.m.?

2. Will the Minister have this service examined and recommend improving the service?

3. Will the Minister examine the fare prices from this location?

4. If the fare pricing arrangements are excessive, will the Minister take the necessary action to have them reduced?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Premier Tours Pty. Ltd., operates at daily bus service from Old Noarlunga to Adelaide departing at 7.32 a.m. and arriving in Adelaide at 8.15 a.m. There are also two return services leaving Adelaide at 2.10 p.m. and 5.20 p.m. arriving at Noarlunga at 3.02 p.m. and 6.14 p.m. respectively.

2. The State Transport Authority is currently negotiating with a private bus operator with a view to arranging for some additional off-peak services between Old Noarlunga and the rail terminal at Noarlunga Centre. These negotiations have not yet been concluded.

3. and 4. The current single adult fare between Noarlunga and Adelaide is \$1.45. This fare is not considered excessive in relation to operating costs nor by comparison with the general level of fares charged by private bus operators.

### CONTRACTORS

637. **The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. Is it the practice for the Public Buildings Department to supply private contractors with refrigerators, freezers, stoves, or any other like equipment for use by that contractor and if so, what method of payment is used to reimburse the Government?

2. Will the Minister advise the details of any such items being supplied?

3. If such items have been supplied where were they sent to and what was the name of the contractor?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The replies are as follows:

1. It is not the practice of the Public Buildings Department to supply private contractors with the equipment described for use by the contractor.

2. However, on occasions when no main contract is let and a Construction Manager is appointed to co-ordinate the work of a number of trade contractors, the Construction Manager is responsible for setting up of site facilities, supplied by the Public Buildings Department, for the use of all contractors and Departmental staff. Tenderers for each of the several trade packages are advised at the time of tender that they need to make no allowance for the provision of site amenities as these will be provided by the Department. This procedure results in lower tenders and the co-ordinated provision of site amenities, as well as helping to reduce industrial disputes. The equipment remains the property of the Government. The furniture and equipment listed below has been supplied to Dillingham Australia Limited as Construction Managers of the Noarlunga Community College project:

(a) Site offices for use of Construction Manager and departmental employees:

general office and conference furniture.  
tea making facilities and refrigerator.

(b) Lunch rooms for use by construction workers as required by industrial award:

pie warmers.  
urns  
tables and chairs.  
refrigerator.

(c) First Aid Room as required by the industrial award:

examination couch.  
medical supplies.

(d) Toilet and change huts as required by industrial award:

lockers.  
cleaning and equipment.

3. All items referred to above, with the exception of the general office and conference furniture, have been delivered to the Noarlunga Community College site where they have been received and put into use by the Construction Manager, Dillingham Australia Limited on behalf of the Department. The office and conference furniture was delivered to Dillingham Australia Limited at their central office to establish a project office on their premises prior to the establishment of the site management office. The furniture will be transported by Dillingham to the site office at no cost to this department. All furniture and equipment will be returned to the Public Buildings Department store when no longer required. In this particular instance, the above procedure was under taken in pursuance of the contract between the Minister of Public Works and Dillingham Australia Limited authorised by the previous Government.

### PAYROLL TAX INCENTIVE SCHEME

639. **The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. How many additional employees have been employed under the Government's Payroll Tax Incentive Scheme?

2. Which employers have employed additional employees under this scheme?

3. What criteria are used to determine that these employees are in fact additional employees?

4. What evidence does the Minister have that all or some of these employees would not have been employed anyway?

5. Have any employees employed under this scheme been retrenched or dismissed?

6. Were any additional employees employed in the service industries under this scheme and are they still employed?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The replies are as follows:

1. 1 023 to the end of January 1980.

2. 451 employers to the end of January 1980, across the whole range of industry and commerce.

3. Employees are judged to be additional employees if they are under the age of 20 at the time of commencement of employment, employed on a full-time basis (on average at least 35 hours per week), and their employment constitutes a net addition to the total full-time workforce of that employer as at 31 September 1979.

4. Many employers through their enquiries have indicated that the Government's payroll tax incentive scheme has stimulated their employment because it has reduced labour costs.

5. The Government is not aware of any instances where employees have been employed under this scheme and subsequently have been retrenched or dismissed.

6. Yes.

### GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

640. **The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. Is the Government pursuing its policy of seconding Government employees to private enterprise?

2. Has the Government reached agreement with the trade union movement?

3. Are private contractors prepared to accept Government employees on temporary transfer?

4. What guarantees will be given to Government employees regarding—

- (a) continuity of employment;
- (b) wage maintenance; and
- (c) the payment of accrued annual, sick and long service leave?

5. Will the private contractor have the right to dismiss a transferred employee?

6. Will Government employees have the right to refuse to be transferred to private enterprise?

7. Will the seconded employee be returned to his previous occupation when finished with the private contractor?

7. Who will be responsible for leave credits while the secondment is in operation?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.
2. Not as yet.
3. to 8. These matters have not been finalised.

#### TRAFFIC SIGNALS

641. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

Will the Minister ensure the immediate upgrading of the traffic signals at the intersection of Grand Junction Road and Hampstead Road, Northfield and if not, why not?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The Highways Department has already commenced an investigation into the upgrading of the traffic signals at the intersection of Grand Junction Road and Hampstead Road, Northfield.

Upon completion of this investigation, consideration will be given to the upgrading of the traffic signals at the earliest opportunity, having regard to the resources available.

#### YATALA PRISON HOSPITAL

642. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Can the Minister advise when construction of the new hospital at Yatala Prison will commence and when it will be completed?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The project is to be referred to the Public Works Standing Committee and therefore there is no anticipated starting date, nor a projected construction period at this stage.

#### SPECIAL LEAVE

643. **Mr. O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: How many Government employees are currently being denied permission to take annual leave, long service leave and special leave on compassionate grounds, respectively, because of the Government's policy of staff reductions?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** Each individual department and instrumentality agrees with its employees the times at which annual, long service and special leave is taken.

#### "THE BROTHERHOOD OF THE SUN"

646. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Is the Chief Secretary aware of any activities in South

Australia on behalf of a religious cult known as "The Brotherhood of the Sun" that was described in the *Sunday Mail* of 9 February?

2. Has the "Sunburst" company associated with the Brotherhood engaged in any commercial activity in this State?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The replies are as follows:

1. There is no evidence to suggest that the religious cult known as "The Brotherhood of the Sun" is active in South Australia.

2. There is no evidence to suggest that the "Sunburst" company associated with the Brotherhood has been engaged in any commercial activity in South Australia.

#### DEMACS

647. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. Were Demacs unavailable to meet a request for four such units at a Ceduna school?

2. Was a decision accordingly made to remove four Demacs from Whyalla?

3. What difficulty was encountered in carrying out this removal?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. The buildings have not yet been moved. No particular difficulties are anticipated in their removal.

#### A.N.Z. BANK

648. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Is the Minister aware that it is the practice of the A.N.Z. Bank to charge a minimum fee of \$1 for conversion of small change into notes?

2. Is the Minister aware that a Mr. H. G. Sheppard of Edwardstown was charged a fee of \$1 for exchanging \$5 in coins into notes at the Edwardstown A.N.Z. Bank on 2 November 1979?

3. Is the Minister aware of a report in the *News* of 19 November 1979 concerning an elderly woman in the electorate of the Federal Liberal Member for Isaacs, who was charged a \$1 fee for cashing a \$10 cheque and a further 25 cents fee for a phone call made by a bank official who checked her account at a local branch?

4. Is the Minister aware of a report in the *Australian Financial Review* of 20 November 1979 that the A.N.Z. Banking Group toppled the Bank of N.S.W. as premier profit earner among private banks with a record net earning for 1978-79 of \$107 million?

5. Does the Minister propose to take any action to check on whether similar policies have been carried out by other banks and if it has not been previously the policy of the Bank of Adelaide, to ensure that it does not adopt this policy in future following its recent takeover by the A.N.Z. Bank?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. It is understood that it is a usual practice of the ANZ Bank to charge a fee for this service. The amount of the fee is left to the discretion of each Branch Manager.

2. It is understood that Mr. Sheppard did not proceed with the transaction on being advised that the fee for the service would be \$1.00.

3. Yes.
4. Yes.



5. Inquiries which have been made indicate that most private banks, including the Bank of Adelaide, charge a fee to convert small change into notes for anybody who is not a customer of that bank. The question of whether any fee is charged and the amount is usually left to the discretion of each Branch Manager.

#### LAND RECLAMATION

650. **Mr. ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Does the Minister propose to have an environmental impact study undertaken before the reclaiming of further land at Outer Harbor and if so, will he give consideration to the effects of such reclamation upon the mangrove and sea-grass growth between North Arm and Port Gawler?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** No. All the reclamation contemplated at this stage will be within boundary banks constructed several years ago. No further encroachment on mangroves or seabed is contemplated.

#### SCHOOL TEACHERS

651. **Mr. ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: In percentage terms, what is it anticipated will be the relative proportion of secondary teachers and of primary teachers amongst the new teachers to be employed over each of the next five years?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The anticipated proportion of primary and secondary teachers to be employed over the next five years are as follows:

	Primary (R-7) Per Cent	Secondary (8-12) Per Cent
1981.....	39	61
1982.....	37	63
1983.....	34	66
1984.....	40	60
1985.....	43	57

#### RAILWAY PLATFORM SIGNS

652. **Mr. ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Has the S.T.A. Rail Division adopted a policy to change station platform identification signs, as evidenced by the signs displayed at Chidda station and if so, will the Minister have a review undertaken so that consideration can be given to the installation in future of signs that are able to be quickly and easily read by train passengers?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The State Transport Authority is undertaking a review of station identification signs with a view to improving the standard of signs currently installed at metropolitan railway stations. The signs installed at Chidda are experimental and it is apparent from public reaction that they are not satisfactory. Further trials are proposed to ensure that an acceptable standard is achieved prior to carrying out any major alterations.

#### INCINERATORS

653. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What action is being taken or considered in regard to

controlling the hazard to the community of back-yard incinerators?

2. What is the Government policy on the onus of responsibility to seek redress in such cases where hazard occurs?

3. Does the Government accept the viewpoint that the onus should rest with the complainant or some independent authority such as the police or local council?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Consideration is being given to this matter, amongst others, in the drafting of new clean air legislation.

2. At the present time, the onus for seeking redress lies with the complainant.

3. Vide 1. above.

#### "LIFE. BE IN IT"

654. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice): asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What amount of money was allocated to the "Life. Be In It" programme in South Australia by the Federal and State Governments?

2. What amount of that money was spent on promotional advertising?

3. What amount of money was spent on staff salaries?

4. What amount was spent on "Life. Be In It" projects within the community?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Federal Government, \$32 000; State Government, \$42 419.

2. The Federal Government allocated an additional \$267 000 for radio and television advertising to purchase equal time for all States and Territories.

3. Federal Government funds, \$12 567; State Government funds, \$25 419.

4. Federal Government funds, \$19 433; State Government funds, \$14 000; Sponsorships, \$11 000.

The above figures relate to 1979-80.

#### MATRICULATION

655. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many matriculation courses have been offered in each of the years 1978 to 1980 at—

(a) the Salisbury branch; and

(b) the Elizabeth branch,

of the Elizabeth Community College?

2. How many courses are proposed to be offered at each branch in 1981?

3. Regarding the matriculation courses being offered in 1980 at the Salisbury branch, what are the average, largest and smallest class sizes?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1.

Year	Salisbury/Branch	Elizabeth/Branch
1978 . . . .	2 evening	13 day + 8 evening
1979 . . . .	2 evening	13 day + 7 evening
1980 . . . .		13 day + 7 evening

In 1980 there were only four enquiries for matriculation courses at the Salisbury branch. These four people have been accommodated in the Elizabeth branch.

2. The same number as offered in 1979, namely two at Salisbury branch, 20 at Elizabeth branch, depending on student demand and departmental resources.

3. There are no matriculation courses at the Salisbury branch in 1980 due to insufficient demand.

**DENTAL SCHOOL**

656. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What dental treatment facilities are available to the general public at the Dental School?
2. Who are eligible for free or subsidised services and what age limits apply for eligibility?
3. Are these free or subsidised facilities available to young people under the age of 18 who have left school but who are unable to find employment?
4. Are any changes anticipated to the spread of eligibility in the coming year?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The Dental School of the University of Adelaide provides staff and facilities for the teaching of undergraduate dental students. Treatment is only available as an adjunct to teaching and is provided in all fields of general dentistry.

The dental department of the Royal Adelaide Hospital provides treatment facilities in: Emergency relief of pain; Removable prosthodontics; Endodontics; Oral and Maxillofacial surgery; Conservative Dentistry; Orthodontics; Dental hygiene; Preventive dentistry.

2. A means test is applied to determine whether a patient is eligible for free or subsidised dental treatment. The assessment scales are based on earned income and not on age, except in the case of children under the age of 18 not living with their parents. These children are assessed on their own income status and not on that of their parents.

3. If the young people under the age of 18 who are unable to find employment are still living with their own families, eligibility for free or subsidised treatment will depend upon the parents' total income. If the children have left home they will be assessed on their separate income and not on that of their parents. Persons in receipt of unemployment benefits are eligible for free treatment upon production of a certificate of eligibility from the Department of Social Security.

**HEALTH EDUCATION**

657. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Which secondary schools are offering health education in 1980 as—
  - (a) a separate core subject;
  - (b) a separate elective subject; or
  - (c) as part of an integrated subject?
2. Which primary schools are offering health education in each of the categories?
3. What new schools are proposed to offer health education in 1981?
4. What is the estimated number of teachers trained in health education that will be required by those new schools?
5. How many teachers are presently involved in teaching health education at—
  - (a) the secondary level; and
  - (b) the primary level,
 and what is the equivalent number of full-time teachers teaching health education?
6. When is it proposed that all secondary and primary schools will be in a position to offer health education at one or more year levels to all students?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. It is not expected that there will be a significant

increase in the number of secondary schools offering health education during the 1980 school year. Some 60 secondary schools offered health education in 1979. It is expected that that number is being maintained. Because of the many alternative arrangements being used in schools, it is not possible to classify the schools into those offering health education as a core, elective or integrated study.

2. There has been a significant increase in the number of primary schools involved in the implementation of the new health education course. The most recent indication is that there will be 250 primary and junior primary schools involved in health education in 1980. It should also be noted that many other schools offer health education programmes even though they are not directly associated with the health education project.

3. At this stage of the year it is impossible to predict the trend for 1981. The matter of curriculum choice and implementation is very much a local matter. Most schools engage in planning for the following year in the second half of a year. Present indications are, if trends continue, that there will be significant increases in the number of primary schools (in particular) involved in health education.

4. In view of the uncertainty of school plans for 1981, the number of specifically trained health education teachers cannot be accurately estimated.

5. Because of the variety of ways in which health education is organised in individual schools, statistics on teachers teaching health education are not available. It is known that in excess of 320 teachers took some secondary health education classes in 1979. Data on primary schools are not available. In the majority of cases, however, class teachers are responsible for health education programmes. Some semi specialist teachers are involved in primary schools.

6. Schools may develop health education programmes as they are ready. Curriculum guidelines from reception to Year 12 are currently available. Teachers' handbooks for Years 4-10 are also available. It is planned to complete the writing of the remaining teachers' handbooks during this year. The decisions on date of implementation of curricula into schools are made at the local level. The members of the health education project team offer as much assistance as they can to schools developing health education programmes.

**VEHICLE SILENCING SYSTEMS**

658. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Has the Police Department recently run a check on vehicles, particularly motor cycles, operating with defective silencing systems in the Chitral Terrace/Cross Road area of South Plympton and, if not, are there any plans to do so?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** Apart from statewide enforcement programmes, no special attention has been paid to the location in question. As no complaints have been received from local residents, there are no plans to conduct a campaign against noisy vehicles in the area.

**NORTH HAVEN TRANSPORT**

659. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is it the intention of the Government to erect a road/rail P.S.G.R. interchange at North Haven and if so, when will the erection of this complex commence?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The provision of bus and rail services in the North Haven area is currently subject to

review. No decision has been taken on a bus/rail passenger interchange at North Haven.

### PUBLIC TRANSPORT

660. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is the S.T.A. considering the reduction of off peak rail and/or bus division suburban services and if so, when and what services will be cut?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** All services, peak and off-peak, are regularly reviewed and frequencies adjusted in line with passenger demand. On Sunday 2 March 1980 revised timetables came into effect on bus services in the south-western suburbs. Some of these services are linked through to areas such as Port Adelaide/Cheltenham and Blair Athol. The basic 12 minute interval day service to Glenelg previously provided two 24 minute services to Somerton and Graymore. This has been changed to three 36 minute interval services to extend the routes into an area not previously served. The evening and weekend frequencies have been widened from a 20 to 30 minute service which is consistent with the standard of service provided on similar routes.

In June 1980, the State Transport Authority proposes to adjust the timetable of services on the North Gawler rail route to provide a more regular service, but the average frequency during off-peak times will not be reduced. Because of the connection between bus and rail services at Elizabeth and Salisbury, there will be some slight changes to bus timetables.

### S.T.A STAFF

661. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is it the intention of the S.T.A. to reduce the number of "made available" staff within that authority and, if so, how many employees will be involved and when and over what period will these reductions take place?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The State Transport Authority makes every effort on a continuing basis to improve its efficiency. Such efforts could lead to the employment of fewer personnel. This applies to staff "made available" to the authority by the Australian National Railways Commission as well as to directly employed personnel. Efficiency improvements are made from time to time as part of an on-going programme and the numbers of personnel involved cannot be predicted.

### RAIL SERVICES

663. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Have the A.N.R.C. and S.T.A. managements met on a regular or irregular basis to discuss the rail operations in South Australia and if so—

- (a) are the meetings on a formal or informal basis;
- (b) where and when do these meetings take place; and

(c) what has been the outcome of these meetings, and if not, are there any proposals to implement such meetings and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows: The General Managers of the State Transport Authority and the Australian National Railways Commission meet on a regular basis to discuss matters relating to the separation of the metropolitan and non-metropolitan railway systems.

Regular meetings are also held between personnel

officers of the commission and the authority to discuss matters relating to the secondment of employees from the commission for the administration, maintenance and operation of the metropolitan railways.

The venue of these meetings alternates between the offices of the commission and the authority. The meetings have led to a better understanding of matters of mutual concern in the management area.

### DEBONDOX

664. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Has the Minister investigated the medical use of the drug "Debondox" and its use by pregnant women and if so, what were the results and if not, will the Minister have the necessary investigations into the use of this drug carried out and if not, why not?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. The Australian Drug Evaluation Committee has repeatedly reviewed all available data on Debendox to establish whether any birth defect link exists. It has examined data submitted to the committee by an Australian expert in the field of drug induced birth defects, and has also kept abreast of the latest information available from the U.S. Food & Drug Administration. The use of the drug is also monitored in South Australia seeking evidence of any associated birth defects. The results of these investigations overseas and at Commonwealth and State level have not produced any conclusive evidence that Debendox produces birth defects. The Health authorities will continue to keep the situation under review.

### RAIL CAR CAPACITIES

665. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What are the seating capacities of the following classifications of S.T.A. rail cars and the number of units in each classification—

- (a) 300 class;
- (b) 400 class;
- (c) 820 class;
- (d) 860 class;
- (e) 2000 class; and
- (f) 2100 class?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The seating capacities of the State Transport Authority's rail cars and the number of units in each classification are as follows:

	No. Vehicles	No. Seats/Vehicle
(a)	61	91
	12	84
(b)	20	80
	17	78
(c)	withdrawn from service	
(d)	24	56
(e)	12 on order	64
(f)	18 on order	106

To date only one 2000 class and two 2100 class railcars have been delivered to the authority and are in traffic.

### PUBLIC TRANSPORT

666. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

- 1. Is it S.T.A.'s policy or "accepted practice for an

appreciable percentage of commuters" to have to stand on the bus and/or rail division services during peak hours?

2. Does the Minister agree with this practice and, if so why, and if not, will the Minister direct the S.T.A. to take the necessary steps to overcome this problem and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The State Transport Authority's policy on standard of service is that all long distance passengers should be provided with a seat. For short journeys, the standard of peak services is based on an 80 per cent utilisation of rollingstock capacity. Schedules are prepared on the basis of an average peak load on buses of 64 (46 seated and 18 standing) and on suburban rail cars an average of 100 (86 seated and 14 standing).

2. It is considered that the provision of a seat for all short distance travellers could not be economically justified.

### PRISON FACILITIES

668. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many cells in the following prisons have no natural light source—

- (a) Adelaide Goal;
- (b) Yatala Labour Prison;
- (c) Cadell Prison Farm;
- (d) Port Augusta Prison; and
- (e) Mount Gambier Goal?

2. How often are such cells used and what would be the longest period that an individual prisoner would be assigned to such a cell?

3. What efforts are being undertaken to ensure that such cells will not be used in future?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The replies are as follows:

- 1. (a) Adelaide Goal—nil.
- (b) Yatala Labour Prison—six.
- (c) Cadell Prison Farm—nil.
- (d) Port Augusta Prison—nil
- (e) Mount Gambier Goal—nil.

2. No specific records are kept on the use of the cells as they are used for emergency accommodation only. Inmates who occupy the cells are moved as soon as possible unless they elect to remain.

3. It is not planned to discontinue the use of these cells, unless the Medical Officer advises against their use.

### AUSTRALPASS

669. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the S.T.A. Rail Division participate in the scheme known as "Australpass" and if so—

- (a) from what date did the scheme commence;
- (b) from what date did S.T.A. become involved;
- (c) what revenue-sharing arrangement has been made for it to recoup part of the proceeds from sales of such passes; and
- (d) what contributions does it make towards the costs of promotion of such passes?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** "Australpass" is available only to overseas visitors to Australia. "Australpass" is a scheme introduced by Railways of Australia. Railways of Australia is an organisation established by several State Railway systems and its activities are largely directed to matters of an intersystem character. The State Railway systems (excepting the S.T.A.), A.N.R. and New Zealand

participate in Railways of Australia. The authority was a member until the declared date of the transfer of the non-metropolitan railways to A.N.R.

### SALISBURY LAND

670. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Who were the registered titleholders of the various allotments of land in the area bounded by Park Terrace, Wiltshire Street and Commercial Road, Salisbury as at 30 June 1979?

2. Who were the registered titleholders as at 19 February 1980?

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** All relevant details on registered titleholders is available to the public at the Lands Titles Office.

### SALISBURY HERITAGE

672. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. What buildings or sites within the electorate of Salisbury have been included in the State Heritage list?

2. What buildings have been nominated for inclusion and are still receiving consideration?

3. How many buildings that have been included in the Heritage list, or are under consideration for inclusion, or that are of architectural or historic interest (but not part of the list) would be demolished if—

- (a) the overpass connecting Salisbury Highway with Gawler Street; and
- (b) the proposed shopping centre development on Wiltshire Street, Salisbury, were to proceed and which actual buildings on the list, or nominated for inclusion, would remain if both projects were to proceed?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Within the electorate of Salisbury the following items have been gazetted as items proposed for the Register of State Heritage Items:

- Corporation of the City of Enfield:
  - Administration Building—Yatala Labour Prison, Northfield "A" Division Cell Block—Yatala Labour Prison, Northfield Former "A" Division Guards Quarters—Yatala Labour Prison, Northfield
  - District Council of Munno Para:
    - Old Bridge—Heaslip Road, Angle Vale

2. Information concerning buildings under consideration is confidential until such time as it is published in the *Government Gazette* and the press in an Interim Heritage List. Owners are advised by letter at the same time as the list is published.

3. There are no buildings in the area of these proposals which are included on the Heritage list.

As indicated in the answer to part 2 of this question, information concerning buildings under consideration is confidential.

### BOATING SUMMONSES

673. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: How many summonses were issued under section 27 of the Boating Act, 1974-1978 in each of the years 1974-75 to 1978-79 and in the period 1 July 1979 to date?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** 1974-5, Nil; 1975-6, 9; 1976-7, 32; 1977-8, 18; 1978-9, 32; 1 July 1979 to date, 8.

### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST

674. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: How many termination of tenancy notices were issued in the past year to tenants of South Australian Housing Trust houses and flats and what were the reasons for the notices?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** No "Terminations of tenancy" have been issued to tenants of trust houses. However, during the past 12 months two "Termination of tenancy" notices have been issued to Aboriginal tenants occupying houses funded under the States Grants (Aboriginal Assistance) Housing Agreement. In both cases alternative arrangements have been made: in one case a transfer to alternative accommodation has resolved the problem and in the other the tenant is satisfactorily complying with the "Conditions of tenancy". "Termination of tenancy" notices are issued in respect of 'Funded' houses at the request of the Aboriginal Housing Board of South Australia Inc.

### COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTRE

675. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: When will the Government make a decision on the submission for a Community Health Centre in Elizabeth, prepared by Women in the Community—Elizabeth in August 1979?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The submission from the Women's Community Health Group Inc. for a Women's Community Health Centre in Elizabeth, prepared by Women in the Community—Elizabeth was sent as a preliminary submission to the previous Minister of Health in August 1979. The submission has been noted within the South Australian Health Commission and will be considered with all other known community health proposals for the northern metropolitan region when requests for new developments for 1980-81 are considered.

### ADELAIDE-NORTH GAWLER LINE

676. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Why does the 4.35 p.m. train on the Adelaide-North Gawler line not stop at Elizabeth?

2. Will the Minister take steps to correct this and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The 4.35 p.m. train has been loaded to capacity for many years and has never been scheduled to stop at Elizabeth. However, the 4.43 p.m. does stop at this station.

2. The North Gawler line rail services are being revised effective from June 1980 and the new timetables provide for the 4.35 p.m. train from Adelaide to stop at Elizabeth.

### HOSPITAL FINANCE

677. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many recognised hospitals and Government nursing homes requested additional finance from the Government as a result of the 1979-80 Budget allocation?

2. What were the reasons given for refusal in each of those cases where additional finance was not provided?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Fifty-four (54) recognised hospitals and nursing homes initially requested additional finance following the 1979-80 Budget allocation.

2. The reasons for not providing additional finance varied with each hospital but, in general, additional finance was not provided because, within the funds available, the hospital was unable to substantiate a claim for additional funds in the light of the services it provides and its costs compared with similar hospitals.

### HOSPITAL STAFF

678. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Are any staff employed in Government hospitals at present unable to take annual or long service leave and, if so, how many and what steps are being taken to rectify the situation?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I am not aware of any staff employed at Government hospitals who are at present unable to take annual or long service leave. It is possible, however, that from time to time there may be circumstances dictated by the requirements of the hospital or health services when employees may not be able to take annual or long service leave at a particular time.

For this reason, staff should understand that they should not enter into commitments on the assumption that annual or long service leave can be granted at a specific time, without first obtaining verification from their employer.

### RAPE CRISIS CENTRE

679. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: When will the Government make a decision regarding future funding of the Adelaide Rape Crisis Centre?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The Rape Crisis Centre is a project funded under the community health programme which is cost-shared with the Federal Government. Budget estimates for 1980-81 have been received from the Rape Crisis Centre and will be considered with estimates for other community health projects in the next few months.

### CHRISTIES BEACH CENTRE

680. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: When will the Government make a decision to appoint a Director at the Christies Beach Community Health Centre and why has there been such a delay in the appointment?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The South Australian Health Commission has been negotiating with the Interim Committee of Management of the Christies Beach Community Health Centre and assisting it to formally identify its requirements for an appropriately classified position to satisfy its administrative requirements at the health centre. The submission was received on Tuesday 26 February 1980 and is receiving immediate attention.

### ON-FARM TRAINING

681. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many students are currently enrolled in the Department of Further Education on-farm training scheme and in which areas?

2. What approaches have been made to the Minister to expand these courses and what has been the Government response?

3. What plans has the Government for making the scheme more widely available?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. It is anticipated that a total of 84 students will be enrolled in the Certificate in Farm Practice course aimed at training young farmers and incorporating elements of on-farm work. This course offered by the Department of Further Education will operate in up to four localities in 1980-81, as follows:

1. Eyre Peninsula Community College—scheme located in Cummins area, 24 students.
2. South-East Community College—scheme located in Kangaroo Inn area, 12 students.
3. Murray Bridge Community College—scheme located in Lameroo-Pinaroo area. Subject to recruitment of a suitable lecturer, 24 students will be offered places.
4. Riverland Community College—scheme located in Berri-Loxton area; enrolments not finalised but 24 students will be accepted.

2. To the best of my knowledge there have been approaches from two other areas where committees have been formed to establish schemes: these Mid North (Burra-Gladstone area) and Tatiara (Bordertown-Keith area).

The response has been that:

- (a) the experience gained from offering four schemes in 1980-81 will be invaluable in the development of further schemes.
  - (b) the resources directed to the Certificate in Farm Practice are limited and will be deployed around the State as the need arises.
3. See 2. (b) above.

### BUSKING

682. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. Is the Government aware that the City of Adelaide recently lost an appeal in the Supreme Court over an attempt to prosecute the Hare Krishna sect for soliciting donations of money in Rundle Mall?

2. Has the Government had any approaches to amend the Local Government Act either to strengthen or weaken it with respect to controlling such activities and, in any event, does it intend to so legislate and with what object in view?

3. What generally is the Government's attitude toward busking or any other form of money raising in Rundle Mall?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.
2. No. The council has since revoked the invalid by-law and made a new by-law which it believes will adequately deal with the matter.
3. The Government does not oppose busking or other forms of money raising in the mall, provided the necessary approvals of the relevant authorities are obtained.

### URANIUM ROYALTIES

684. **The Hon. R. G. PAYNE** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier:

1. What value of royalty is estimated to be received by the Mines Department from the mining and marketing of

uranium from South Australia for each of the years 1979-80 to 1982-83?

2. What State taxes and charges are expected to be able to be reduced, or held at current levels, because of increased State revenue from such royalties, for the same years?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The replies are as follows:

1. Until the companies concerned have completed their feasibility studies and have determined rates of production and recovery, it is premature to place a value on royalty that might be returned to the State through the mining of uranium in the future. There will be no production of uranium this financial year.

2. It is too early to speculate on any changes in State taxes and charges at that time.

### SPORTING ACCIDENTS

685. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Has the Minister's office received any representations (by letter, telephone call or in person) from members of the Sports Medicine Federation concerned accidents in places of public entertainment such as roller skating rinks?

2. Does the Minister propose any action to minimise the likelihood of accidents of this nature in places of public entertainment?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. I am not aware of any representations.
2. Refer Question on Notice No. 686.

### PUBLIC ENTERTAINMENT

686. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Is the Minister aware of accidents occurring in places of public entertainment, particularly roller and ice skating rinks, for which adequate preventive measures have not been taken?

2. Did a participant receive a neck injury at the "Downtown" roller skating rink in the city on Sunday 24 February and, if so, was this person left unattended for some time, what treatment was provided and what are the likely recovery prospects of the person concerned?

3. What action is proposed by the Minister to ensure that such places of public entertainment meet adequate safety standards and provide adequate treatment facilities?

4. Will any amendments be made to the Places of Public Entertainment Act that may be required?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The replies are as follows:

1. Accidents do occur in skating rinks but this is inherent in many sporting activities. In the seven roller skating and one ice skating rink licensed in South Australia pursuant to the provisions of the Places of Public Entertainment Act, the safety standards, supervision and first-aid facilities are considered adequate by the Inspector of Places of Public Entertainment.

2. Licensees are not obliged by the Act to report such accidents. No details of any accident that may have occurred at the *Downtown* roller skating rink on Sunday 24 February 1980 are available.

3. See 1. above.

4. Amendments to the Places of Public Entertainment Act or regulations in respect of skating rinks are not

contemplated at this time. Additional controls will be considered if a need is demonstrated.

#### URANIUM

687. **The Hon. R. G. PAYNE** (on notice) asked the Premier: During the Premier's visit to Japan in April, this year, are any discussions to be held concerning the mining, marketing or processing of uranium in South Australia?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Yes.

#### DIALYSIS

688. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Has there been any reduction in the use of dialysis machines at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital since September 1979 and, if so:—

- (a) what has been the cause of the reduction;
- (b) by how many hours per week; and
- (c) how many patients are affected?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The number of patients using dialysis machines at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital in September, 1979 was 46, and in February, 1980, 42—a net reduction of four.

Regarding paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) The number of such patients fluctuates for a variety of reasons, and during the past six months eight kidney transplants were performed (a higher than usual number) and eight patients were transferred to the Home Dialysis Programme. During that same period, the renal unit received 16 new patients, and consequently normal hours have been maintained in the use of the dialysis machines.

#### TAR BABIES

689. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Which was the school in the Salisbury area referred to in the *Sunday Mail* of 17 February 1980 in the article entitled "Tar babies", which alleged that laying of bitumen work was done in such a manner and at such a time that resulted in some children being bespattered with bitumen?

2. Are steps being taken to see that, in future, work of this nature will be undertaken when children are not in the immediate vicinity or during vacation periods?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The school in question was Salisbury West Primary School. Information from the school Principal indicates that, contrary to the press report, no children were bespattered with bitumen. There have been no known complaints from parents to the school Principal, the Regional Director of Education or to the Education Department. Spraying was very carefully controlled and barricades were in place which prevented any person approaching the spraying area. The newly-sprayed areas were spread with dry topping by workmen following within a few metres of the spray. The principal has commended the co-operation of the contractors concerned.

2. The planning of new schools should allow sufficient time for bitumenizing to be completed before occupation. While every effort is made to ensure that this occurs, and delay at any stage during construction that cannot be made up, means that final work such as bitumenizing is delayed.

#### SALISBURY SHOPS

690. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Does the shopping centre proposed to be built on Wiltshire Street, Salisbury, comply with the spirit and actual proposals of the December 1979 discussion paper on The Control of Retail and Centres Development in Metropolitan Adelaide?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The Wiltshire Street area between Commercial Road, Park Terrace and Wiltshire Street, is considered to be part of the John Street District Centre designated on the Salisbury Centres Supplementary Development Plan authorised on 19 September 1979 and shown on map 1, attachment 2 of the discussion paper. A shopping proposal within the Wiltshire Street area would therefore be in accordance with the spirit and actual proposals of the discussion paper.

#### SALISBURY CENTRES

691. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of the Environment: In relation to the "three smaller centres to serve the Salisbury area" referred to as replacing "the proposed district centre at Parafield" in the December 1979 discussion paper on "The Control of Retail and Centres Development in Metropolitan Adelaide":

- (a) where are these three centres;
- (b) what floor area are they proposed to consist of;
- (c) will they be classified as "District Centres", "Neighbourhood Centres" or "Local Centres"; and
- (d) when is it proposed that these centres will be built, if they do not already exist; or when will they be at their maximum desirable floor area if they already exist in part?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

- (a) John Street, Salisbury. Ingle Farm, southern corner of Montague Road and Walkleys Road, Parafield Gardens, southern corner of Kings Road and Martins Road.
- (b) No floor area stipulated in the Salisbury Centres S.D.P.
- (c) District Centres.
- (d) John Street and Ingle Farm already exist. No definite plans to develop Parafield Gardens at present. No maximum desirable floor area set for the centres.

#### COMMUNITY HEALTH

692. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of the Environment:

1. Further to the answer to part (b) of question number 458 relating to community health and associated programmes and domiciliary services, is the Minister now able to provide further information regarding reduction of services to the community?

2. Since November 1979:

- (a) have there been any staff retrenchments; and
- (b) have the views of the management committees regarding effects on services to patients been received by the Government?

3. If services to patients have been cut, what action does the Government intend to take?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The overall level of health services has been maintained.

2. (a) There have been no staff retrenchments. Retrenchment of staff is contrary to Government policy.  
 (b) Yes. Where appropriate, supplementary allocations have been made in light of the views expressed by boards.  
 3. Not applicable.

- (a) Four requests were received.  
 (b) The St. John Ambulance Association and the Royal Flying Doctor Service received extra finance.

### MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

693. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Further to the answer to part (b) of question number 456 relating to mental health services, is the Minister now able to provide information regarding reduction of services to the community?

2. Since November 1979:

- (a) have there been any staff retrenchments; and,  
 (b) have the views of the hospital boards regarding effects on services to patients been received by the Government?

3. If services to patients have been cut, what action does the Government intend to take?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The overall level of health services has been maintained.

2. (a) There have been no staff retrenchments. Retrenchment of staff is contrary to Government policy.

(b) Yes. Where appropriate, supplementary allocations have been made in light of the views expressed by boards.

3. Not applicable.

### HOSPITAL SERVICES

694. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Further to the answer to part (b) of question number 434 relating to recognised hospitals and nursing homes, is the Minister now able to provide further information regarding effects on service to patients?

2. Since November 1979—

- (a) have there been any staff retrenchments; and  
 (b) have the views of the hospital boards regarding effects on services to patients been received by the Government?

3. If services to patients have been cut, what action does the Government intend to take?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The overall level of health services has been maintained.

2. (a) There have been no staff retrenchments. Retrenchment of staff is contrary to Government policy.

(b) Yes. Where appropriate supplementary allocations have been made in light of the views expressed by boards.

3. Not applicable.

### FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS

695. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Further to the answer to part (c) of question number 455—

(a) how many requests for minor adjustments were received by the Government; and

(b) what institutions were successful in obtaining extra finance?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

### ROAD WIDENING

696. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is it intended to purchase properties or portions of properties in the following streets as part of a road widening programme—

(a) Trimmer Parade—between Tapleys Hill Road, Seaton and Findon Road, Findon; and

(b) Fife Street—between Findon Road and Ledger Road, Woodville,

and, if so, how many properties will be involved, what is the number of properties to be purchased in each street, when does the Government intend purchasing these properties and what is the width of the road widening which the programme entails?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** Regarding Trimmer Parade, Seaton, the Metropolitan Adelaide Road Widening Plan indicates that Trimmer Parade may be widened in the future. However, the Highways Department has no present proposal to widen Trimmer Parade, nor does it intend to do so in the foreseeable future. Should it be necessary to proceed with road widening, 139 properties would be involved. The department is not seeking to acquire any properties, but, if a landowner requests that his property be acquired and provides evidence that he would suffer hardship if acquisition does not take place, the Highways Department will negotiate for its purchase.

In relation to Fife Street, Woodville South, the Highways Department has no proposal for widening Fife Street, which is a matter for consideration by the Corporation of the City of Woodville.

### WOODVILLE ROAD

697. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Has the Government had any discussions or negotiations with the Woodville council in relation to closing Woodville Road between Findon Road and Port Road, Woodville, and, if so, what is the intention behind the closure?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to use this land as a car park for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital complex and, if so, when will this closure take place and will any properties or portions of properties be purchased which front the aforementioned road?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The Government has no plans to close Woodville Road between Findon Road and Port Road, Woodville. The road is under the care, control and management of the Corporation of the City of Woodville and any questions relating to its closure should be directed to council.

### FOOTBALL PARK LAND

698. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Has the Government entered into negotiations or discussions with the Woodville council with respect to selling to, or handing over to, the council that portion of land abutting Football Park and currently owned by the Public Buildings Department and if so, why, and, will the Government receive any remuneration from the sale or



handing over of this land and if so, how much?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** At this stage officers of the Public Buildings Department have only had preliminary discussions with the Town Clerk of the City of Woodville concerning this land. Any further consideration will depend on the corporation's response to these discussions.

### WORD PROCESSING

700. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Will members be provided with summaries of papers delivered at the seminar "Technology and employment—the word processing perspective" held at the Education Centre on 27 February?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** This seminar was conducted by the Adelaide Word Processing Association Incorporated, and requests for papers should be directed to the association.

### TOURISM ADVISORY COMMITTEE

701. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What are the names of the members of the Tourism Advisory Committee?

2. How many working parties drawn from members of the committee are at present considering issues of current and long-term relevance to the promotion and development of tourism, who are the persons on each working party, and how many additional members are likely to be co-opted to the working parties?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON** The replies are as follows:

1.

Name	Organisation
G. F. Joselin (Chairman)	Department of Tourism
G. L. Mewett	Ansett Airlines of Australia
R. J. Heath	State Transport Authority
J. S. Kew	Trans Australia Airlines
R. H. Waters	Royal Automobile Association
G. Alderman	Bus Proprietors Association
D. Roberts	Australian Federation of Travel Agents
W. F. Connelly	Australian Hotels Association
C. W. Smith	Motor Inns and Motels Association
P. E. Masters	Australian National Railways Commission
H. Dowling	Association of Regional Tourist Organisations
R. H. Davis	Caravan Parks Association
L. Connelly	Airlines of South Australia
K. Adams	Local Government Association
D. M. Crinion (Secretary)	Department of Tourism

2. The committee has four current working parties, as shown below. It is not possible to say how many additional members are likely to be co-opted to these groups.

Working Party	Representation
1. Accommodation	Australian Hotels Association Motor Inns and Motels Association Royal Automobile Association Caravan Parks Association.
2. Transport	Ansett Airlines of Australia State Transport Authority Bus Proprietors Association Australian National Railways Commission

3. Regional

Development . . . . . Association of Regional Tourist Organisations  
Local Government Association  
Australian Federation of Travel Agents

4. Promotion . . . . .

Trans Australia Airlines  
Australian Federation of Travel Agents  
Department of Tourism.

### LONSDALE RAMP

707. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice): What is the current position on the projected boat launching facility in the Lonsdale area?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The present position is that the Noarlunga council has prepared a submission for a sheltered boat launching facility in the Lonsdale area, and has asked for an indication of the Government's financial support for the project. The Government is currently considering its role in the provision of recreational boating facilities.

### SCHOOL DENTAL CLINICS

708. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Will the measures set out in part 3 of the Minister's answer to question number 510 in fact discharge the commitment made in the answer to question number 33?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Yes. With the resources now in operation it is anticipated that the School Dental Service will be able to provide dental care to all primary schoolchildren by the end of 1980.

### MORPHETTVILLE RACECOURSE

709. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Has the Government given a guarantee to the South Australian Jockey Club on the rebuilding of the grandstand at the Morphettville Racecourse and if so—

- what is the amount of the guarantee;
- what are the conditions of the guarantee; and
- was the guarantee considered by the South Australian Development Corporation or the Industries Development Committee?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** No.

### SECONDMENTS

710. **Mr. WHITTEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

- How many employees have been seconded from Government departments to private employers?
- What trades have been involved with the secondments?
- Have there been any dismissals because of refusals to accept secondments?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The replies are as follows:

- None.
- See No. 1.
- No.

### H.C. MEYER

711. **Mr. WHITTEN** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Has an evaluation of the hull and machinery of the dredge *H.C. Meyer* been completed and has any decision been made concerning the future of the dredge?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The evaluation of the hull and machinery of the dredge *H.C. Meyer* is still being carried out.

**A.D. VICTORIA**

712. **Mr. WHITTEN** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: What is the cost of the replacement dredge that is being chartered to enable dredging of the Port River to proceed?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The cost of the bare-boat charter of the bucket dredge *A.D. Victoria* for six months will be \$472 160.

**HOME OF INCURABLES**

713. **Mr. WHITTEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What arrangements, if any, have been made to reopen the 204-bed west block at the Home for Incurables?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** In the present situation of major financial constraint, it has not been possible to allocate funds to commission the west block during the present financial year. However, this matter is being kept under review.

**PASSENGER LUGGAGE**

715. **The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Government support the carriage on the metropolitan railway system of passenger luggage such as—

- (a) wheel-chairs;
- (b) prams and pushers; and
- (c) bicycles,

and if so, will the Minister ensure that sufficient accommodation is made available on all trains and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The Government supports the carriage on the metropolitan railway system of wheelchairs, prams and pushers and bicycles. Steps are being taken to provide reasonable accommodation for these items on all trains.

**AUSTRALIAN RAIL**

720. **The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Will the Minister instruct the State Transport Authority to enter into consultations with the Australian Railways Union on all matters affecting members of that organisation and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** A close liaison exists between the State Transport Authority and the Australian Railway Union, and constant contact is maintained with the State Secretary and other officers of the union. It is the policy of the authority that there be a high level of consultation with the Australian Railways Union on all matters which may affect it.

**PAY-ROLL TAX SCHEME**

722. **The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Can the Minister give an assurance that the Payroll Tax Scheme providing employment for persons under 21 years of age has not been responsible for transferring unemployment to older groups?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** There is no scheme relating to persons aged 21 years, only for those under 20 years. Because of the multitude of variables affecting unemploy-

ment levels, it is practically impossible to predict what effect such a scheme will have on employment levels of older groups.

**NOW THE CHIPS ARE DOWN**

723. **The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. Why is the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment no longer distributing the film *Now the Chips are Down*?

2. When was that decision made?

3. What, if any, new arrangements have been made to make the film available to the community?

4. When was or when will the film be passed to the new distributor?

5. If there has been a delay in putting the new distribution arrangements into operation, what is the reason for it?

6. How many bookings have been made for the film?

7. How long in advance would a borrower have to make a booking for the film in order to borrow it?

8. If the demand for the film has meant a waiting time of more than one week, will the Minister take steps to make more copies of the film available and if not, why not?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The replies are as follows:

1. The department's copy of the film was continuously being damaged and as the South Australian Film Corporation has two copies for loan and the facilities to ensure that the films are kept in a good state of repair, it was decided at the end of last year to restrict the Department's film to internal departmental use only.

2. to 8. See No. 1.

**MINISTERS' OFFICES**

724. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How many persons are employed in the Premier's office?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** See answers to Question 115 and 192 given on 23rd October, 1979, and 19th February, 1980.

725. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How many persons are employed in the Treasurer's office?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** See answers to questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

726. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How many persons are employed in the office of the Minister of State Development?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** See answers to questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

727. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How many persons are employed in the office of the Minister of Ethnic Affairs?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** See answers to questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February, 1980.

728. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** will ask the Deputy Premier:

1. How many persons are employed in the office of the Minister of Mines and Energy?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** See answers to questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

729. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. How many persons are employed in the Minister's office?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** See answers to questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

730. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. How many persons are employed in the office of the Minister of Public Works?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of ministerial officer?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** See answers to questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

731. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many persons are employed in the Minister's office?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** See answers to questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

732. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many persons are employed in the office of the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed, or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Minister officer?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** See answers to questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

733. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many persons are employed in the Attorney-General's office?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** See answers to questions 115

and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

734. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked Minister of Education:

1. How many persons are employed in the office of the Minister of Corporate Affairs?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** See answers to question 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

735. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many persons are employed in the office of the Minister of Fisheries?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** See answers to questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

736. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many persons are employed in the office of the Minister of Marine?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** See answers to questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

737. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. How many persons are employed in the Minister's office?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial Officer?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** See answers to questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

738. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. How many persons are employed in the office of the Minister of Forests?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** See answers to questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

739. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. How many persons are employed in the Minister's office?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** See answers to questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

740. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. How many persons are employed in the office of the Minister of Planning?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or,

in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** See answers to questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

741. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. How many persons are employed in the office of the Minister of Local Government?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** See answers to questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

742. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. How many persons are employed in the office of the Minister of Arts?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** See answers to questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

743. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many persons are employed in the Minister's office?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** See answers to questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

744. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many persons are employed in the office of the Minister of Recreation and Sport?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** See answers to questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

745. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many persons are employed in the Minister's office?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** See answers to questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

746. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many persons are employed in the office of the Minister of Tourism?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** See answers to questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

747. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the

Minister of Health:

1. How many persons are employed in the office of the Minister of Consumer Affairs?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** See answers to questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

748. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. How many persons are employed in the Minister's office?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** See answers to questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

749. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. How many persons are employed in the office of the Minister of Irrigation?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** See answers to questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

750. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. How many persons are employed in the office of the Minister of Lands?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** See answers to questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

751. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. How many persons are employed in the office of the Minister of Repatriation?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** See answers to questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

752. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. How many persons are employed in the office of the Minister of Housing?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service Classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** See answers to questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

753. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many persons are employed in the office of the Minister of Community Welfare?

2. What are the names of the officers and what is the Public Service classification in which each is employed or, in the case of Ministerial contract employees, the grade of Ministerial officer?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** See answers to

questions 115 and 192 given on 23 October 1979 and 19 February 1980.

754. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is the Federal Government currently evaluating sites for a major airport in the Two Wells and Virginia area?

2. Are there plans to extend the main Adelaide Airport runway for Boeing 727 operations?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. No. State Commonwealth officers have held a meeting with a view to setting up a State Airfields Committee. That committee will investigate alternative sites for a major airport in the Virginia and Two Wells area.

2. Present information is that the main runway at Adelaide Airport will be extended in a south-westerly direction to give an increase in effective take-off length of 90 metres, which will be used by Boeing 727 aircraft for lining up on the runway prior to take-off.

### CARPET

756. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What A.S.A. standards are applicable to domestic carpet as sold by retail stores?

2. What standards are applicable to the laying of domestic carpet?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. There are three Standards Association of Australia (SAA) standards that include domestic carpet within their scope.

(i) AS 1385-1973 Metric Units for Carpet Measurements and Carpet.

(ii) AS 2119-1978 Method for Sampling and cutting Specimens of Textile Floor Coverings for Testing.

(iii) AS 2111.1 to AS 2111.17—1978 Methods of Test for Floor Coverings.

2. The SAA has a draft standard dealing with the laying of carpets. This has not yet been finalised.

### FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

758. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Is it the practice of the Physiotherapy Section of the Flinders Medical Centre to give priority to patients covered by private funds and to defer pensioner patients for up to a week and, if so, would this policy still apply if the Casualty Section had deemed a case to be of some urgency?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** No. It may have been that there was a waiting time, for all classes of patients, of one week.

### HOSPITAL ASSAULT

759. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Was a nurse, employed at the Royal Adelaide Hospital sexually assaulted when leaving the hospital at night a few weeks ago, and if so—

(a) when was the Minister informed of the assault;

(b) was the assault suppressed from the media and, if so, who requested the suppression, who authorised it and were the police advised of the suppression;

(c) what steps are being taken to protect nurses leaving the hospital late at night; and

(d) what steps are being taken to ensure that those nurses leaving the hospital late at night are allocated parking spaces close to the Hospital?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** No report has been received of a sexual assault on a member of the nursing staff.

(a) not applicable;

(b) not applicable;

(c) depending upon availability of medical orderly staff, which is determined by pressure of activity in the Casualty Department, escorts can be provided for nursing staff who wish to travel to the North Car Park late at night;

(d) nursing staff are permitted to bring their vehicles to the main Hospital Car Park on North Terrace after 5 p.m. Many avail themselves of this facility.

### S.A. HOSPITALS

760. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Is the Government still committed to its policy of autonomy for South Australian hospitals and if not, how has the policy changed?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Yes, subject to statutory constraints.

### HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

763. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Has the Minister or his Department received any recent requests that the present system of transporting handicapped children to school by bus be replaced by taxis, and if so, who made this request, what has been the Government's response, and what are the reasons for that response?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The Education Department has received requests that mini buses be replaced by taxis for the transport of handicapped children. Requests were made by parent organisations associated with the Townsend House School and the Brighton Speech and Hearing Centre. Departmental officers are investigating the requests, the practicability and the cost involved. However, at this time no decisions have been made other than to watch closely the extension of the bus service where children would be required to be too long travelling to and from their schools.

### HEARING-IMPAIRED CHILDREN

764. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Is the Minister aware that there is concern among the parents of hearing-impaired children that vocational opportunities for girls so afflicted are very limited?

2. Are such girls in fact given the same range of options as boys in vocational training and, if not, what plans are in hand to rectify this problem?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. I am not aware of any currently expressed concern of this kind, although it would be entirely reasonable if it existed. Generally, vocational opportunities are not good for any young people, and apparently worse for girls.

2. There are four High Schools at which Speech and Hearing Centres have been established. At each, hearing

impaired students are offered the same work experience programmes as hearing students. Craft subjects are available equally to boys and girls, hearing and hearing impaired.

**DEAF CHILDREN**

765. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Does the Education Department accept that oral/aural methods of training for deaf children need to be carried on into their secondary schooling?

2. What approaches have been made to the Government for the setting up of secondary speech and hearing centres, what has been the Government's response and what are the reasons for that response?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. Where Children have been educated in the oral/aural methodology, it is essential that that option continue for as long as possible.

2. One approach has been made to the Government on that specific issue. A number of other approaches have been made at various levels in the Department. In addition, approaches have been made from time to time for an alternative proposal—i.e. the provision of adequate specialist teacher support for hearing impaired children in their neighbourhood schools. This matter has been under active consideration by officers of the special education section.

**TEACHER HOUSING**

767. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Is the Minister aware of the contents of Mr. John Gregory's letter of 22 November 1979 addressed to the Hon. D. J. Killen?

2. Has the Government made its own representations to the Hon. Mr. Killen on this matter and, if so, what is the result of those representations and, if not, why not?

3. Does the Government regard the teacher housing position at Woomera as currently satisfactory and, if not, what changes would it like to see?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. No. The letter was a carbon copy endorsed "copy to Mr. Allison", and involved a request to the Commonwealth Minister of Defence from the President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers for a waiving of certain lodging charges incurred by two teachers in Commonwealth controlled accommodation at Woomera.

3. Yes. There were initial difficulties, particularly amongst teachers without dependants. However, the situation has improved. The Regional Director of Education, Northern Region is not aware of any current difficulties that may exist with the accommodation of teachers at Woomera.

**ARTS GRANTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

769. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. Who are the members of the Arts Grants Advisory Committee?

2. When was each such person appointed and when will his or her term expire?

3. What is the purpose of the committee?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:  
1. and 2.

Name	Appointed	Term Expires
<b>Chairman</b>		
Elizabeth Silsbury, 44 Tusmore Avenue, Tusmore, S.A. 5065	26-2-80	31-12-80
<b>Members</b>		
Ms. S. Roux, 45 Clifton Street, Prospect, S. A. 5082	8-3-79	31-12-80
Mr. A Taylor, 334 Halifax Street, Adelaide, S.A. 5000	8-3-79	31-12-80
Ms. M. Dodd, 1 Rugby Street, College Park, S.A. 5069	8-3-79	31-12-80
Mr. D. Dolan, C/o S.A. School of Art, Holbrooks Road, Underdale, S.A. 5032	8-3-79	31-12-80
Ms. P. Chapman, C/o The Old Post Office, Harrogate, S.A. 5244	26-2-80	31-12-81
Mr. G. Worby, 3 Deepdene Avenue, Bellevue Heights, S.A. 5050	26-2-80	31-12-81
Mrs. E. Gleghorn, 27 Northgate Avenue, Unley Park, S.A. 5061	19-3-80	31-12-81

3. To advise the Minister on the allocation of funds for minor and miscellaneous grant applications in the field of the arts.

**ABALONE**

770. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What is the total abalone catch for zones A. B. C, and ZF?

2. Since zoning was introduced, how many people have been licensed to dive for abalone in South Australia and what is the total number of people now licensed?

3. Has the Department of Fisheries considered abolishing zoning?

4. Has the department examined the effects of the new licenses on the resources since extra licenses were granted on Eyre Peninsula?

5. Is there a falling catch rate in parts of South Australia and, if so, what action will be taken to correct the situation?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The replies are as follows:

1. 842 832 kilograms (provisional figures) for the year 1978-79.

2. 45 persons licensed to dive; 35 licences still current.

3. No.

4. Yes.

5. Yes.

**PRAWN FISHING**

771. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Who has the control over the prawn fishing zones situated in the Venus Bay area?

2. Whose responsibility is it to police these areas for breaches of the fishing regulations?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The replies are as follows:

1. Commonwealth and South Australian Governments.
2. South Australian Government.

#### HYDE PARK INTERSECTION

772. **Mr. LANGLEY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. When will traffic lights be installed at the intersection of King William Road and Mitchell and Park Streets?

2. Has the Government received a grant for this work?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. During the 1980-81 financial year, resources permitting.

2. Yes. The work will be funded under the MITERS scheme.

#### DAY-CARE CENTRES

773. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Has the expansion in the number and role of day-care centres been implemented by the Department for Community Welfare and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** No expansion has been undertaken by the Department for Community Welfare. Some day-care centres in this State are operated by the South Australian Health Commission and by voluntary agencies. Immediate resources have not been available and relationships between agencies have not yet been clarified.

#### RETIREMENT

774. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Has the Minister of Community Welfare had any consultation with the Council for the Ageing, trade unions, employers and educational institutions to ensure the provision of comprehensive counselling services in relation to preparation for retirement, and how many voluntary agencies have been established to provide these services?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** No. Action has not yet been taken on this matter.

#### SENIOR CITIZENS

775. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What extensions have been made by the Department for Community Welfare to existing schemes initiated by senior citizens to provide educational and recreational facilities for themselves and, if none, why not?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** No new schemes have been introduced, but several existing schemes have been expanded. The Department for Community Welfare's role in this area is one of assisting the elderly citizens in what they desire to initiate and the work is part of the normal duties of the department's social work staff. Some financial assistance has been given from the Community Welfare Grants Fund.

#### GRANTS

776. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: Have the guidelines and method of distribution of grants and provisions for community development yet been determined?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** Yes, the guidelines for distribution of the fund during the current financial year have been determined and are available to all potential applicants through the offices of all local authorities throughout the State and the Department of Local Government.

#### SENIOR CITIZENS

778. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: How many programmes designed to maintain senior citizens' independence from institutions have been extended by the Department for Community Welfare, and, if any, which and if none, why not?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The number of programmes supported by the Department for Community Welfare through grants and social worker and volunteer assistance is not readily obtainable. The Commonwealth Department of Social Security and the South Australian Health Commission already have responsibilities in this area. The Superintendent of Magill Home is investigating the future involvement of the Department for Community Welfare in this matter.