

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 31 July 1980

The House met at 12 noon pursuant to proclamation, the Speaker (Hon. B. C. Eastick) presiding.

The Clerk (Mr. G. D. Mitchell) read the proclamation summoning Parliament.

After prayers read by the Speaker, honourable members, in compliance with summons, proceeded at 12.7 p.m. to the Legislative Council Chamber to hear the Speech of His Excellency the Governor. They returned to the Assembly Chamber at 12.46 p.m. and the Speaker resumed the Chair.

[Sitting suspended from 12.47 to 3.30 p.m.]

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

The SPEAKER: I have to report that the House has this day, in compliance with a summons from His Excellency the Governor, attended in the Legislative Council Chamber, where His Excellency has been pleased to make a Speech to both Houses of Parliament, of which Speech I, as Speaker, have obtained a copy, which I now lay upon the table.

Ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS: EDUCATION FUNDING

Petitions signed by 1 426 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose a 3 per cent cutback in funding for the Education Department of South Australia were presented by the Hons. Jennifer Adamson and H. Allison, and Messrs. Hamilton, Millhouse, and Olsen. Petitions received.

PETITIONS: ELECTRICITY CONCESSIONS

Petitions signed by 411 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to grant concessions on electricity charges to persons receiving social welfare pensions were presented by the Hon. R. G. Payne and Mr. Evans. Petitions received.

PETITION: SLAUGHTERING OF HORSES

A petition signed by 130 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose any move to allow the slaughtering of horses for human consumption in South Australia was presented by Mr. Oswald. Petition received.

PETITION: THEBARTON INFORMATION CENTRE

A petition signed by 1 400 residents of South Australia praying that the House provide adequate funding to maintain the Thebarton Information Centre for the 1980-81 financial year was presented by Mr. Plunkett. Petition received.

PETITION: PRE-RECORDED MUSIC

A petition signed by 14 residents of South Australia praying that the House ensure that the playing of pre-

recorded music is not to the detriment of working musicians was presented by Mr. Hamilton. Petition received.

PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

Petitions signed by 137 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to tighten restrictions on pornography and establish clear classification standards under the Classification of Publications Act were presented by the Hons. D. C. Brown and D. O. Tonkin, and Messrs. Max Brown, Millhouse, and Oswald. Petitions received.

PETITION: SOCIAL WELFARE

A petition signed by 171 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to implement recommendations 39, 40, 42, 45, 46, 49 and 53 of the report of the Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare was presented by the Hon. Jennifer Adamson. Petition received.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Flagstaff Hill Primary School Extensions,
Murray Bridge Sewerage Scheme—Adelaide Road Area,
Mount Gambier North West Primary School (Stage I).
Ordered that reports be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MONARTO

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am sure I have no need to recite in detail the sad chronicle of events which spawned and developed the concept of Monarto—a tragedy played out before an unsuspecting (and paying) audience of all South Australians.

Suffice to say that the previous South Australian Government embarked some eight years ago upon a dream which had as its basic concept the need to develop an alternate city in order to preserve metropolitan Adelaide at its present size. The concept envisaged a growth in population that has not materialised. It envisaged a city at Monarto of some 180 000 people, and the scheme included sending public servants and their families to live in this artificial city of the future. Taxpayers' money was poured into the project.

The Commonwealth Government (up to and including 30 June this year) provided more than \$9 100 000 by way of loans and \$1 300 000 in grants. South Australia's indebtedness to the Commonwealth, including capitalised interest by 30 June, was in excess of \$15 000 000.

The State also invested considerable amounts of taxpayers' money in Monarto. There was \$2 800 000 from State Loan funds, \$8 200 000 borrowed from financial institutions, and grants of \$1 700 000.

By 30 June 1980, the State Loan indebtedness passed

\$12 000 000 and, when coupled with the Commonwealth debt, there was owed in excess of a staggering \$27 000 000 on Monarto. The debt has been increasing with the passing of every day. It became a millstone around the State's neck—a burden of such magnitude that it threatened to jeopardise the development of major projects of significant economic and social importance, not only to South Australia but to the nation as a whole.

It was in this context that this Government, on coming to office, sought an immediate review of Monarto and the use of the land at Monarto. That review recommended the land be returned to its original rural use, with some limited area retained for the possible future expansion of Murray Bridge, with some specific areas of natural vegetation retained as conservation parks. Because of the proposed change in land use, which was at variance with existing agreements, some delicate and protracted negotiations between Commonwealth and State officers were involved in respect to the State's \$15 000 000 debt to the Commonwealth.

I am happy to say that last week I was able to conclude an agreement with the Prime Minister that, on payment of \$5 100 000 to the Commonwealth, that Government would forgo all claims on money it had invested in the project, including all the interest it had capitalised.

However, while the South Australian Government now owns the entire Monarto site, and has substantially cut its debt from \$27 000 000 (continually escalating), it still has some \$17 000 000 of South Australian taxpayers' money tied up in the project.

The Government will now take immediate steps to dispose of appropriate parts of that land and recover as much of the \$17 000 000 as is practicable. It will do so in an orderly manner, with proper regard for the property market. It will, however, be sensitive to the needs of the community, although it needs to be remembered that this Government has inherited large areas of land that are dedicated as national parks and conservation areas. These areas are costly to maintain, costly to protect and costly to develop.

As to the Monarto Development Commission, it is my Government's intention to retain the commission as a legal entity in order to avoid the costly process of re-registering land already in the name of the commission. However, from an administration and management point of view, steps will now be taken to incorporate the commission's staff with either the Department of Lands, the Land Commission, or some other appropriate body.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: POKER MACHINES

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: On Tuesday 10 June 1980, the member for Hanson asked me in this House to make representations to the Commonwealth Government about a report in the previous month's issue of *Aristocrat News*, a publication of Ainsworth Consolidated Industries, a firm which manufactures poker machines. The report suggested that the Commonwealth may soon allow poker machines on Commonwealth property in South Australia, including the Indian Pacific Railway.

As requested, I wrote to the Prime Minister on 18 June emphasising in the strongest possible terms that the State Government was at present completely opposed to the introduction of poker machines in South Australia. I said I would be extremely disappointed if the Federal Govern-

ment were to take action to allow the introduction of poker machines on Federal Government property, without first consulting the State Government and taking its wishes into consideration.

On 22 July the Prime Minister advised me that the Australian National Railways Commission had no intention of introducing poker machines, or any other gambling games, on its trains or property in South Australia. Similarly, no such proposal was being considered for West Beach Airport.

The Prime Minister also gave me an undertaking that any proposal for the introduction of commercial activities which may not conform with State law would, of course, be the subject of prior consultation with the South Australian Government.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: FIFE PACKAGE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Shortly after the State Government came to office last year, I wrote to the Prime Minister urging the Federal Government to introduce the Fife package to overcome problems in the petrol retail marketing industry. Early this year, the Minister of Consumer Affairs repeated the State Government's support for this package and pointed out that the marketing of petroleum was a national issue that could be fully overcome only at a national level.

Throughout the following months, we continued to support this view, and to back the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce and petrol resellers in their campaign to urge the Federal Government to act. However, both I and the Minister said that, if action to introduce the Fife package was not forthcoming, the State Government would introduce legislation which would give effect to the spirit of the Fife package on a State level. We recognised that that was not the ideal way to overcome the problems within the industry, because petrol is a commodity of national significance and is transported across State borders.

Our intention to support independent resellers, and to ensure there is a situation of fair play in the market, led to my stating in July that I would instruct Parliamentary Counsel to draft legislation to implement a State version of the package. Shortly after this, the Federal Minister of Business and Consumer Affairs, Mr. Garland, announced that Government's intention to introduce legislation in the Budget session for the purposes of substantially reducing the number of oil company controlled sites, enacting the previously announced franchise Bill with some amendments, and limiting price discrimination.

In addition, the Prices Justification Tribunal will conduct an inquiry into the retail element included in the wholesale price of petrol. Reports of the Federal Government's proposed measures have been welcomed by reseller organisations throughout Australia. It is, of course, too early to assess the outcome of the Federal Government's proposals. However, I must stress that the State Government will not hesitate to introduce State legislation if it appears that such measures are necessary.

The Government continues to believe implementation of elements contained in the so-called Fife package would be in the best interests of the industry. We believe in the free enterprise system, but, in the interests of the community as a whole, there must be a market of fair trading, and protection for small business.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MINTARO SLATE AND FLAGSTONE COMPANY

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: My statement relates to Mintaro Slate and Flagstone Co. Ltd. I wish to inform the House of certain matters related to the activities of this company and associated companies. Press reports earlier this month suggested that the company and its associates had identified extensive deposits of lignite in the Eucla Basin in South Australia.

For instance, the Australian *Financial Review* reported on 4 July that "2 750 000 000—plus tonnes of lignite are indicated". The report also stated, "It is believed that the deposits could now be commercially exploitable." These reports were drawn to my attention and I was also aware of significant movements in the price of the company's shares on stock exchanges.

By letter dated 11 July, I sought clarification of, and justification for, these statements and a report as required under the terms of exploration licences granted by me to companies in which Mintaro has an interest and which hold the licences in that area of the Eucla Basin referred to in the report of 4 July in the *Financial Review*.

I received a reply to this letter on 17 July which stated, *inter alia*, that:

The claim in relation to estimate of lignite reserves is justifiable, and that:

The claim in relation to commercial exploitation is justifiable.

At the request of the company and its associates, I met with their representatives on 17 July to discuss the information supplied in their written reply, and other relevant matters. As a result of that meeting, I issued a press statement on 18 July to indicate that, to that stage, I was not personally satisfied that the information, with which I had been provided, supported the assertions made by the companies in their written reply to me.

Following my press statement, the Stock Exchange of Adelaide requested further information, and representatives of my department have had discussions with the Chairman of the Stock Exchange, Mr. I. H. Lloyd. During those discussions, the then Acting Director-General of the department, Mr. R. K. Johns, undertook, on my behalf, to comment on certain further information provided by Mintaro to the Stock Exchange. This afternoon, I have supplied the following report to the Stock Exchange of Adelaide:

My concern with regard to press statements and subsequent reaffirmations by company principals which have alluded to "reserves" and development potential of "lignite" that occurs in the Eucla Basin is that they may give an impression of the quality of the material that is not supported by drilling undertaken by the Department of Mines and Energy in 1978. Further, information available to me does not suggest that the material can be readily upgraded to support a commercially viable fuel preparation project.

Carbonaceous materials have been variously reported in drilling undertaken by previous exploration companies in the Eucla Basin but the composition of those materials is unknown since no cores were cut nor electric logs run—their identity is based on visual examination of cuttings only. Cores recovered from holes drilled by the Department of Mines and Energy in 1978 on analysis demonstrated that the lignite is of poor and variable quality; the seams are thin and they are discontinuous. While such drilling is too widely spaced and quite inadequate to establish seam behaviour,

composition and extent in a meaningful conventional reserves category, it serves to indicate that lignite containing less than 45 per cent ash is limited.

It should be understood that carbonaceous materials containing an avowed 60 per cent ash content have no conventional or demonstrated energy use. (By comparison, Victorian brown coals contain 0.5 to 1.5 per cent ash; Wakefield, Moorlands, and Kingston deposits, all of which are of similar age to those of the Eucla Basin, contain 6 to 13 per cent ash.) The process by which it has been stated that the Eucla Basin materials are to be upgraded to high heat value/low ash products has not been developed commercially and, therefore, there may be no basis for the claim that the Eucla Basin deposits are commercially exploitable. Other uncertainties relate to remote location and cost of recovery.

My involvement in this matter stems from my belief that the Minister of Mines and Energy has a responsibility to inform the public when shares in a public company are traded at prices which may result from misleading or incorrect information as to the extent of that company's mineral or petroleum resources in South Australia. With regard to this matter, I believe that the public is now adequately informed and warned.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PRISON ESCAPES

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: This is the first opportunity I have had since the escape of Joseph Tognolini from the Yatala Labour Prison to make a statement in this House. This incident has caused me tremendous concern as I am sure it has concerned members on both sides of this House, and, indeed, the whole community. In the early hours of Saturday morning, 28 June 1980, Tognolini, a dangerous and determined criminal, escaped from B division of Yatala Labour Prison. Tognolini was assisted by people outside the institution. Oxy-acetylene equipment was used to cut the bars of Tognolini's cell.

It is suspected that Tognolini's aides also carried guns, in addition to the equipment used in the escape. Entry into the prison was made through the work compound on the northern perimeter of the main wall. There is a double wire fence in which a gap was cut.

The intruders entered a number of workshops in the compound, and a set of oxy-acetylene equipment was removed and used to dismantle the locking devices on an unused back gate. This gate is under a tower which at the time of the escape was manned until 12 midnight and not manned again until 7 a.m.

The intruders entered the tower to activate part of the locking mechanism in the gate. From the tower it is possible to observe movements of the prison staff within this area. It is a remote corner not under general observation from any other area of the prison. The cutting equipment was apparently lifted to the window of Tognolini's cell, where he cut the bars from inside his cell. All equipment was taken out of the prison and the only article left in position was the outside ladder used to enter the tower.

The prospect of assistance from outside in breaching prison security is a new problem for the department. It is quite clear that in recent times we are dealing with criminals of a greatly changed calibre. At the same time more sophisticated equipment is now available, and the standards of security in all our institutions are being reassessed in this light.

For some years grave concern has been expressed over

the level of security at Yatala and other institutions, and at the frequency of escapes. After coming into office last September, I ordered a review of security at Yatala Labour Prison. As well I visited Tasmania and Victoria to inspect security measures used in their institutions. Mr. Speaker, 23 inmates escaped from South Australian institutions between 1 January 1979 and 30 June 1980, and 17 of these have been from Yatala Labour Prison. Eighteen have been recaptured and returned to custody.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister sought leave to make a Ministerial statement. Leave was granted and, in my mind, that requires that the Ministerial statement be heard in silence.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: When I was so rudely interrupted I was saying that 23 inmates escaped from South Australian institutions between 1 January 1979 and 30 June 1980, and 17 of these escapees have been from Yatala Labour Prison. I also said that 18 have been recaptured, although they have not all come from Yatala Labour Prison.

These statistics caused me grave concern and, on 15 October 1979, I commissioned a report on security standards within the Department of Correctional Services. This was undertaken by the then Assistant Director, Correctional Institutions, Mr. W. A. Stewart, now the Director of Correctional Services. The inquiry covered the following areas of departmental activity:

1. Accommodation requirements;
2. Institutional security standards;
3. Security procedures;
4. Equipment;
5. Staff.

As part of the inquiry, Mr. Frank Cassidy, a former Yatala Superintendent, was asked to make an independent assessment of Yatala routines and procedures. Mr. Cassidy worked in the South Australian Correctional Services Department from the 1950's to the 1970's, and occupied successively the positions of Superintendent, Yatala Labour Prison, and Assistant Director, Correctional Institutions. In the early 1970's, he was asked to conduct an inquiry into the prison system for the Northern Territory, and he had retired only recently as Assistant Director, Department of Social Welfare in Canberra.

Mr. Cassidy's assessment was only part of a wider inquiry being conducted by the Director of Correctional Services, and I was most concerned when I learnt that the assessment had been "leaked" to the press. The disclosure of those areas of deficiency recorded by Mr. Cassidy was a most irresponsible act, and could seriously have threatened security; indeed, the consequences could still affect the community.

But even while the report was still being prepared by Mr. Stewart, action was being taken to remedy defects which became apparent during its preparation. The Public Buildings Department undertook a study at Adelaide and Yatala gaols to examine the buildings and yards in order to determine what additional surveillance equipment was required. The report of that study was received on the same day as Tognolini's escape, and Cabinet approved the installation of very sophisticated television surveillance equipment and other devices at its next meeting.

The Government was also made aware that extra correctional staff was needed by the prison system, and the appointment of an additional 21 positions was approved by Cabinet on 12 May 1980, well before the Tognolini episode. These officers completed their training on 4 July 1980, and some commenced duties on the following day. All of the officers are now on duty at the various institutions. This has resulted in nine extra custodial staff

at Yatala, and six extra custodial staff at Adelaide Gaol.

Indeed, the action taken by the present Government in calling for a detailed report on security, in increasing staff numbers, and in investigating and approving the installation of electronic surveillance devices is in sharp contrast to the inactivity and negative attitude of the previous Government. During the previous Administration, the Department of Correctional Services asked on several occasions for additional staff to upgrade standards of security. In March 1977, it asked for 36 prison officers for Adelaide and Yatala gaols. This request was refused. In the same year, the department asked for 21 senior prison officers for all correctional institutions in South Australia. This request was refused. Yet again in the same year, the department asked for a reclassification of 21 prison officers to improve night-time supervision. This request was refused.

It is clear that the present position in South Australia's correctional institutions has in large measure been the accumulated result of years of neglect and indifference. More has been done to remedy that position in the first 10 months of this Government than was ever done in 10 years of the previous Government.

As well as the measures I have outlined, which were taken after this Government's election to office, a number of other steps have been taken. For instance, when Mr. Cassidy's assessment was received in early February 1980, by the then Director of Correctional Services, steps were taken immediately to correct those deficiencies which had not already been the subject of Government action. Further measures have been taken following the Tognolini escape. Immediate steps were taken to improve security by extending the hours of manning to 24 hours a day from Saturday 28 June 1980. All broken locks were replaced and repairs to the various sections were completed on the Saturday morning by the Public Buildings Department and industry officers called to duty. A preliminary report outlining details of the escape was prepared by the Director of Correctional Services and given to me on the following Tuesday, 1 July 1980.

On Thursday 3 July, I commissioned an inquiry into the escape of Tognolini to be conducted by the Tasmanian Controller of Prisons, Mr. Michael Hornibrook, and the Government Investigations Officer of the South Australian Law Department, Mr. Noel Lenton. Mr. Hornibrook and Mr. Lenton investigated the circumstances surrounding the escape of Tognolini from Yatala Labour Prison and recommended various security measures which they considered necessary to prevent a similar future occurrence. I received this report and its recommendations on Tuesday 22 July.

In particular, they reported on when and how the escape occurred and the reasons for the occurrence, and recommended necessary short-term remedial action. The Government was already moving to upgrade security at Adelaide and Yatala Gaols when the escape occurred. I have already mentioned that Cabinet had approved the installation of a sophisticated closed circuit television system, as well as silent microwave detectors. The cost of this equipment is about \$235 000. Cameras will be located to give surveillance of all cell doors throughout the prison, and other cameras will be installed at various locations within the prison. As far as external surveillance is concerned, cameras will supply a complete coverage of the exterior walls as well as roof areas and approaches to the perimeter walls.

The proposed Yatala Labour Prison infirmary has also been resited to reduce security risks. The proposed infirmary will now be more than six metres from the external security wall and will be under constant

observation from a tower as well as under surveillance by television and other electronic devices.

Following the escape, additional floodlighting has also been installed in the compounds at Yatala and Adelaide gaols. Extra staff is being employed on overtime to man the towers at Yatala, both day and night, and staff on duty will be issued with new and more efficient two-way radio handsets. Consideration is being given to the employment of additional staff. With the same number of hours worked without overtime, it is estimated that 11 additional staff can be employed without any increase in the overall wages bill.

The Police Department has stepped up its patrols, including the use of dogs around the perimeter wall at Yatala, and an access road at the prison will be upgraded for security patrol inspections. Upgrading of the security fencing in the perimeter of the industry compound is also under way.

The report prepared by Mr. Stewart is now complete and is to be considered in detail by the Government. Whether or not all or part of it will be made public will depend entirely upon an assessment of the possible effects of such an action on the security of correctional institutions. The Tognolini escape has demonstrated conclusively that every possible care and precaution must be taken to maintain maximum security, in the interests of the community as a whole.

In conclusion, I can assure the House that the Government will continue with the investigations and remedial actions that it initiated soon after its election until it is satisfied that all possible steps have been taken to maintain the security of South Australia's correctional institutions.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: BURRA ACCIDENT

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I report to the House that, at 10 p.m. yesterday, a serious accident occurred on the main highway south of Burra to a truck carrying sodium cyanide pellets to Tennant Creek. My highway officers have informed me that about 40 drums of cyanide pellets fell off the truck and are now spread over an area of about 300 metres by 100 metres. The area has been cordoned off, and measures are being taken immediately to have the toxic pellets cleaned up. The House will realise that, to do this, those people cleaning up the pellets will have to wear self-contained breathing apparatus, and we have enlisted the aid of the Fire Brigade. Several departments, including the Health Commission, the Department of Industrial Affairs, the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Department of the Environment, are involved in supervising the cleaning up of the area. We have called for a full report tomorrow and have ordered an investigation as to the cause of the accident. The police are on the job, and lights will be provided so that the cleaning up can continue into the night. It is expected that the site will be cleaned up by 10 p.m. Obviously, detours are in effect at present to allow motorists to proceed.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

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

That Standing Order 57 be so far suspended as to enable the motion for the adjournment of the House to be debated.

Motion carried.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:
By the Treasurer (The Hon. D. O. Tonkin)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Audit Act, 1921-1975—Regulations—Various Amendments.
- ii. Land Tax Act, 1936-1979—Regulations—Exemption Criteria.
- iii. Industries Development Act, 1941-1978—Regulations—Bread Pricing—1980.

By the Minister of Industrial Affairs (The Hon. D. C. Brown)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Motor Fuel Licensing Board—Report, 1979.
- ii. Industrial Court Rules—Workers Compensation Act, 1971-1979—Workers Compensation Rules, 1980.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, 1979-1980—Regulations—Various Amendments.
- ii. Justices Act, 1921-1979—Rules—Fees.
- iii. Kindergarten Union of South Australia—Report, 1979.
- iv. Supreme Court Rules—Supreme Court Act, 1935-1975—Costs.
- v. Teachers Registration Board of South Australia—Report, 1979.
- vi. Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia—Report for period 1 July to 31 December 1979.

By the Chief Secretary (The Hon. W. A. Rodda)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Commissioner of Police—Report, 1978-79.

By the Minister of Fisheries (The Hon. W. A. Rodda)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Fisheries Act, 1971-1976—Regulations—Licence Fees.

By the Minister of Marine (The Hon. W. A. Rodda)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Harbors Act, 1936-1978—Regulations—Various Charges.

By the Minister of Industrial Affairs (The Hon. D. C. Brown) for the Minister of Agriculture (The Hon. W. E. Chapman)—

By Command—

- i. Australian Agricultural Council—Resolutions of the 108th Meeting held on 4 February 1980.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Alsatian Dogs Act, 1934-1980—Regulations—Exemption from Prohibition.
- Dog Control Act, 1980—Regulations—
 - ii. District Council Codes.
 - iii. Prescribed Private Pound.
- iv. Libraries and Institutes Act, 1939-1979—Regulations—Parking.
- National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1972-1978—Regulations—
 - v. Park Fees.
 - vi. Permit Fees.

- VII. Protected Animals.
- VIII. National Trust of South Australia Act, 1955-1975—General Regulations, By-laws and Rules.
- IX. South Australian Waste Management Commission Act, 1979—General Regulations, 1980.
- X. District Council of Kadina—By-law No. 29—Control of Motor Vehicle Hire.
- XI. District Council of Kapunda—By-law No. 28—Keeping of Poultry and Burning Offensive Substances.
- XII. District Council of Meadows—By-law No. 39—Penalties.
- XIII. District Council of Meningie—By-law No. 27—Repeal of By-laws.
- XIV. District Council of Murray Bridge—By-law No. 22—Control of Reserves and other Public Places.
- XV. District Council of Strathalbyn—By-law No. 18—Street Traders.
- By the Minister of Planning (The Hon. D. C. Wotton)—
Pursuant to Statute—
- I. City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976-1978—Regulations—Prohibition.
- Planning and Development Act, 1966-1980—
Metropolitan Development Plan—Planning Regulations—
- II. Corporation of Tea Tree Gully—Zoning.
- III. District Council of Meadows—Zoning.
- IV. District Council of Stirling—Special Land Subdivision Control.
- Interim Development Control—
- V. District Council of Angaston.
- VI. District Council of Balaklava.
- VII. District Council of Barmera.
- VIII. District Council of Barossa.
- IX. District Council of Beachport.
- X. District Council of Berri.
- XI. District Council of Burra Burra.
- XII. District Council of Bute.
- XIII. District Council of Clare.
- XIV. District Council of Cleve.
- XV. District Council of Clinton.
- XVI. District Council of Coonalbyn Downs.
- XVII. District Council of Crystal Brook.
- XVIII. District Council of East Torrens.
- XIX. District Council of Dudley.
- XX. District Council of Elliston.
- XXI. District Council of Eudunda.
- XXII. Eyre Highway—
Out of Districts—
- XXIII. Out of Councils—Yalata.
- XXIV. Northern Flinders Ranges.
- XXV. Corporation of Gawler.
- XXVI. District Council of Gladstone.
- XXVII. District Council of Gumeracha.
- XXVIII. District Council of Jamestown.
- XXIX. Corporation of Jamestown.
- XXX. District Council of Kadina.
- XXXI. District Council of Kanyaka-Quorn.
- XXXII. District Council of Kapunda.
- XXXIII. District Council of Karoonda East Murray.
- XXXIV. District Council of Kimba.
- XXXV. District Council of Kingscote.
- XXXVI. District Council of Lacedpede.
- XXXVII. District Council of Lameroo.
- XXXVIII. District Council of Laura.
- XXXIX. District Council of Le Hunte.
- XL. District Council of Light.
- XLI. District Council of Lincoln.
- XLII. District Council of Loxton.
- XLIII. District Council of Lucindale.
- XLIV. District Council of Mallala.
- XLV. County of Manchester—Flinders Ranges Planning Area.
- XLVI. District Council of Mannum.
- XLVII. District Council of Meadows.
- XLVIII. District Council of Meningie.
- XLIX. District Council of Millicent.
- L. District Council of Minlaton.
- LI. Corporation of Moonta.
- LII. District Council of Morgan.
- LIII. District Council of Mount Barker.
- LIV. District Council of Mount Gambier.
- LV. District Council of Mount Pleasant.
- LVI. District Council of Mount Remarkable.
- LVII. District Council of Murat Bay.
- LVIII. District Council of Murray Bridge.
- LIX. District Council of Naracoorte.
- LX. Corporation of Naracoorte.
- LXI. County of Newcastle—Flinders Ranges Planning Area.
- LXII. District Council of Onkaparinga.
- LXIII. District Council of Owen.
- LXIV. District Council of Paringa.
- LXV. District Council of Peake.
- LXVI. District Council of Penola.
- LXVII. District Council of Pinnaroo.
- LXVIII. District Council of Pirie.
- LXIX. Corporation of Port Augusta.
- LXX. District Council of Port Broughton.
- LXXI. District Council of Port Elliot and Goolwa.
- LXXII. Corporation of Port Lincoln.
- LXXIII. District Council of Port MacDonnell.
- LXXIV. District Council of Port Wakefield.
- LXXV. Corporation of Renmark.
- LXXVI. District Council of Ridley.
- LXXVII. River Murray
Out of Councils—
- LXXVIII. District Council of Riverton.
- LXXIX. District Council of Robe.
- LXXX. District Council of Saddleworth and Auburn.
- LXXXI. Corporation of Salisbury.
- LXXXII. District Council of Snowtown.
- LXXXIII. District Council of Strathalbyn.
- LXXXIV. District Council of Streaky Bay.
- LXXXV. District Council of Tanunda.
- LXXXVI. District Council of Tatiara.
- LXXXVII. District Council of Truro.
- LXXXVIII. District Council of Tumby Bay.
- LXXXIX. District Council of Victor Harbor.
- XC. District Council of Waikerie.
- XCI. Corporation of Wallaroo.
- XCII. District Council of Warooka.
- XCIII. Corporation of Whyalla.
- XCIV. Corporation of Woodville.
- XCV. District Council of Yankalilla.
- XCVI. District Council of Yorketown.
- XCVII. District Council of Willunga.
- XCVIII. District Council of Central Yorke Peninsula.
- By the Minister of Transport (The Hon. M. M. Wilson)—
Pursuant to Statute—
- I. Highways Department approvals to lease properties, 1979-1980—Road Traffic Act, 1961-1980—Regulations—
- II. Australian Design Rules.
- III. Traffic Prohibition—Noarlunga—Regulations.
- By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (The Hon. M. M. Wilson)—
Pursuant to Statute—
- I. Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1978—Regulations—Amendment.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- I. Chiropractists Act, 1950-1973—Regulations—Various fees.
- II. Licensing Act, 1967-1977—Regulations—Various Amendments.
- III. South Australian Health Commission—Report, 1978-1979.

By the Deputy Premier (The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy) for the Minister of Water Resources (The Hon. P. B. Arnold)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- I. Waterworks Act, 1932-1978—Regulations—Watershed Boundary.

By the Deputy Premier for the Minister of Lands (The Hon. P. B. Arnold)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- I. Crown Lands Act, 1929-1980 Section 5 (f)—Statement of land resumed.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: I indicate that the honourable Deputy Premier will take questions relating to water resources and that the honourable Minister of Industrial Affairs will take questions relating to agriculture.

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. BANNON: Is the Premier satisfied that the pay-roll tax incentive programme is having a significant effect on increasing the number of teenagers employed in full-time jobs? Does he still believe that 7 000 new jobs (later increased in his December statement to 10 000) will be created during the Government's term? If not, will he now consider the reintroduction of direct job creation schemes? According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, youth unemployment in South Australia has risen by over 1 000, to a record level of 17 000 (the highest in Australia) since June 1979, and now stands at 27.6 per cent of the labour force.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am still satisfied that the pay-roll incentives that have been taken by this Government are working quite effectively in order to stimulate youth employment. However, I am aware that there is considerable concern in the community about current levels of unemployment, something which concerns every member. I do not believe that this is a matter out of which political capital need be made, because it is a matter about which I think we all have a very real concern.

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The fact that the Deputy Leader is still sore about losing the last election is beside the point. Present figures show that the total of new positions for which exemptions were claimed is running at just under 1 700. There has been a suggestion in studies made that those people would have been employed anyway, sooner or later, but what I am saying is that about 1 700 young people have been offered jobs because of the incentives offered by this Government by way of pay-roll tax concessions. There is no way that members of the Opposition can get away from that fact.

I turn to the previous Government's record. I am grateful to the Deputy Leader for raising this point, because I think it is important that people in South Australia understand exactly what the level of unemploy-

ment was when the Opposition left the Government benches. In the eight years between June 1971 and September 1979, the labour force grew to 600 000, an increase of 87 000. During the same period, the number of persons employed in the private sector decreased by 1 500. The rate of unemployment during that time (and I think this is significant indeed) rose from 2.5 per cent to 7.6 per cent. In answer to members of the Opposition who stand and complain because the level of unemployment in South Australia is in excess of 8 per cent, I say that they were responsible for presiding over a situation where the unemployment figure rose to 7.6 per cent. The position is still totally unsatisfactory. What we do know is that permanent employment will be created only by encouraging investment in this State.

Mr. Keneally: What about your 10 000 jobs?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That is another matter that I think members of the Opposition should get quite straight. If they were to look at the policy speech that I made before the election they would see quite clearly that the statement was made then that, if just one firm took advantage of the pay-roll tax concessions offered in respect of the employment of young people, 7 000 jobs could be created. Members of the Opposition cannot get past the fact that some 1 700 jobs have already been created. The Government has plans to extend the pay-roll tax scheme in other ways to make it possible to encourage still more employment. That was foreshadowed in His Excellency's Speech today. I do not propose to go into this matter in detail now.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The honourable member for Florey can talk all he likes—we will look at the record at the end of this Government's first term in office. I believe that we will be in a strong position at that time, a far stronger position than we would possibly have been in had the previous Government remained in office.

Artificial schemes do not create full-time permanent employment. The only way in which proper employment, employment which is secure and which provides the security of long-term involvement, can be created is by the promotion of development in this State. That is what this Government is doing.

I will now list briefly a number of facts concerning industry in this State which have come to my notice recently. Australian Bacon, a \$100 000 000 smallgoods company, will create 200 jobs. Grundfos has a planned \$1 000 000 investment. Fasson Proprietary Limited has announced a \$4 000 000 expansion. Seeley Brothers has obtained a \$5 000 000 export order. That company has had to employ a further 70 to 80 people, and that is outside the pay-roll tax incentive scheme.

Grundfos is employing 20 people and Fasson will be increasing its work force by 40 over the next 12 to 18 months. John Shearer will be creating 100 new jobs by closing its Queensland operation and relocating in South Australia; I.C.I. has announced a \$10 000 000 expansion with 100 new jobs; and B.H.P. is to spend \$90 000 000 to \$100 000 000 on its Whyalla steelworks. That investment is additional to the \$30 000 000 investment by that company in relation to new coke ovens, and an extra 30 workers will be employed there.

Simpson Limited is to centralise its dishwasher manufacturing operations in Adelaide and will spend \$6 000 000. A new factory at Regency Park will be built, and it is expected that it will employ an additional 150 people in the first year of operation and 300 additional people when it reaches its peak production. In addition,

the Simpson company has won an export washing machine order for \$1 700 000, which has consolidated that part of its operation.

G.M.H. will build an \$8 000 000 plastics factory as a first stage at Elizabeth. Mitsubishi Motors has taken up its share option in Chrysler. Adelaide Brighton Cement, which is spending \$20 000 000, has commissioned the construction of a limestone carrying vessel. Punalar Paper Mills of India is to spend \$50 000 000, and this will create up to 500 new jobs. The programme will include a major wood-pulping plant. Transfield has won a \$7 000 000 contract for the supply and fabrication of structural steel for the new northern power station. The company's work force in Whyalla will go up by about 50, and up to 120 men will be needed in the construction phase over the next two years. Dairyvale Metropolitan Co-operative has announced a \$1 300 000 expansion of its cheese factory.

The Leader wants new schemes; I would have thought that this policy was working better than anything else he could possibly hope for—and he will not stop me yet.

Noske Flour Mills is to spend \$1 300 000, and employment will be up by 10; Omark Limited in Whyalla is spending \$2 000 000 to press steel sleepers, and an extra 30 to 40 jobs will be provided in that city; Sapfor Timber Mills is to be expanded by a further \$2 000 000 with 100 new jobs; Adelaide Steamship Company is raising \$4 000 000 for further expansion; and Alulite Proprietary Limited has invested a further \$200 000 and will increase its staff by 80 over the next two years.

Safcol fish finger plant at Millicent, at a cost of \$1 100 000, will employ an additional 48 staff. Tatiara Meat Company has built a new boning room and freezing facility at a cost of \$700 000, with an employment impact of 25 new jobs; Rubery Owen Holdings Limited is expanding into a new costing facility requiring \$1 500 000 and creating 30 extra jobs; and the Kingston lobster tourist complex, opened at a cost of \$500 000, will create 17 new jobs.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What a joke!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members are well aware of the requirement that all proceedings of the House be conducted with due decorum. Certain latitude is given in relation to comments at Question Time, but there is far too much comment and too much interjection. I ask for it to cease.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: In the mining area, I refer to Western Mining Corporation—we find that Roxby Downs employment has gone up from 90 to 170 jobs, and 40 more jobs have been provided at Mount Gunson; and the Werner Tool Company is providing 16 more jobs. There is a number of other unfinished projects—16 applications at present are before the Government for assistance under the Establishment Payments Scheme. Every one of those applications, which represent \$6 000 000 altogether of proposed capital investment and 350 new jobs, has been lodged with the Government since September last year.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: All of those projects are job-creating and are initiatives taken by the business community since last year; all of them reflect a renewed confidence in South Australia and its prospects for a full economic recovery. The Leader knows full well that the direct results of this investment will not flow overnight; it may take up to 12 or 18 months for the results to be felt. In the meantime, our unemployment figures are showing slight improvement. They will not be helped by artificial schemes to create artificial jobs. I remember well that, in this House, the Leader of the Opposition put forward five

points in a plan for increased employment.

I think he said at that stage that the economy was deteriorating. If the economy is deteriorating, all I can say is that the Leader of the Opposition is an even worse judge of an economic climate than I thought he was before, because the economy is far stronger now than it has been at any time during the past three years. The massive levels of new investment, new industries locating in South Australia and the expansion of existing South Australian companies provide a solid base for better and further expansion in the future.

I suspect that the Leader is about to launch into that time-worn, outdated, and totally discredited proposition that we should revive the unemployment relief schemes—the SURS scheme and the RED scheme. I should have thought that the experience of the Whitlam Government would indeed—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It is short-term expediency. It may change the figures and make them look better for a short time, but it creates nothing permanent. This Government's policies are directed towards creating a strong and firm economic base which has its origin in industrial expansion and development, in real jobs; that is what it is all about. I know that if the Leader's Party was in Government (heaven forbid) he would probably resort to these artificial schemes in an attempt to pad his figures. We are in business to do the right thing by South Australians and to do it properly, and that is exactly what we are doing.

ENVIRONMENTAL MUTAGEN LABORATORY

The SPEAKER: I have received the following letter from the member for Mitcham:

I wish to advise that when the House meets today I shall move that at its rising it do adjourn to 2 p.m. tomorrow, Friday 1 August, to debate the following matter of urgency, namely, that this House expresses the utmost concern at the closure of the Environmental Mutagen Laboratory at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, and is of the opinion that the laboratory should be re-opened immediately so that the valuable work done in it may continue.

I ask that those honourable members who support the request made by the member for Mitcham to rise in their places.

Mr. Millhouse: Oh, come on, fellows.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. There being insufficient support for the honourable member's request, it will not be proceeded with.

QUESTION TIME RESUMED

STURT COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Education say what the Government's position is with regard to the TEASA recommendation that the Sturt College of Advanced Education be closed and used for other purposes? In the TEASA Report it was suggested that the Sturt college could be closed. I have had a lot of representations on this subject, and I am conversant with the operation of the college, which is in my electorate. I am concerned about such a recommendation, and, on the evidence that has

been put to me at this stage, I would not support the closure. I ask the Minister what is the Government's attitude and position concerning this recommendation.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Let me say from the outset that TEASA has done something that required a great deal of courage in so far as it grasped the continuing nettle of advanced education and decided to bring to the people of South Australia a recommendation that a specific college in South Australia be closed. The South Australian Government made quite clear at the time the report was released that it would prefer to consider this matter at a later date and certainly subsequent to public submissions being made to TEASA in response to its initial report. I make quite clear that the Government is still completely open-minded (and certainly not empty-headed) about the prospect of whether to close a college if that needs to be done at all, and certainly at this stage the Government has not considered the possibility of closing the Sturt college or any other college.

In fact, I was a little disappointed that an alleged comment made by a member of TEASA stated that TEASA's mind was firmly made up. Obviously, the Chairman of TEASA has made it patently clear that submissions will still be received by the authority until 30 August, so its mind is not made up, and after 30 August the Chairman of TEASA and his group will be submitting to the Government a final report, which will be considered by Cabinet.

The great number of letters that I have received from student nurses and education students at Sturt have been exemplary, in that they have all been extremely polite and informative. They have been well written, not a stereotyped sort of letter, and they have all been extremely useful. They have been passed on to the Chairman of TEASA, and I believe that the report of the Auchmuty inquiry, which is a Federal inquiry into the affairs of colleges of advanced education throughout Australia, is to become available in the near future, and this, too, may have some influence upon the thinking of TEASA before a final recommendation is made to the Government.

EMPLOYMENT PROSPECTS

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: In the light of the Premier's remarks a moment ago I think my question now becomes very pertinent. Does the Deputy Premier endorse the remarks of the General Manager of the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Mr. Arnold Schrape, which were reported in the *Advertiser* of 12 July—

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: That's not how you pronounce it.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I like to pronounce it in the way I did. I do not need help with the pronunciation.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will continue with his question.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I shall do that if I am allowed to do so. Before I was so rudely interrupted, I was talking of the remarks of Mr. Arnold Schrape, reported in the *Advertiser* of 12 July, that a mining boom, including large-scale mining and export of uranium, will not necessarily provide any significant increase in direct employment of labour, while its indirect effect on employment should not be exaggerated. Does the Deputy Premier endorse those remarks?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I do not recall reading the statement attributed to Mr. Arnold Schrape—

Mr. Millhouse: He's right, though.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: If the honourable member would listen, I might be able to throw some light on the matter, for his benefit. If that statement is correctly reported, I do not agree with Mr. Schrape, because in fact mining can produce a significant level of employment, and the multiplier effect of that mining operation can be most significant. Let me give the Deputy Leader some examples. The increase in employment in this State is likely to be gradual. Even members of the Opposition realise that. The Premier has just given the House a long list of significant increases in activity, commercial and industrial. Although taken singly the items might not be particularly significant, the sum total is very significant and the trend is especially significant.

Individual mining operations might not be large employers, although some can be. I think the Premier quoted, for instance, an increase in employment at the Werner Tool Company. It was my pleasure to open the company's new premises recently. The firm makes specialist drill heads for the drilling industry, and an increase of 16 in the employment in that activity can be attributed directly to mining exploration. Recently, I visited Mount Gunson, in the north of the State, and Roxby Downs, and I learned of further employment that had been generated at Mount Gunson. At Roxby Downs, employment is going up in the immediate future from 90 to 170. Although members opposite might not think that is very significant, I believe it is. I do not know whether Mr. Schrape is aware, but apparently the Opposition does not know, of the employment expectations which will be generated at Roxby Downs, where there will be a massive mine in the middle to latter half of the present decade.

Of course, the range of employment depends entirely on the size of the mining operation. Several people who predict the employment that will be generated directly as a result of the mining at Roxby Downs suggest a figure of 4 000 to 5 000. Even the much vaunted short-term employment scheme, the version of the Red scheme known as the State Unemployment Relief Scheme, never generated that sort of permanent employment.

The short-term band-aid approach to the employment problem of the Labor Party in this State and federally was quite stupid—putting people on the public payroll for short periods of time to pad the unemployment figures until something turned up. Those Labor Governments did not have a clue what was going to turn up. The fact is that mining operations can be significant employers, even as individual operations.

The multiplier effect of that mining operation is also quite significant, depending on the nature of the operation. I might add that the predictions depend on whom one talks to. If the member for Mitcham, who seems to have disappeared from the Chamber, and the Deputy Leader visited the State of Saskatchewan in Canada they would realise that the mining industry is probably the most significant employer in that State. In that mining operation they talk about a multiplier factor of about 20 to 1. That sounds exaggerated to me but even a conservative estimate of mining operations is of a factor of about 4 to 1. Even if one takes the lower level of the employment which is expected to be generated at, say, Roxby Downs, and multiplies that by four, that must be significant, even in the Deputy Leader's ken.

The Opposition, of course, constantly denigrates the mining industry especially by asserting that that industry is wholly capital intensive and does nothing to create jobs. I refer knockers to a feature article on the local aviation industry that appeared in the *Advertiser* on 24 July.

That article stated that the private aviation industry in this State had been lagging. Charter planes had not had

much to do. As a result of the greatly increased exploration activities, generated by this Government, I might say—

Mr. Hemmings: Rubbish!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is not rubbish. There were 137 exploration licences current in South Australia at June last year and when I last inquired of my department there were 355, a record number by far, and record expenditure. If members listened carefully to the Governor's Speech this morning they would have heard that \$18 700 000 is earmarked for mineral exploration on-shore, and I announced \$50 000 000 for exploration off-shore in South Australia, activity which was never matched during the decade of the Labor Administrations in South Australia. I now return to that *Advertiser* article in which reference was made to mining. Mr. Michael Kennett, Commercial Manager of Williams Aviation, is reported as saying:

There is more activity. The mining companies are generating more business with exploration and seismographic work around the State.

Mr. Gerry Blackshaw of Rossair is reported as saying:

The mining and oil industry has increased its charter work recently. There are lots of things happening, and the plans for Roxby Downs and the Cooper Basin liquids pipeline should help.

It is palpable nonsense for the Opposition and the member for Mitcham to assert that mining does not generate employment. It generates employment, depending on the size—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I asked you whether you agreed—with Schrape.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have already answered that part of the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister will resume his seat. Supplementary questions are out of order, and I would suggest to honourable members on both sides of the House that constant comment and further questioning only increases the length of the reply.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I believe I must treat this matter fully, because obviously the Opposition and the member for Mitcham do not know that not only does the mining industry generate a great deal of employment, depending on the nature of the operation, but it also generates a great deal of economic wealth in a State and country.

Mr. Hamilton: Utah.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: There we get this hatred of the multi-nationals (trans-nationals, as they are now called). All that the honourable member can say, like a parrot, is Utah. We know perfectly well what would befall this country if the ideological hatred of the Labor Party were visited on this great Commonwealth, if, tragically, the Labor Party should win a Federal election. We would find that all this activity would dry up. Mining has played a significant part from the very foundation of this State. Members have just visited the Constitutional Museum. In the early days of the State, the discovery of copper at Burra gave a real fillip to the economy. In the middle of the last century, the discovery of copper at Kadina, Wallaroo and Moonta also provided a fillip to the economy.

Even the blinkered vision of those opposite must acknowledge that the activities of Broken Hill Proprietary Limited and the development of the iron ore deposits in the Middleback Range have given a great fillip to this State's economy in this century. Let us not have that nonsense regurgitated by the Deputy Leader. He and his colleagues know perfectly well that, if they can overcome their hatred of the mining companies and the multi-

nationals that have money to invest, they will admit that mining and the increase in mining activities can and will give a great fillip to employment and to the economy of this State.

ARTERIAL CONNECTORS

Dr. BILLARD: Will the Minister of Transport undertake to review planning by the Highways Department for arterial connectors between Salisbury, Elizabeth and Tea Tree Gully, with a view to providing more adequate facilities for arterial traffic between these two regions? At present, arterial traffic between these two regions uses Target Hill Road, Golden Grove Road, Yatala Vale Road, or Kelly-Murrell and Nelson Roads. Of all these routes, only Golden Grove Road is classified as arterial, and its use as an arterial road (at least in its western portions) is restricted, first, because of the condition of the road surface; secondly, because of its siting; and, thirdly, because the nature of its intersection with Main North Road restricts the use of the road by heavy vehicles.

I have been informed that, currently, no plans exist within the Highways Department's five-year forward plan that would, in any way, be related to this problem. Many of my constituents are therefore expressing considerable concern at traffic pressures on the existing routes, and apprehension at the lack of plans to solve the problem.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I shall be pleased to examine the honourable member's question. A main arterial connector between Tea Tree Gully, Salisbury, and Para Hills is extremely important. I was aware that there was not a programme in the Highways Department budget for the next five years, but I will have a close look at this matter for him. I have received correspondence from other people in the honourable member's area about it, and, indeed, from the Para Hills area.

Mr. McRae: And from the Playford District.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: And from the Playford District. I will look into this matter for the honourable member.

UNEMPLOYMENT

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Can the Premier say whether the Commonwealth Minister for Employment and Youth Affairs (Hon. Ian Viner) was correct when he said, in his news release of 2 July, that employment in South Australia had fallen 3 600 over the 12 months ended May 1980 and, if he was, when does the State Government expect that the decline in employment levels below those in 1979 will be halted? Although I am not aware that Mr. Viner went on to detail any more closely these figures, it has been put to me that he was referring to the fact that seasonally adjusted unemployment figures in South Australia had fallen from a little over 45 000 to a little under 44 500 in the three-month period prior to the recent State election and, therefore, the whole of the increase in unemployment has occurred under the Premier's Administration. In view of the concern that we all have about this unfortunate state of affairs, and the Premier's recent statement to the House that those many initiatives that he read out to us (most of which were around the place when the Party of which I am a member was in Government—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member not to comment, but to confine his remarks to explaining his question.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: By way of explanation of

my question, as I recall, the Premier mentioned that some of these initiatives take some time to work their way into the economy, and I am sure the House would be interested in some fine tuning as to the Premier's predictions about when the working-through process is likely to become effective.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am not aware of the details of the statement referred to by the honourable member. However, I do know and have repeated constantly both in this House and outside it that the increases in employment that will occur will occur over a period of 12-18 months on average. If the honourable member really believes that it is possible to fine tune, as he describes it, an exact figure for the rate of increase in employment, all I can say is that I am pleased indeed that I did not study under him at school.

THE BIRCH

Mr. GUNN: I ask the Chief Secretary whether, in view of the unfortunate number of unprovoked attacks and rapes that have occurred in recent times (and honourable members will be aware that such attacks and rapes have taken place over a long period), he will consider amending the necessary legislation with a view to bringing back a more suitable deterrent, such as the birch? I raise this matter because it appears that existing penalties that have been handed down by the courts have proved to be quite unsatisfactory. I make my suggestion because I believe that, if the courts had the power to prescribe the use of the birch on these people who have acted in an anti-social fashion, I am sure that this deterrent would have to be applied on only one or two occasions and other people who might be considering this type of activity would not do it in the future.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I do not have any plans to put this into action. We are planning to do certain things with people who misdemean. The honourable member raises an interesting prospect, and it may indicate the way in which some people in the community think. Presently, the thoughts of many people are in favour of seeking to rehabilitate those people who misdemean.

Mr. McRae: What are you going to do with them?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Perhaps the honourable member for Playford can hold his whist; he might be lining up as the first offender. I am sure that this question poses deep thoughts in many minds, but I have to say that the Government has not considered this, nor does it have any plans to look at it. I know from the honourable member's interest that he will have some people on his side and some against. Because of the busy programme that I have, I do not expect the Government to be giving this matter any high priority in the next couple of weeks.

DISCIPLINARY ACTION

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: What action, if any, has the Deputy Premier taken against a senior public servant whom the Minister claimed publicly had caused him to make a clanger in making his historic announcement about an agreement between the Pitjantjatjara and a mining company, even though no negotiations had taken place, an incident referred to by the A.B.C. as a "case of foot-and-mouth disease"? Will the Deputy Premier take a closer personal interest in future in the conduct and outcome of such negotiations?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I did not hear that particular A.B.C. report, but the honourable member is alluding to the fact that a statement was made in relation

to some mineral exploration in what are described as Aboriginal lands in the North of this State.

In fact, we have been able to announce this significant exploration, something which the Labor Party, while in office, could not do because first, it could not attract explorers; and, secondly, it could not come to terms with the Aborigines. Nonetheless, this Government has been able to do both of those things successfully. The incident referred to was blown up out of all proportion. In fact, the Deputy Leader suggested I resign, but overnight he rethought the position and said that maybe I should have been sacked. The facts of the matter are that two companies will spend significant sums of money in the North of the State.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will just explain how serious the matter was and then members may see the matter in a clearer light. Both exploration efforts will proceed. The fact is that one company had started talks with the Aborigines. I thought it courteous that both companies should talk with the Aborigines before the granting of the licence was gazetted. The condition that a company could not proceed to do anything until it had had discussions with the Aborigines appeared on the licence. All this incident amounted to was one licence being delayed for three weeks. The fact of the matter is that both explorations will go ahead. The granting of one licence has been gazetted. The granting of the other licence will be gazetted once the company concerned has had discussions with the Aborigines, and I understand that will happen in a day or two. The blow up of the incident was thus much ado about nothing.

The officer concerned in this matter is an excellent officer of the Mines Department. He made a mistake. When he returned to the State I had a conversation with him. I ascertained the circumstances surrounding the incident, and the officer is now going about his normal business in his usual excellent fashion. I hope that explanation satisfies members opposite. In my conversation with the officer I sought an explanation as to why this happened and said to him that I hoped it would not occur again.

HARBOR DREDGING

Mr. OLSEN: Will the Minister of Marine, following his on-site inspection of major port facilities in the State, say whether he has prepared a programme for upgrading work, specifically that relating to harbor dredging in the Spencer Gulf region? If he has, when will the work commence and be completed? Should a programme not be prepared, what are the inhibiting factors preventing its completion?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The Marine and Harbors Department is in the course of preparing a submission dealing with the upgrading of the Port Pirie channel, with the aim of improving navigational conditions at that port. Although studies are not complete, the general intention is that the minimum width of the channel at critical sections should be increased, the sharper bends should be eased, the length and width of the swinging basin should be increased significantly and some additional navigational aids should be erected.

The department's dredging programme envisages work commencing about October 1981, with completion in approximately nine months from that time. *En route* to Port Pirie, it is the intention to carry out minor dredging in the outer channel at Wallaroo which will enable the channel width to be widened to accommodate the larger

ships now seeking to use that port. This work will probably be carried out in or about September 1981.

The loss of the *H. C. Meyer* delayed the dredging programme in this State quite considerably. We now have the dredge *Victoria* working and taking up the slack. We have had some problems with it because it is a noisy dredge and we have not been able to work it around the clock in the inner port areas. The honourable member's points are acknowledged and will be looked at in conjunction with the marine and harbors programme.

PITJANTJATJARA LAND RIGHTS

Mr. ABBOTT: Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs say why he has not been directly involved in the current negotiations with the Pitjantjatjara Council over the drafting of the revised Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Bill?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The honourable member who asked the question is labouring under a misapprehension. In fact, several Ministers have been directly involved in the negotiations, and the more recent ones at Alice Springs involved only two of the several Ministers who have previously been involved entirely in negotiations. In fact, the Deputy Premier went to Alice Springs representing the Premier, who has spearheaded the negotiations appropriately, since the Pitjantjatjara like to negotiate with superior members of Cabinet.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I do not think the negotiations by members opposite are any contradiction of that statement when one considers that a former Premier of this State almost unilaterally developed the previous legislation, which would have been a much better piece of legislation had the Opposition's own Attorney-General been involved as ours was in concluding the finer points of litigation. We consider that the Bill that we are presenting to the people of South Australia is a much finer piece of legal legislation than was the previous one, which was literally unworkable.

Our Attorney-General, as a matter of course, went to Alice Springs in the company of the Deputy Premier to bring almost to a conclusion the finer points of drafting the legislation. There is nothing ulterior in that, although I suspect that the question was asked to try to belittle the efforts of the present Government in concluding a satisfactory piece of negotiation in Aboriginal affairs. Meanwhile, I was back in Adelaide looking at an alternative piece of legislation for the Aborigines which is the counter to the Pitjantjatjara legislation. That was the possible allocation of Maralinga land to the Aboriginal Lands Trust, which is something else that we are hoping to bring before the House in the current session of Parliament. The negotiations that we are currently putting before the people of South Australia is not a unilateral piece of legislation. Several responsible members of the Government have been involved, and it has been quite a common comment that has been made to us during the course of negotiations that, for the first time in several years, a whole host of people who have previously been completely excluded from negotiations have now been brought in and their opinions sought. I believe that the Pitjantjatjara people, other Aboriginal people of South Australia and the Government will ultimately be satisfied with the legislation that we bring down.

BICYCLE TRACKS

Mr. SCHMIDT: Will the Minister of Transport indicate

his attitude and that of the Government to off-road and on-road bicycle track systems? As the former Minister of Education will be well aware, I have long campaigned in the southern area in regard to safety elements around schools, with regards particularly to the mode of transport used by children to get to school. One of the biggest problems is that the parents deliver children in vehicles and congest roadways around schools, resulting from time to time in serious accidents.

At the last school at which I taught, several children were killed on the road as they attempted to get to school. Along those lines, I approached the Director-General of Education and the Commissioner of Police to see what could be done in those respects. Would the Minister indicate his attitude to providing on-road and off-road facilities to encourage children and other members of the population to make greater use of bicycles rather than congesting the road with motor vehicles?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I welcome the question from the honourable member for Mawson, who has shown a great interest in cycling and bicycle policy.

Members will realise that at present the bicycle policy that this Government has carried on from the former Government consists of the allocation of a certain sum through the Bicycles Track Fund, which subsidises initiatives to be taken by local government in providing bicycle tracks. That is virtually the terms of reference of the Bicycles Track Committee. However, the present Government believes that this is not sufficient. Certainly, the trend overseas and interstate has been to veer away from the concept of the bicycle track *per se*. Members will realise that there is great difficulty in providing bicycle tracks, particularly through built-up areas, the current trend being towards a bicycle plan.

Mr. Millhouse: Like Geelong.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Indeed, like Geelong, and I believe the member for Mawson has travelled interstate and studied the Geelong situation. These bicycle plans identify for cyclists those routes that are safest for them to take. The Government believes strongly in encouraging cycling, but it also believes that this must be done with safety. Not only the question of the bicycle plan but also the education accompanying it must be considered, especially when most of the people who use the routes delineated in such a plan would be young children.

Mr. Millhouse: Why?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I know that the member for Mitcham is a cyclist, and I regret that he had an altercation with one of my buses the other day. I have apologised to the member for Mitcham for the inconvenience he was caused. I was very pleased, when I saw him cycling down the corridor of Parliament House this morning, to note that his bicycle was not damaged and, most importantly, that he was not injured.

Mr. Millhouse: It was my superior riding that saved me.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I regret, because of the great variation in weights of the bus and the member for Mitcham, that there could have been a serious accident. In answer to the member for Mawson, the Government is looking extremely closely at an alternative bicycle policy, and I hope in a few weeks to be able to make an announcement on that policy.

CASSIDY REPORT

Mr. O'NEILL: Will the Chief Secretary explain how he could inform a newspaper reporter that he had not seen or

even heard of the Cassidy Report on security at Yatala Prison when six months earlier he had mentioned that report, by name, in a letter to the General Secretary of the Australian Government Workers Association?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The Cassidy report is not a report—it is an assessment that was designed to include an addition in the Stewart Report, which was commissioned by the Director, with my approval. To whom did the honourable member say I mentioned this report six months ago?

Mr. O'Neill: The Secretary of the A.G.W.A.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: That is a complete fabrication. I received a letter from the Secretary, Mr. Morley, either early in March or on 28 February, asking me for a copy of the Cassidy remarks, which I had not seen and which I was not intended to see at that stage. As the honourable member well knows, Ministers are busy. I was having continuous discussions with the then Director of Correctional Services. Members who think they can put words in to my mouth have another think coming.

PORT LINCOLN ROADWORKS

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Minister of Transport tell the House why the proposed earthworks on the western approach road into Port Lincoln have been postponed and, secondly, can the Minister say when it can be expected that work will resume? I have just been contacted by the Chairman of the District Council of Lincoln, advising me that, because of a query on funding, the Highways Department has deferred work on the western approach road into Port Lincoln. I understand that the council was to commence work for the Highways Department next Monday. This late notification has severely disrupted the works programme of the council. However, more importantly, it will seriously delay the completion date of the western approach into Port Lincoln.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I was not aware that the earthworks on the western approach road to Port Lincoln had been deferred, but I will certainly get a report for the honourable member and let him know the position.

MR. R. D. BAKEWELL

Mr WHITTEN: My question is directed to the Minister of Industrial Affairs. Was the Minister informed or consulted either before or during his recent overseas trip about the decision to remove Mr. R. D. Bakewell from the position of permanent head of the Department of Trade and Industry? Did the Minister approve of that move and, if so, for what reason?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Yes, I was consulted; in fact, I had a discussion with the Premier and the appropriate people involved. I could not have a discussion with Mr. Bakewell before I went overseas, because he had not returned from long service leave, and I believe that the Government showed great wisdom in appointing Mr. Bakewell as Ombudsman. Mr. Bakewell himself told me that he looked forward to assuming this position, which he saw as a challenge, and I believe he will do an excellent job in the position.

KINGSTON COAL

Mr. LEWIS: Has the Minister of Mines and Energy any recent advice from Western Mining Corporation about the

Kingston coal deposits?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, I have some advice that will be of interest to the member for Mallee. I was at Kingston, in the member's district, last Friday night, when local people showed a great deal of interest in the possible development of coal at Kingston, and I understand that Western Mining Corporation has made a statement today in its quarterly report and that the indications are that the indication of coal reserves at Kingston in the South-East is very significant. The figure of 970 000 000 tonnes is the first estimated indication of the extent of the deposits. It is therefore of real importance at a time when the Government must now closely consider the availability of resources for future power generation in South Australia. The current investigations at Kingston are providing sufficient detail to allow an informed comparison to be made between those resources and alternative options for future power development in this State. I also welcome the announcement by Western Mining Corporation that it has recommenced exploration on the Stuart Shelf. This is in addition to the accelerated programme now being undertaken in the Olympic Dam area. I think the member for Mallee will be very interested to hear of an estimate of 970 000 000 tonnes in this Kingston deposit, which is very significant indeed.

PHOTOCOPYING ADVERTISEMENT

Mr. TRAINER: Will the Premier support the boycotting of Gordon Distributors and the 3M company because of a recent photocopying machine advertisement? If so, will this boycott apply to Government contracts and will changes be made to the law to make such advertisements illegal? If not, on what grounds and by what methods will the Premier support the boycotting of companies involved in sexist advertising?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The member for Ascot Park is really going a little too far, I think. There has been no suggestion of a boycott by the Government.

Mr. Millhouse: The Minister was going to use her influence to stop people from buying the machines. It's in a letter.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I repeat that there has been no suggestion that a boycott will be applied by the Government. The Minister of Health is entitled to a view that she holds very strongly, and I am surprised at the member for Mitcham, particularly, who I believe has always championed the situation of freedom of speech and certainly freedom of thought and opinion. I am rather surprised at his attitude. There is no question that there will be a boycott of anything by the Government in respect of 3M.

LAFFERS TRIANGLE

Mr. GLAZBROOK: Will the Minister of Environment advise me of the current situation concerning the report dealing with the area of land abutting Marion and Sturt Roads which is known as Laffers Triangle, and of the stage that that report has reached? A number of residents in my electorate had hoped that some progress would have been made on solving the problem of the usage of this land. It has been suggested to me that the area could be put to multiple uses for the community. However, until agreements have been reached, following the long-awaited report, any suggestion of possible projects is deemed to be

futile. I therefore seek the Minister's advice on this report.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I am pleased that the member for Brighton has asked me this question. Members will recognise that he has raised a similar question previously. It is a matter that has been going on for a very long time.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Since 1974.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I am told that it has been going on since 1974. That shows that the previous Government was involved for a long time. Many Government departments have been, and still are, involved in preparing the report. I am pleased to be able to tell the honourable member that I have been informed that the report is nearing completion and that I am to receive a copy of it by the end of July. It will then be time for the Government to take—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Have you got it?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I have been told that I can expect it by the end of July; I have not received it today. As the honourable member would appreciate, with a day such as that which we have had today, it may have arrived on my desk in my absence. I shall be following the matter up so that the Government can take some action and the matter can be taken to Cabinet as a result of the report. I understand that the committee is seeking confirmation that the triangle will be used for open-space and recreation purposes. This suggestion has been put forward by a number of Government departments, and the committee will be putting that suggestion to me in the report. A supplementary development plan to amend the current metropolitan development plan zoning may be desirable in this regard, but that is something at which we will have to look more closely after I see the final report.

Also, the committee has recommended that future recreational development within certain areas of the triangle be carried out by means of an administrative arrangement between the major public landowners and Marion council. I know that Marion council is keen to have this matter finalised as quickly as possible, and I am keen that we work with them as closely as we possibly can. So far, the committee has received representations from the council. The council has contributed input to that committee, and it is important that the council's decisions should be taken note of. I am looking forward to receiving this report so that we can take action.

PRISON SYSTEM

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith.

The SPEAKER: There being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I accept the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The substantive motion that I desire to move if I am successful in this motion is as follows:

That (1) because of the bumbling inactivity of the Chief Secretary over the parlous state of the prison system; (2) in particular, the quite unsatisfactory situation at the Yatala Labour Prison; and (3) the lack of any action to implement the recommendations of the report on security matters at Yatala made to him in February by Mr. Frank Cassidy, this House no longer has any confidence in him, and calls on him to resign forthwith.

I realise that I must not canvass the substance of that

motion. Despite moving my motion my affection for the Minister is unchanged, but I believe matters of importance to the community and the State come before personal friendship. I must say that he is simply not fit to be a Minister. May I also say in explanation—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has correctly identified the requirements of Standing Order 463, which indicates that he shall only canvass those matters that require him to gain support for a suspension of Standing Orders. I ask the honourable member to contain himself to that matter and that matter only.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Very well, Sir. Parliament has not sat much since the last election. While Parliament has been in recess, many things have happened that undoubtedly would have been raised in Parliament if it had been sitting. I believe even Australian Labor Party members would have raised some of those matters, including this matter.

I reiterate that I do not propose to debate the substance of this matter, but I will merely refer to it as an explanation for the support I am seeking on the motion before the Chair. If my motion is carried, the matter of substance that will be debated concerns the escape, as the Minister said earlier in Question Time, on 28 June of one Tognolini from Yatala Labour Prison after his friends apparently broke in to get him out. He was due to be arraigned in the District Criminal Court on the following Monday.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have indicated to the honourable member that Standing Order 463 is pertinent to this matter. I will read Standing Order 463 and then ask the honourable member to contain himself to the parameters of that Standing Order, otherwise I will find it necessary to withdraw leave. Standing Order 463 provides:

The mover shall in every case be limited to 10 minutes in stating his reasons for seeking such suspension . . .

It then goes on to indicate that one other such member may be permitted to speak. I ask the honourable member not to transgress again, or I will be forced to withdraw leave.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, from your own experience you will appreciate how difficult it is to keep on the right side of the line. I sincerely want to keep on the right side of the line.

The SPEAKER: It is also extremely important to keep on the right side of the Speaker.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir, of course. However, to explain the importance and urgency of this matter it is necessary to advert to the subject that I wish to have debated, otherwise members will not be able to form a judgment on its importance, and urgency, and the reason why we should proceed at this time. It is only to convince my friends, if I have any in this Chamber, on those matters that I will refer to at all to any of the matters of substance.

I have referred to the escape and I will say no more about it. It then transpired (and again the Minister referred to this this afternoon) that the Minister commissioned a report in December. I use the word "report" advisedly. I have the letter here. That was the word used by Mr. Gard when acknowledging receipt of it to Mr. Cassidy. The Minister commissioned the report and then received it in February. However, when Tognolini escaped the Minister apparently knew nothing about the report, let alone having done anything to implement the 33 or so recommendations. That is all I want to say about the substance of this matter.

In support of the motion, based on what I have said, I point out that such crass ineptitude demands the immediate attention of the House. A Minister who acts in this way should not be a Minister at all. Because

Parliament was in recess at the time, this is the first opportunity that we have had to debate this matter. The very fact that the Minister himself took his first opportunity to make a Ministerial statement today, which was no more than a tissue of excuses, shows that the Government itself tacitly acknowledges the urgency of this matter.

The fact is that the Minister has made the statement he has made, which is entirely unsatisfactory. The things he suggested are absolutely superficial. The problems at Yatala are problems of staff, morale, and management, and go far beyond—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member places me in the position where one further transgression on his part will require me to warn him and subsequently, if he transgresses further, to name him. I seek not to take either of those actions, but I shall have no hesitation in doing so if he transgresses once more.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have almost finished the explanation that I need to give. I am sorry if I have transgressed, because the path is a difficult one to tread. These things, the facts which are known to members, demand a debate in this House and a proper explanation, after debate, from the Minister as to why he acted as he did. Unless he can give that explanation he should not be a Minister, and it is in this place that the matter should be tested out, and it should be tested out today, which is the first opportunity we have had.

For these reasons, I move the motion. I ask honourable members, in the name of free speech in this place, because of the importance of the matter, and because of the public outcry that was caused, to support the motion and to have the debate so that we may question the Minister, and so that the Minister may give proper answers to these significant and relevant questions about this matter.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

Mr. PETERSON: Yes, Sir.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I have very serious doubts indeed as to the seriousness with which the member for Mitcham is taking this move. He has in the press been making politics with rather outrageous statements, with misstatements of fact, and indeed untruths—

Mr. Millhouse: Absolute nonsense!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am absolutely disgusted that the member for Mitcham should have put politics above the security of the community of this State, which is what he has done.

Mr. Millhouse: Nonsense!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham was heard in silence, and I ask him to hear the Premier in silence, otherwise the situation will arise that I explained to him previously.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: What was done by the member for Mitcham was dangerous, reckless, and irresponsible, coming as it did from an officer of the court, as well as a responsible (or at least we hope a responsible) member of this Chamber. We should not be considering a motion for suspension to enable the honourable member to bring in a no-confidence motion; indeed, in my view we should be considering a motion of censure of the member for Mitcham and the action he has taken.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the honourable Premier's attention to the fact that the requirements which are limiting upon the mover of the motion are equally limiting upon the second speaker to it. I ask the honourable Premier not to introduce further material of the nature of that which he has just introduced.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I accept your ruling, Sir, but I

point out with great respect that I am certainly not supporting the motion.

Is the member for Mitcham really serious in what he is trying to do this afternoon? He had an opportunity earlier in the afternoon to seek to suspend Standing Orders, but he did not take it. He could indeed have spoken to the Leader of the House; it is, I think, the understanding of everyone in this Chamber that that is the normal accepted practice and indeed a tradition of the House, and the honourable member has been here long enough to know that. I can remember that a long time ago, when he used to sit on the Opposition benches, he was well aware of that tradition and indeed was the person who applied it. He could have, as a matter of courtesy, and if he were honest about it, spoken to the Leader of the House and expressed his desire to move a motion of no confidence. He has had ample opportunity. He has been here all the afternoon, but he has not done that. He could have, had he wanted to, made these moves.

He said that, because the House had not been sitting for some weeks, the Minister took the first opportunity to make a Ministerial statement on the matter, and suggested that that was some evidence of the seriousness with which the Minister regarded the subject. I totally agree with that side of it. The Minister does regard the subject as very serious indeed, and it was for that reason that he gave a detailed Ministerial statement. I very strongly suspect that it would not have mattered what he said: the member for Mitcham would have tried to make political capital in any case. I suggest that the member for Mitcham read, and not dismiss, that Ministerial statement. It may not suit his purpose, as it puts to rest some of the untruths that he has been peddling. However, I suggest that he read the statement seriously and carefully. The honourable member said, for instance, that the Chief Secretary commissioned a report from Mr. Cassidy.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier is now getting into the substance of the motion that will be debated if the House sees fit to carry the motion that is now before it. I ask the Premier to speak only to those matters that will either allow or disallow the carrying of the present motion.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Thank you, Sir. I am sure that you appreciate the great difficulty that one has in not introducing matter that has already been introduced by the member for Mitcham.

An honourable member: Including that point.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes. I repeat that the Government acknowledges that this is a serious situation, and for that reason a detailed Ministerial statement was made today. Although the Government is serious about the moves that it is taking to remedy the whole situation, I cannot believe that the member for Mitcham is at all serious. He has not taken the first opportunity to act but has moved this motion without consulting with the Leader of the House in the belief that it would be rejected. Indeed, I suspect that he moved it for the purpose of being rejected and refused the numbers. I do not believe that the member for Mitcham expects this motion to be debated at all. If he had been serious and honest about the matter, he would have spoken to the Leader of the House or to me well before this sitting commenced this afternoon. I oppose the motion.

The SPEAKER: The question is that the motion be agreed to. For the question say "Aye", against "No". There being a dissentient voice, there must be a division.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (2) — Messrs. Millhouse (teller) and Peterson.

Noes (39)—Mr. Abbott, Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, L. M. F. Arnold, Ashenden, Bannon, Becker,

Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, Lewis, Mathwin, McRae, Olsen, O'Neill, Oswald, Payne, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Slater, Tonkin (teller), Trainer, Whitten, Wilson, Wotton, and Wright.

Majority of 37 for the Noes.
Motion thus negatived.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: CASSIDY REPORT

Mr. O'NEILL (Florey): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The SPEAKER: Leave is granted but, before allowing the honourable member to proceed (and being the first occasion this session that a personal explanation is being given), I draw to honourable members' attention the requirements relating to a personal explanation. By leave of the House, a member may explain matters of a personal nature, although there be no question before the House, but such matters may not be debated. Leave of the House to make a personal explanation shall, in the first instance, continue for five minutes, and, without further leave, the member shall be limited to that time in making the explanation. I am not offering or asking the honourable member to seek guidance or assistance for the second part of the Standing Order, but I believe that all honourable members should recognise the parameters of a personal explanation.

Mr. O'NEILL: Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for any guidance or assistance you can give me. I rise in response to the assertion made by the Chief Secretary in answer to my question, "Will the Chief Secretary explain how he could inform a newspaper reporter that he had not seen or heard of the Cassidy Report into security at Yatala Prison, when six months earlier he had mentioned that report by name in a letter to the General Secretary of the Australian Government Workers Association?" He said, in response to my question, that it was a complete fabrication: I maintain that it was not a complete fabrication. I asked my question genuinely, because I have seen a copy of the letter that the Chief Secretary wrote to the General Secretary of the Australian Government Workers Association.

Unfortunately, I do not have the letter in my possession at present and, therefore, I cannot quote it verbatim. However, I can assert categorically that contained in the letter was a statement by the Minister that in fact he knew of the existence of the Cassidy Report and that (if I remember correctly) he could not divulge the contents of the report because it was confidential. Therefore, rather than my being guilty of fabricating a proposition, I assert that the Chief Secretary today has misled this House—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has made his point, and he may not then make an accusation against another member. He can explain his position and his position only.

Mr. O'NEILL: If it is necessary to confirm my position in the matter, I am prepared to produce a copy of that letter with the permission of the Secretary of the Australian Government Workers Association and table it in the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would have to indicate, not that there has been an application for tabling, but I would have to indicate to the honourable member that it is not possible for a member of this House, other than a Minister, to table a document. The honourable member

would find other ways of bringing the matter to the attention of the House.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Sessional committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The Speaker, and Messrs. Duncan, Gunn, McRae, and Russack.

Library: The Speaker, and Messrs. Lynn Arnold, Billard, and McRae.

Printing: Messrs. Mathwin, Plunkett, Randall, Schmidt, and Slater.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

That a committee consisting of Messrs. Billard, Evans, Goldsworthy, Schmidt, and Tonkin be appointed to prepare a draft Address to His Excellency the Governor in reply to his Speech on opening Parliament and to report on Tuesday next.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. TRAINER (Ascot Park): I would like to make a few remarks about an organization operating under the name Aussie Pools, which has been previously mentioned in this House and is a scheme run by a company calling itself Pro-Win (Aust.) Proprietary Limited, operated by a Mr. Wheeler and a Mr. Van Reesema. Free football pool coupons are given away each week by shopkeepers in the expectation of attracting trade. The shopkeeper pays \$89 deposit and \$19.50 per week to be an agent. This subject was earlier raised in a question to the Minister of Recreation and Sport on 1 April by the member for Fisher, who cited an advertisement soliciting agents in the *Advertiser* of 19 March. I have not been able to find it in that issue, so that date may be incorrect. What brought this business to my attention was a letter from a constituent, Mr. T. Crawford, of Charles Street Ascot Park. His letter is as follows:

I wish to bring your attention to a "free" competition operating in Adelaide at the moment, namely, Aussie Pools, organised and run by Pro-Am promotions. Entry forms are obtained from various shopkeepers acting as agents around South Australia. A prize is given for forecasting the highest scoring football teams in order each week. I have been entering this competition for several weeks and finally for matches played on the 13 and 14 of July 1980—

I believe my constituent has the dates wrong, and that the dates should be 12 and 13 July. The letter continues:

I had a winning entry which was received and acknowledged as such by the promoters. I was therefore entitled to a prize of \$500 which they refused to pay me on the grounds that I had submitted more than one entry for that week. However, there is no intimation on the entry form which I enclose or in the advertisement in the evening newspaper.

I have been to Consumer Affairs, the small lotteries office, News Ltd., and finally to a solicitor, who incidentally all agreed that I should have been entitled to the prize. However, the Consumer Affairs and the small lotteries office contend they have no jurisdiction in this case, even though

they agree that their activities are at the very least dubious, and the *News* will look into the wording of the advert. In the light of these facts I believe that some action should be taken by a Government official into the activities of this promoter.

The letter is signed by T. Crawford.

I received a sample coupon from him, as described in that letter, and there was nothing in it prohibiting multiple entries. I ran a check in the Parliamentary Library on Aussie Pools and found an early advertisement with no mention in it of multiple entries. I also found a promotional feature that appeared in the *News* on 14 May, but there was no mention in that, either, about multiple entries. I also located a series of clippings about two people attempting to put in a phoney coupon to get the then \$7 000 jackpot. I later discovered that one of these two men had allegedly dreamed up the Aussie Pools concept, had been frozen out of the scheme, and was trying to get his cut of the profits by using inside information to try to set up a winning coupon.

I telephoned Aussie Pools and spoke to a Mr. Ernst Van Reesema, a persuasive gentleman who almost convinced me that my constituent was a dreadful cheat trying to defraud a respectable firm, and that someone else allegedly had a better claim to a win that week than did my constituent. I was 99 per cent satisfied with his explanation that the rules had been altered after a few rounds of the competition to ban multiple entries and that that was printed in the advertisements and on the coupons. I will say more on that later. However, I still had some nagging doubts, which increased when my attention was drawn to a report in the *Advertiser* of 20 June, as follows:

An appeal against a three-month prison sentence imposed on an Adelaide businessman for company offences was dismissed in the Supreme Court yesterday by Mr. Justice Mohr.

The sentence was imposed in the Adelaide Magistrates Court in January on Ernst Abraham Siewertsz Van Reesema of College Street, College Park.

He was found guilty by Mr. G. E. Carter, SM, of having, without the leave of the Supreme Court, been concerned in the management of Maelor-Jones Pty. Ltd. within five years of a conviction of an offence involving fraud or dishonesty.

He was also found guilty of having been concerned in the management of Armor Coatings (Marketing) Pty. Ltd. within five years of a conviction involving an offence against the Secret Commissions Prohibition Act. . . . Mr. Justice Mohr said Van Reesema's whole attitude had quite clearly been one of contempt for the law . . .

Having had that drawn to my attention, I had a closer look at the organisers' backgrounds and some of the history of Maelor-Jones and Van Reesema, who, it has been suggested to me, is an associate of the well-known lawyer, Tennyson Turner, who is currently languishing in Cadell. On 12 February 1980, the company which organises this pool changed its name from Hoversport International to Prowin Ltd. On 8 February 1980 the directors, Glyn West Nominees and William Carol, both resigned and were replaced by two new directors named T. R. Wheeler and B. R. Wheeler. The shareholders seem to be a rather mixed lot and consist of Mr. S. G. Maidment, solicitor; G. W. Forbes; and I. C. Hardwick, R. S. Nelson and Yonder Investments Limited (a very strangely-named group) from Western Australia.

Anyone looking at the company records can find out a great deal about the organisers of this company. If the information provided to me is correct, it is surprising that these individuals, after all their troubles, found it so easy to operate a large-scale, unlicensed football pool, apparently quite legally. They were only just within the law because it is a free competition and does not fall within

the ambit of the Lottery and Gaming Act or the Trading Stamp Act. It is not a lottery in the normal sense of the term, since there is no contractual relationship between the organisers and the entrant; there is such a relationship only between the agents and the organiser, unless, of course, the ticket is in some way tied in with a purchase whereby a person must buy something in a shop before he can get a ticket, and in that case there is a contractual arrangement between the entrant and the organisers. If entrants in this competition (like my constituent) are not allowed to take, or are stopped from taking, multiple tickets, how can the customer be limited to one coupon by the shopkeeper agent? Does the shopkeeper have to say, "Only one ticket per sale"? If that is so, the coupon is limited to a purchase and this scheme would come under the Act.

There is no evidence of this, so, at the moment, no laws apply and the proprietors can make their own rules as they go along—on a par with the old style chook raffle in a pub. Following these revelations, I inquired among a few of the small businessmen, for whom this Government has, unfortunately, shown little concern. All of them mentioned a woman coming to the shop and giving a sales pitch about the value of this scheme for boosting their floor traffic and the inexpensive advertising they would get. As one put it to me, "This bird with big boobs talked me into it", and perhaps 160 or so shopkeepers paid contracts which, apparently, were binding for the rest of the football season, as some found out when they tried to get out of the contracts when the business that had been promised did not come into their shops.

Around the time that they signed their contracts they received a letter stating that their agency applications had been approved by the board and apologising for the delay in getting the draws started, caused by "Parliament requiring to consider the introduction of Aussie Pools in South Australia". I do not remember this being mentioned in the House other than in the question asked by the member for Fisher, but it seems that this House gave its seal of approval, as the letter then states:

We believe, however, that the official stamp of approval by Parliament considering the matter will go to substantially improve the operating success of the Aussie Pools concept. Over the period that this scheme has been operating, the number of agents has varied from 99 to 130. For example, the 5 May advertisement lists 107, although it claims, in bold print, 116 locations. (This could be an example of false advertising.)

Several shopkeepers, such as the eight Mase's butcher shops, pulled out early when, as one put it, they smelled a rat as far as having confidence in their businesses profiting from it was concerned. Others withdrew later and received letters pointing out that they were contracted to pay until the end of the season. I have a copy of one here demanding a further \$331 from a small business proprietor who felt that he had gained no extra trade at all after several weeks participation and had pulled out. I have a great deal more information on this organisation, which seems to be operating with fairly large profits and with small odds against paying out. Indeed, I calculate the odds of somebody winning at about 3 500 000 to one. I will return to this topic at a later stage.

Mr. GLAZBROOK (Brighton): In the limited time that I have available, I would like to speak about some of the problems surrounding the Dog Control Act, 1979. With almost one year of the operation of this Act and regulations having passed, several points of interest have been drawn to my attention. Many councils in the metropolitan area have issued information guides on what

dog owners cannot do—in other words, what is against the law. In talking to one senior council officer, I gathered the distinct feeling that a guide should be produced showing dog owners what they can do, as all that the Act and the regulations show is what cannot be done.

For instance, a youth under 18 years old technically is not a person who can have control of a dog. This means that, if my young son or daughter took our dog for a walk and later in an open space took off the lead, my dog would be deemed to be wandering at large and subject to committing an offence. Section 34 (4) of the Dog Control Act provides:

In any proceedings for an offence against this Act or in any civil proceedings in relation to any injury, damage or nuisance caused by a dog, any person who was an occupier of premises in which the dog was kept or permitted to live at the material time shall be deemed to have been keeping, or to have had possession or control of, the dog at that time unless he proves that another person of—

and this is the important part—

or above the age of eighteen years was keeping, or had possession or control of, the dog at that time.

I think that, every time we see a young person or persons playing with their dog without an adult's supervision, we have to remind ourselves that the owner of the dog or the parents are breaking the law.

Many people buy dogs for their children and the dog and the children grow up together as friends. It is quite common to see dogs and children playing together, walking or just playing.

I now refer to the problems of exercising dogs, with regard to section 35 of the Act, which states that, where a dog is in a place to which the public has access, or in a place where the occupier has consented that it should be, and no person is exercising effective control over the dog, the dog shall be deemed to be wandering at large. This means that, once the dog is let off the lead to run around, it cannot, once it is out of sound of the owner's commands, be under effective control; the dog is deemed to be wandering at large. Unless a dog-owner can find a person with a very large paddock, who gives his permission for a dog to be run on that paddock, effective exercise for the dog is lost. Obviously, what is needed is an area for people to exercise dogs off the lead. Regarding the age of 18 years, we need to consider lowering the age of a person who has effective control of a dog to about 12 years of age. Some parents are complaining about incidents in which councils stick to the letter of the law and issue expiation fees for offences committed by young children with their dogs.

I also believe that the term "dogs wandering at large" needs much finer definition because, if a person believes that his dog is not guilty of wandering at large, he receives a fine, and the only course of action open to him is to allow the court to decide, after he refuses to pay the fine. This is a costly waste of taxpayers' time and money, and it can be a traumatic experience for the owner of the dog who is hauled off to court, and can cause severe embarrassment for the owner, all because of the definition of a "dog wandering at large".

Let us consider a case whereby a person, working in his garden, may let his dog into the front garden; he bends his head to plant some seeds and the dog jumps over the gate and wanders in the street, not very far and within call of the owner. Unknown to the owner, the dog catcher is in the street; he catches the dog and the owner is issued with an expiation fee because it is deemed that the dog was wandering at large. However, the dog was within distance of effective control because it was within the sound of his master's voice. In this case, the result is a fine.

Consider also the case of two young 14-year-old children exercising their dog in the park. The children decide to play ball with a friend and the dog temporarily runs off, not very far and within call of the children; however, the children may not be paying attention to the dog. The dog warden may be around—the result is a fine because it is deemed that the dog was wandering at large. Conscientious councils are being blamed for observing the regulations of the law and are catching the flak because of an ill-worded definition.

Similar comments can be made about the definition of "effective control", which permits a dog to be not on a leash if it is in close proximity to a person and responsive to that person's commands. Is close proximity 5ft., 10ft., or 50ft.? Does it depend on the wind, the traffic, or how loudly a person can whistle or shout? What is "effective"? If it is not effective, then the dog is deemed to be wandering at large. Each dog warden must judge every case, note book in hand. As I have said, some changes are necessary to bring some rationale into this Act, and I hope that we will see some amendments to the Act to overcome these odd areas of doubt that I raised, and indeed to satisfy many dog-owners who are now being challenged because of certain sections of the Act.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): This Government came to office with a multiplicity of promises and it had a variety of backers, some of whom will be vividly recalled, such as the financial backers, which included the mining corporations, various manufacturers and the retail traders, appropriately, in terms of name, led by Mr. Rundle, that famous bag man of Rundle Street, or Rundle Mall as we call it today. Among the community, those who changed their votes would have been heavily influenced by promises of variously 7 000, 10 000 or 17 000 new jobs.

In fact, in the Districts of Florey, Playford, Newland, and Todd, it was quite clear in the minds of the young constituents that the number of new jobs that was going to be available was 17 000. The new members for Newland and Todd will vividly recall, as the new member for Florey and I as the continuing member for Playford recall, those horrible placards put out around these districts on 19 September last year, in which these young people were deluded, deceived and defrauded by this Government into thinking that 17 000 jobs would soon be available. It was on that expectation that they voted for this Government. I am absolutely appalled to find that 10 months later not only are there not 7 000, 10 000 or 17 000 new jobs, but there has been a rise in unemployment.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Mr. Rundle—

Mr. McRAE: I am coming to Mr. Rundle. Those young people who worked at the polling booths for the Liberal Party on that day in the hopeful expectation, dewy eyed, that this promise would be fulfilled will know one thing. They were unemployed on that day, and they are still unemployed today.

Mr. Rundle was employed, and well employed, on that day, with his large business, well known to many of us, and today, about 10 months later, is even better employed. He still has his business or, if he is going to sell it, he will still have the capital from the business, but I doubt that. He will still be employed in that business and, in addition, will have a highly paid job in one of the world's most interesting cities. He will take his family there and reside there for five years, if the present Government remains in office for that long. I hope that this Opposition, when it becomes the new Government in about two years time, will bring Mr. Rundle back as one of its first acts.

Any appointments made that are corrupt (and that was a corrupt appointment: there is no other word for it)

should be immediately revoked. I am not saying that Governments should not have the opportunity or that it should not be the responsibility of Governments to employ people that they think are the right people for the job. However, when it is a question of a contract payment for being bad man for a dubious group of traders, I draw the line.

The next thing that influenced many people on that day was the question of law and order. Many members, including the members for Todd and Newland, will remember the horrible advertisements inserted in the newspapers at about that time. I do not forget them. They were inserted under the supposed authorisation of a man called Mr. Buick. I do not know whether he has been paid off yet.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Yes, he got a fishing contract.

Mr. McRAE: Did he? I am not surprised. He was the supposed authoriser of that advertisement, but I know that it was paid for by Adrian Brien Ford Proprietary Limited. I am not sure what payment has been received there, but no doubt something will be coming in the pipeline for him, too. That horrible advertisement declared that members of the Australian Labor Party were in some way involved with criminals or were not doing everything in their power to carry out reforms in the criminal justice system to see that criminals were brought to justice and adequately punished. That was disgraceful.

The Hon. H. Allison: In New South Wales—

Mr. McRAE: I will ignore the unfortunate statement by the Minister of Education, who I should have hoped would set a higher standard in this House than to make that stupid interjection relating to the savage bashing by criminals in New South Wales of Mr. Baldwin, M.L.C. The bashing was certainly not by members of the A.L.P. but was by a criminal yet to be discovered.

Many of us remember, and I will never forget, those disgusting advertisements, paid for by Adrian Brien Ford, that made all those suggestions. So, it is interesting to note what the track record has been. Those were the promises that influenced so many people. For example, 17 000 new jobs were promised but nothing has eventuated. The people of electorates in the north-eastern suburbs are left in the same desperate plight as they were in 10 months ago. With regard to law and order, nothing has been done, and the situation is an absolute shambles. In fact a Gilbert and Sullivan charade was played out here in the House today, when the member for Eyre, I think it was, suggested that the best he could think of was the return of the birch, and the Chief Secretary mumbled something about some people being in favour and some against, but that he was not too sure. He had a lot of things that he was going to do but he was too busy to tell us what they were going to be. That is the sort of standard, and I hope that members opposite who are not in the Ministry will demand in their Party room that this Cabinet live up to its responsibilities.

Last year I had a positive motion on notice which called on the House to set up a Select Committee to see that people who were the victims of crime were adequately compensated. That was in keeping with the philosophy of the Liberal Party and it was in keeping with the philosophy of any reasonable person. What happened? Because this called for a free and open Select Committee, it was frustrated and muzzled and replaced by a committee of people (whose competency I do not challenge—well qualified people) who were to meet in secret and receive only written submissions, contrary to all the other promises we were given by the Liberal Party that it would be a free and open Government, and that there would be Select Committees of Parliament, whereby legislators would carry out their correct responsibilities and accept their responsibilities. There is none of that; we have handed over Government to a group of bureaucrats. That is not good enough.

Mr. Mathwin: Steady!

Mr. McRAE: I am not condemning members of that committee because they are bureaucrats; I said that they were very competent people. What I am condemning is the fact that this is not an open Select Committee of this Parliament. That is what I am demanding and why I intend to put this motion back on notice again as quickly as I can.

I intended to look at the Governor's Speech to see whether I could find any more action of a positive nature to be taken by this Government in order to carry out its promises. I was going to do that in some detail, but I understand that we have an agreement between the Parties that these grievances this evening be limited and, of course, I will follow up that undertaking. I have only one minute left and during that time I will say that nothing I can see in His Excellency's Speech (which of course, was not written by him, or it would have been of a much higher standard)—

The SPEAKER: Order! I would draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that the House has already passed the motion that the Governor's Address be further considered on Tuesday.

Mr. McRAE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was going to deal again with the arrogance of this Government as displayed in this Speech, but in view of your remarks I will delay that until next week. In conclusion, I shall say that on those two important topics, which so influenced voters in the north-eastern suburbs, the Government has not carried out its promises. I suggest that one of the reasons for that is that the Government never had any reasonable policies to start with. It has already failed the electorate, and in particular (and this is terribly sad) the young members of the electorate.

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

Motion carried.

At 6 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 5 August at 2 p.m.