HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 26 February 1981

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

PETITION: SOUTHEND WATER

A petition signed by 311 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide the township of Southend with an adequate water supply was presented by Mr. Lewis.

Petition received.

OVERSEAS VISIT REPORT

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy) laid on the table the report on the overseas visit in October and November 1980, compiled by Mr. R. K. Johns, Deputy Director-General, Department of Mines and Energy.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MEEKATHARRA MINERALS LIMITED

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I advise the House of communication that has been made today with the company Meekatharra Minerals Limited. Members will recall that this company has been the subject of two previous statements to the House on 4 December last year and 9 February.

As the result of matters raised in those statements, I have telexed the Managing Director of the company, Mr. D. J. O'Callaghan, in the following terms today:

> Following meetings between your consultants and representatives of your company and officers of the Department of Mines and Energy on 18 and 23 February 1981, I am advised that the data relating to exploration for coal in the Arckaringa Basin has been reviewed further by departmental officers.
>
> It is understood that drilling has intersected a number of seams of coal over a wide area and that the results are sufficiently encouraging to justify further work. However, the drillholes are widely spaced (averaging 5·5 km apart) and the availability of but four seam analyses from only two holes are such as to be inadequate to justify the establishment of a meaningful category of reserves and coal quality.
>
> I believe that the statements made by you and on which press comments have been made, which referred to assumed reserves of 2 400 000 000 tonnes of coal, cannot be sustained on available data. Further, as discussed during the meeting on 18 February, no economic connotation can be attached to the resource at this time.
>
> Until further drilling and sampling have been undertaken to establish the behaviour of the various coal seams through firm correlations of drillhole intersections and there is much better understanding of coal quality, the deposits should be referred to as having large inferred reserves with limited potential for economic extraction in the near future.
>
> Public statements on activities should include information on ranges and averages with respect to coal depth, individual seam thicknesses, thickness of inter-seam partings, method of interpreting coal seam thicknesses and should refer to coal quality on an "as mined" basis. There are other prospects for discovery of further, perhaps thicker and better coals, and I welcome your interest and look forward to progress of exploration in this and adjacent areas in due course.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: T-JUNCTION RULE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Members will recall that I have introduced in the House amendments to the Road Traffic Act concerning changes to the T-junction road rules. These have been passed and the new rule takes effect on Sunday 1 March 1981.

It is a very important change in that it reduces, yet again, the power of the give way to the right rule, which is now taking a very minor role in road laws. We have priority roads introduced and, of course, any intersections that have signals, or sign-posted directions, have already reduced the impact of the give way to the right rule.

The change taking place this Sunday will apply nationally and will mean that a car travelling on the continuing road at a T-junction will have priority. The car travelling on the terminating road of the T-junction will have to give way to traffic in both directions on the road it is joining.

At the time the Australian Transport Advisory Council agreed to this change it was decided that Transport Australia would organise publicity for all States. That department has produced newspaper, radio and television advertisements, which have been distributed to all States. It was emphasised that the advertising campaign should be short and intensive, focused on the date of introduction of the new rule. The timing has been co-ordinated nationally.

In keeping with this, my department, through the Road Safety Council, is spending in the order of $17 000 on a campaign on all television stations in South Australia, including country television stations, that begins tonight and runs until next Tuesday. Newspaper advertising has already begun and radio advertising will begin tomorrow.

Apart from the $17 000 being spent, we will be receiving free radio and television time, as a community service, valued at over $8 000, which effectively brings the campaign total to $25 000 worth of advertising. The commercial radio stations have generously consented to their drive-time announcers mentioning the change of rule when traffic information is broadcast in the mornings and the evenings.

Starting today, 40 000 information leaflets will be distributed through major city and metropolitan supermarkets. I was concerned about comments by the police in this morning's *Advertiser*, because, had they contacted my office, they would have been advised of the planned advertising campaign and the reason for its short intensive application.

It is important that the campaign is not drawn out to minimise confusion about when the change comes into effect. However, I am pleased that the police comments received such a prominent display on the front page, further assisting the spreading of the message. It is a simple, commonsense rule, and there need be no confusion or danger if people think and give way as the advertisements advise.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The identification of the disease-causing amoebae, *naegleria fowleri,* in the water supply system of the northern towns and Yorke Peninsula has aroused widespread public concern in those areas and throughout the State. Late yesterday the Government received information which indicates that *naegleria* amoebae are present on a widespread basis throughout our water supplies. The advice indicated that it is neither possible nor practicable to eliminate them entirely from South Australia's water supply. The advice confirms previous statements by the Minister of Water Resources and me that these amoebae are widespread in the natural soil and water environments in the State and, indeed, beyond its borders.

I must stress that the preliminary survey results reported to us yesterday, whilst they indicate the existence of *naegleria,* have not yet proceeded to the stage where their high temperature tolerance and pathogenicity have been determined. In this regard it is important that the information I provide to the House not be used by either the Opposition or the media to arouse a sense of unfounded alarm throughout the community. Nevertheless, the information given to us yesterday is of a nature which requires immediate action in order to ensure that the community is aware of the situation and is provided with information which ensures that simple precautions can be taken to avoid what is a remote risk of contracting amoebic meningitis. It has been well established that the disease can be contracted only if fresh water is allowed to enter the nose. It cannot be contracted from sea water.

Following the identification of the pathogenic amoebae *naegleria fowleri* in the Whyalla and Yorke Peninsula water supplies, the State Water Laboratories initiated a survey of other State water supplies on 17 February 1981. Less intensive surveys of this nature have been done in the past in the knowledge that this organism and the non-pathogenic *naegleria* species is widespread in the natural soil and water environment. Previous surveys of water supplies have, however, proved to be negative for *naegleria fowleri.* The preliminary results of the current survey have been summarised in a report, which I now table, and I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable Minister wish to table it as a separate document, or is it part of the Ministerial statement and attachments?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It is a separate document, but I believe that it should be incorporated in *Hansard* because it contains statistical information that would take a long time to read to the House.

Leave granted.

STATE WATER LABORATORIES

Naegleria isolates at 42°C—High Temperature (44°C) Tolerance and pathogenicity not yet determined

Location	Sampled	Water Temp.	Free Chlorine Residual (mg/L)	Recognised	Action Taken
Morgan-Whyalla Pipeline					
Wright Street, Port Pirie	17.2.81	32	0·5	24.2.81	Increased surveillance
Loudon Road, Port Augusta	18.2.81	30	1·5	24.2.81	Increased surveillance
Whyalla-Lincoln Gap Main (before Whyalla)	18.2.81	28	<0·1	24.2.81	Rechlorinated prior to Whyalla
Crystal Brook	17.2.81	31	<0·1	24.2.81	Mains disinfection to achieve 0·5 mg/L free chlorine recommended
Yorke Peninsula Water Supply					
Paskeville No. 2 (after chlorination)	20.2.81	20	<0·1	24.2.81	Operations Division advised—investigating
Clinton Reservoir	17.2.81	24	N.D.	24.2.81	Rechlorinated at Kainton Corner
Warawurlie Tank	18.2.81	23	<0·1	24.2.81	See Note 3 below
Muloowurtie North Tank	17.2.81	28	<0·1	24.2.81	
Curramulka North Tank	18.2.81	26	<0·1	24.2.81	
Port Vincent Town Supply	17.2.81	27	<0·1	24.2.81	
Stansbury Tank	17.2.81	24	<0·1	24.2.81	
Stansbury Town Supply	17.2.81	23	<0·1	24.2.81	
Yorketown Town Supply	17.2.81	27	<0·1	24.2.81	
Edithburgh Tank	17.2.81	25	<0·1	24.2.81	
Edithburgh Town Supply	17.2.81	25	<0·1	24.2.81	
Other Northern Water Supplies					
Brinkworth Town Supply	18.2.81	27	<0·1	24.2.81	Chlorinated at Walladges Corner from 24.2.81 (chlorine dose rate—3 mg/L)
Blyth Town Supply	18.2.81	27	<0·1	24.2.81	
Port Broughton Town Supply	20.2.81	27	<0·1	24.2.81	Checking disinfection at Upper Wakefield
Tod-Ceduna Trunk Main System					
Lock Town Supply	17.2.81	27	N.D.	24.2.81	
Kimba Town Suply	18.2.81	22	N.D.	24.2.81	
Minnipa Town Supply	18.2.81	17	N.D.	24.2.81	
Wuddina Town Supply	18.2.81	22	N.D.	24.2.81	
Ceduna Town Supply	17.2.81	N.D.	N.D.	24.2.81	

STATE WATER LABORATORIES

Naegleria isolates at 42°C—High Temperature (44°C) Tolerance and pathogenicity not yet determined

Location	Sampled	Water Temp.	Free Chlorine Residual (mg/L)	Recognised	Action Taken
Tailem Bend-Keith Trunk Main System					
Keith	18.2.81	N.D.	N.D.	24.2.81	Checking disinfection at Tailem Bend
Mannahill Open Dam Storage					
Mannahill Town Tank	9.2.81	28	N.D.	13.2.81	
Mannahill Town Supply	9.2.81	28	N.D.	13.2.81	

Notes:

1. N.D. = not determined
2. High temperature tolerance (at 44°C) has not been demonstrated for these isolates. Testing for high temperature tolerance will commence on 25.2.81.
3. Lower Yorke Peninsula tanks including Minlacowie, Minlaton, Port Vincent, Stansbury, Yorketown and Edithburgh were disinfected on 17-18.2.81. Many of the *Naegleria* sp. from this area could have been isolated from samples collected before tank disinfection. The chlorine dose rate at the Upper Mount Rat chlorinator was increased to 6 mg/L on 18.2.81.
4. Mannahill was not included in the original planned survey but a sample taken on 9.2.81 for bacteriological testing was examined.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The report confirms the presence of *naegleria*—that is, amoebae which survive at a temperature of 42°C—in water supplies in the following locations:

- on the West Coast as far west as Ceduna, which receives its water from the Tod distribution system originating in the Tod reservoir.
- in the North-East of the State from the open dam supply at Mannahill on the Broken Hill line.
- in the Keith water supply in the South-East which is piped from the Murray River.
- in a private Murray River water supply at Walkers Flat.

The results are from water samples taken last week. The present isolates have only been detected in samples cultured at 42°C at this stage. The next step in identifying whether or not they are the pathogenic *naegleria fowleri* is to culture them at 44°C to determine whether they are "high temperature tolerant" and then to confirm them by pathogenicity tests using mice. Past experience is that approximately 30 per cent of *naegleria* isolated at 42°C are confirmed as *naegleria fowleri*. However, even the presence of *naegleria* at 42°C is sufficient evidence to confirm that the pathogen is widespread in the natural water and soil environment in South Australia and may be present in the warm public water supplies of the State.

I mentioned earlier that it is neither possible nor practicable to eliminate *naegleria fowleri* entirely from our water supplies in South Australia. In other words, amoebic meningitis must be considered as an endemic, although extremely rare, disease in South Australia—that is, in much the same way as is Australian arboencephalitis, commonly known as Murray Valley encephalitis.

The Government will maintain all existing chlorination programmes and will proceed with its filtration proposals. However, because of the widespread State distribution network and the use of private water sources by some country residents, it is quite impracticable to maintain the required chlorine residual levels at every hamlet and individual consumer's supply.

On being informed of the results of the survey, the Minister of Water Resources and I initiated the development, by senior health and water resources officers, of a submission which was considered by Cabinet this morning. As a result, the following action will now be implemented:

1. A comprehensive ongoing State-wide public awareness programme (particularly prior to and during summer) will be mounted by the South Australian Health Commission. The estimated cost is $75 000 per annum.

   This programme will be directed to the South Australian community generally, with added attention being given to communication through schools and local government. The programme will also stress that the active pathogen may be present in any warm water body and is not confined to public water supplies.

2. The Amoebic Identification Unit of the State Water Laboratories will be upgraded to enable more comprehensive ongoing surveillance of State water resources and public water supplies, and to provide resources to carry out appropriate fundamental research in this field. The estimated cost is $150 000 per annum.

3. We will establish an expanded Standing Committee on water quality to report to the Ministers of Health and Water Resources on all health aspects of water quality in South Australia. It will comprise senior level representation from the South Australian Health Commission and the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The membership and terms of reference of this committee will be developed by consultation between the Ministers, and the terms of reference will specifically include responsibility for recommending procedures by which local health officers in local government will be kept informed of the results of the surveillance programme.

Notwithstanding the establishment of a Statewide health education awareness programme on amoebic meningitis, the Government recognises the importance of ensuring that local government can respond quickly to the presence of high temperature tolerant *naegleria* in local water supplies by intensifying the general awareness programme in local areas.

4. A medical officer of the S.A. Health Commission and a microbiologist of the State Water Laboratories will undertake an overseas visit to the amoebic meningitis research centre in the

U.S.A. and Europe, where this disease is also endemic, during the coming winter (northern hemisphere summer) to evaluate the relevance of work being done on this disease in those centres. This recommendation takes into account that, while the South Australian experts are recognised internationally, considerable value should be obtained by personal interaction with their counterparts working in the field overseas.

It is known that amoebae exist everywhere but that high temperatures are conducive to the rapid multiplication of the high-temperature tolerant species, which include the pathogenic *naegleria fowleri*. This summer has been the hottest on record since the 1930's. Similar conditions may not recur. Nevertheless, in the light of results of surveys initiated earlier this month, the Government it taking every responsible measure to protect the State's water supplies and to inform the public of its own responsibilities in regard to amoebic meningitis.

QUESTION TIME

PUBLIC WARD PATIENTS

Mr. BANNON: Will the Premier give this House a categorical assurance that means testing for public ward patients in South Australian hospitals will not be introduced? Will he release to the public the Government's submission to the Commonwealth on the hospitals agreement? South Australia is currently a party to a binding legal agreement with the Commonwealth which guarantees that the Commonwealth will meet 50 per cent of our hospital expenditure until 1985. Both the Premier and the Minister of Health have publicly indicated that the State Government is prepared to abandon that agreement in exchange for a tax sharing arrangement that would have no specific health allocation. They state that this would allow the State Government to allocate health moneys to other areas of Government, no doubt a move designed to rescue the State's financial position.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Leader not to comment in giving the explanation to his question.

Mr. BANNON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Commonwealth sources have advised that the Minister of Health favours such means testing. Abandonment of the agreement is the only way in which the State could apply means tests to public ward patients.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No, and I will give the second question consideration.

MOTOR VEHICLE INDUSTRY

Mr. ASHENDEN: Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs tell the House what he sees as the effect on the South Australian car industry if the recommendations in the recent report of the I.A.C. were to be adopted, and what action he intends to take to ensure that South Australia is in no way disadvantaged by those recommendations? I have been contacted by constituents of mine who are employees of G.M.H. at Elizabeth and who have expressed concern to me at the possibility of their losing their jobs, if the recommendations were to be applied. I have also been contacted by past colleagues of mine at Mitsubishi, who have advised that in fact the industry is becoming more efficient. They advise that it is restructuring and that they are meeting the needs of the Australian motoring public, for example, with the move in production to small cars. They have also advised me that the efficiency of the car industry in this country is now well ahead of that in many European countries.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I thank the honourable member for the question on a matter which I think has a very grave bearing on the future of the automotive industry in South Australia. The I.A.C. report was released at midnight last Monday, and I am gravely concerned about the recommendations in it. It has been only briefly assessed, because that is all that could be done in the time available, by the experts in the Department of Trade and Industry. It is fair to highlight that General Motors-Holden's, at the highest level, and Mitsubishi, also at the highest level, have complimented the departmental Public Service staff of the South Australian Government on the expertise that they have available to advise on the automotive industry. It is fair to say that they are the best departmental advisers one would find in any State Government in Australia.

My assessment is that, if the I.A.C. recommendations were adopted (and this is speculation, but I think it is fairly accurate speculation), this State could lose up to 1 800 jobs for automotive assemblers at G.M.H. and Mitsubishi, and a further 800 jobs in the component industry in this State. Obviously, that has major implications for employment in South Australia, and for the viability of a large number of component companies. The employment effects would go beyond that, because it is generally assessed that, for every job in the manufacturing sector, at least two other jobs elsewhere in the community are dependent on it. Adding them together, one can reach a potential loss of 7 000 jobs, if the I.A.C. recommendations were adopted.

I have been somewhat distressed by the suggestion in one or two public utterances by different groups and particularly by the editorial in one of the Adelaide daily newspapers that gave the impression (whether this was intended or not is another matter) that the Australian automotive industry was not changing with the times. If one looks at what has occurred in the industry over the past two or three years, and what will occur until the end of 1984 under existing Federal Government policy, one starts to see the extent to which Australian car manufacturers and their component suppliers have already undergone a dramatic restructuring of the industry. In South Australia in the past 12 months alone, we estimate that employment with the two major motor vehicle assemblers has declined by 15 per cent. A figure was quoted recently in the newspaper that G.M.H. employment has declined from about 11 500 to 8 000. That has occurred because restructuring and improved efficiency in the car industry are already taking place and will continue under existing Federal Government policy. To say that, by knocking the recommendations of the I.A.C., one is suggesting that the Australian automotive industry should stagnate and not change and adapt to world concepts and design is simply being blind to the facts of what is occurring.

The day of the Australian car has gone in terms of an Australian-designed car. Australian automotive manufacturers are now inevitably linked into the world car concept. We see that with the Commodore, the Sigma, and others. As we continue with that process, which has started but which is far from completion, we will see further loss of jobs under the existing Federal Government policy. I think that is inevitable. I am not criticising that loss of jobs. It has to occur if we are to have an automotive industry at all, but I urge severe caution in applying the entirely different course of action now being recommended by the I.A.C., in which it is trying to change horses mid-stream, from a car protection policy of 85 per

cent Australian content and at least 80 per cent of the automobiles sold in Australia being manufactured in Australia, and also the import-export complementation scheme, to a protection policy entirely based on tariffs.

I can assure the honourable member that I am confident that the Federal Government will reject the I.A.C. recommendations. Sir Phillip Lynch, when he launched the new Mitsubishi name for Chrylser here in South Australia, said that it was his Government's policy that it would stick to a system of about 80 per cent of the automobiles sold in Australia being made in Australia—in other words the 80/20 rule on local manufacturing. I was also interested to see the press call by the Hon. Jim Dunford and the call he made in another place yesterday asking for us to have urgent talks with the Federal Government. He seems to be ignorant of the fact that the South Australian Government took the very unique step and the first step ever in which a State Government has gone to the Federal Government with a delegation of trade union officials and component car manufacturers.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: On my suggestion. You know it, too!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It was not on the honourable member's suggestion. We went to the Federal Government and had unique talks for 2½ hours. Furthermore, the matter was discussed with the Prime Minister only in the past two weeks. I also had further talks with Sir Phillip Lynch in the past two weeks, so the Hon. Mr. Dunford has called for talks that have already taken place. I can give the House an assurance that the South Australian Government will continue to fight to make sure that our automotive industry is efficient and changes with world demand, but that at the same time job opportunities are protected.

OMBUDSMAN'S INQUIRY

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Why did the Premier attempt to interfere with the Ombudsman's continuing inquiries into the assault conviction of Gregory James Cleland by publicly releasing a police report which claimed that Cleland's conviction was justifiable? Yesterday in the House the Premier, and notably not the Minister responsible (the Chief Secretary), released the Police Commissioner's report which concluded that Cleland's conviction by visiting Justices was justifiable. The Ombudsman, Mr. Bakewell, following extensive investigation had previously raised doubts about the validity or justice of the conviction. In this morning's *Advertiser* Mr. Bakewell is quoted as saying:

> Notwithstanding what the Premier said this afternoon, the Ombudsman's Office will continue the investigation. I am not satisfied with the police report.

I want to know why the Premier took the extraordinary step of publicly releasing the police report in an attempt to undermine the Ombudsman and his continuing inquiries?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Deputy Leader's attempts to in some way impute motives to me and, also, apparently to impute some reaction to the Ombudsman really do him little credit. The position is simply this: the Ombudsman, as the Deputy Leader knows, comes under my umbrella in portfolios. It is therefore my duty to report to this House on matters which have been referred to the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman has written to me today saying that he has received the report of the Police Commissioner, a summary of which I gave to this House yesterday. There is nothing improper in that matter, since the case had attracted a good deal of media and public interest. The Ombudsman has also informed me by letter, which I received only just now, that he is still not satisfied about various matters that have come forward, and that he is continuing his inquiries. That is where the matter now rests.

HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. GLAZBROOK: Will the Minister of Health say what is the view of the Government regarding the recommendation of the Jamison Committee of Inquiry that the present terms of cost-sharing health services should be discontinued and replaced by a method of formula funding, and what representations have been made to the Federal Government in support of this view?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: As has already been indicated publicly, for a variety of reasons the State Liberal Government is opposed to cost sharing and the arrangments which were developed early in the 1970's under the Federal Labor Government. I think those reasons are well understood by the public of South Australia. The first and most important reason is that split responsibility leads to buck passing. That is something I do not like, and I do not think any South Australian constituent likes it either. Inevitably it leads to buck passing. When a State has constitutional responsibility for the delivery of certain categories of public service, it should be entitled to exercise that responsibility without being dictated to by another sphere of Government.

Secondly, it is a fact, and there is considerable evidence to prove it, that all the specific cost-sharing programmes for both hospital and community health have required a substantial bureaucracy in order to implement them. It is a bureaucracy that has to be paralleled in two places, in Canberra and in the States, and to me it seems quite ridiculous that Canberra should be determining what happens in health centres at Clovelly Park and Coober Pedy. That is something which the State Government has the responsibility to determine. We want to make those decisions around the Cabinet table in South Australia. We do not want to be told by Commonwealth bureaucrats how we should expend health funds in this State.

Thirdly, as I have indicated, the cost-sharing agreement is anti-federalist in concept, which is not surprising seeing that it was developed by a socialist Government. As to the formula funding proposals, which the Jamison committee recommended, it would depend largely on the definition of the formula and the development of the formula what effect it would have on South Australia. It would be possible for a Federal Government to devise a formula which in effect enabled it to continue to exercise tight control over the proportion of the State funds which were used for health purposes. Again, we believe that it is the responsibility of this State Government and other State Governments to determine levels of health expenditure, not only within the health portfolio but also between the health portfolio and other portfolios.

For those reasons, the State Government favours the notion of general revenue grants, which have been described as the absorption option, and we certainly hope that the Federal Government will respond to representations on this subject that have been made in writing by the Premier and personally by me to the Commonwealth Minister for Health.

MINISTER OF HEALTH'S OFFICE

Mr. HEMMINGS: Did the Minister of Health specify that her new offices, to be located on the first floor of the

Bank of New South Wales building in Pirie Street, should be illuminated by incandescent lights rather than by the normal strip fluorescent lights? If the offices are to have incandescent lighting, does the floor now require extra air-conditioning to cope with the extra heat generated by those lights? Also, is there any positive guarantee that further reconstruction of the air-conditioning system will not be necessary? Can the Minister detail to the House any other costly changes carried out, or proposed by her, for her new offices, such as new oversized desks and custom-built armchairs, and can she yet offer an estimate of the total cost of this little operation?

Last year I put Question on Notice 492 to the Minister of Industrial Affairs on planned refurbishing of Ministerial offices. The reply on 20 November confirmed that the Minister of Health was proposing to have some work done. Apart from that, the reply provided scanty information, and that is why I am asking the Minister concerned for amplification. There does appear to be a lot of activity on that first floor, and alterations to the air-conditioning system in that building have been causing inconvenience to other tenants and a strain on the already beleagured taxpayers' pockets.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: This year we have been in this House for three weeks, and during that time a great many health issues of considerable importance to the whole community have been publicly debated. I find it extraordinary, in fact almost beyond belief, that the first question that is addressed to me by the so-called Opposition spokesman on health is on a matter as footling, petty and ridiculous as this one.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Pettifogging nonsense.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Indeed; the honourable member has indulged in pettifogging nonsense, as the Minister of Transport so aptly described it. The answer to the honourable member's question is "No".

FRUIT FLY

Mr. MATHWIN: Would the Minister of Agriculture detail outbreaks of fruit fly in South Australia this season, and also what steps are to be taken by the department to control this pest? There has been some publicity about the fruit fly strikes in the metropolitan area and at Whyalla. Although the number of strikes has been detailed by the department, the media did not list the areas of infestation. So that all members may have this information in relation to their districts, and to know whether or not they are infested, I ask what steps the Department of Agriculture has taken to control this shocking situation.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Adelaide's fifth metropolitan fruit fly outbreak for the season has been identified. Infestation in peaches was reported by a St. Peters householder recently and identified as Mediterranean fruit fly, the same species found in all other outbreaks this summer. A check of surrounding properties carried out by the department did not find the pest on any other site in that region. Such early detection and inspection reduce the chances of the fly spreading to other areas, particularly in gifts of fruit. For that reason alone it is important that the member for Glenelg has raised this subject today, because a reminder to the public is justified.

Residents in the area have been notified of the outbreak and liquid baiting has commenced. The St. Peters outbreak occurred in an area treated last year against Queensland fruit fly, which was the other major type that could cause problems in South Australia. The recent find of the Mediterranean species indicated a new introduction either from Western Australia or from that well-known town Whyalla, where it was identified earlier this season, or from one of the earlier metropolitan incidents. Where outbreaks occur, householders are notified by pamphlet, and it is most important that everyone in the area co-operate fully by not removing fruit from their property. New infestations can occur far from the original site, particularly when people who do not think their produce could be affected hand on the fruit fly through gifts of fruit to friends and relations.

The other metropolitan outbreaks this season have been in the Enfield area, where three infestations were reported. The first was in December 1980, and there were subsequent reports in January and this month of February. Fruit fly was also reported in February on a single property at Para Hills. The Whyalla infestation was late last year, and control operations have been in progress for the past 11 weeks. No flies have been caught in the area for the past seven weeks. The Department of Agriculture will continue for a further five weeks its control measures which we hope, with the co-operation of the public, will be effective.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Minister of Transport say what effect the decision by the Commonwealth Government to freeze road construction funds will have on the work programmes for the Stuart Highway and other road projects in South Australia? The Commonwealth Government has frozen road construction finance for the rest of its current five-year programme. State Governments have been told that the Commonwealth will introduce legislation in the next few months to widen the definition of "national highways" under that programme. A report states:

> The Australian Transport Advisory Council, which met in Melbourne on Friday, plans to hold another meeting in the next few weeks to try to discuss these proposals, but the Commonwealth Transport Minister, Mr. Hunt, has told his State counterparts that he will be unavailable.
>
> At a sometimes noisy meeting on Friday, Mr. Hunt circulated a document asking the States to indicate their preferences for changes. It asked them to indicate "preferred options", "less preferable but acceptable options" and "not negotiable options".
>
> Mr. Hunt told the States that there would be no further increases in finance for the remaining four years of the highway programme and that the definition of national highways would be expanded to include tourist roads, inter-regional roads, inter-capital roads and remote roads.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: And commerce roads.

Mr. KENEALLY: I thank the Minister. It continues:

> The State Ministers have expressed alarm that these proposals will mean that the same amount of money will have to be spread more thinly. Victoria's Transport Minister, Mr. Maclellan, said he was concerned that if the national highway definition was expanded, construction work on the Hume and Western highways would suffer.

It follows, then, that the national highways in South Australia are at risk, despite the Minister's frequent boast about the Stuart Highway's completion time.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Certainly, at the ATAC meeting last Friday (which was a rather momentous meeting in relation to another subject), this matter was canvassed, and the State Ministers will meet again, I expect in the next two weeks. The Victorian Minister is to arrange the meeting, and I have not yet been notified of the date. I understand that the Commonwealth Minister is to introduce legislation in about four weeks and, if we are

to have a chance to put our case, we will have to meet very soon.

The Commonwealth Minister circulated the document to which the member for Stuart referred. It referred to a reduction of categories from four to three. The three categories would be national highways, with the expanded definition to which the honourable member referred, arterial roads (rural and metropolitan), and local roads (rural and metropolitan). The State Government believes that the number of categories should be reduced to two—national roads and State roads. The reason for this follows on the answer given by the Minister of Health, because we believe that the State should take the responsibility of disseminating the money available for State roads.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Especially tourist roads.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: That is another matter. The Government believes that we should have the power and the responsibility to disseminate road moneys within the State and that there should be two categories—national roads and State roads. However, regarding funding, the honourable member realises that the Commonwealth has announced the total road funds for Australia for the next five years, that is, this financial year and the next four financial years. Those total road funds have been allowed for at an inflation rate varying from 9 per cent next year to 6 per cent, I think, in four years. I earnestly hope that inflation is running at only about 6 per cent in four years. If it is not, the State will be behind in road funding, and I make no apology for saying that.

However, what is not evident at this time, and what I am presently urging the Commonwealth to hasten, is the decision as to what the slices of the cake will be throughout the Commonwealth. South Australia, is not yet aware of what its road funding will be. All we can do is make an estimate based on last year's percentages of the total cake. Indeed, as my friend and colleague the Minister of Agriculture says, we are hoping that we will get more of the cake, because we get only 8·4 per cent of the total road funds, when I believe that on a population basis we should get 9·5 per cent or nearly 10 per cent. On a road length basis we should get more than that share. Indeed, if vehicle kilometres is used as a criterion, we should get a larger slice of the cake. I make no apologies for these statements, because I do not believe that South Australia is getting its fair share of Commonwealth road funds. That is something that both the Premier and I are taking up with our counterparts on the Federal scene, with the full support of every member of this Government.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: And, I hope, of this House.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is the Minister of Transport who has the call.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The member for Stuart asks about the fact that the Commonwealth has made an announcement about road funds and that there may be no increase in those road funds.

Mr. Keneally: I asked what effect it would have on the Stuart Highway and other road projects in South Australia.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: What effect it will have on any part of our roads programme depends on the percentage of the allocation given to South Australia out of those total road funds. As soon as we know how much we are going to be given for national highways, we will be able to answer the member for Stuart's question.

PORT PIRIE DISTRICT INSPECTOR

Mr. OLSEN: Can the Minister of Industrial Affairs say when it is anticipated to fill permanently the current vacancy in the position of District Inspector at the Industrial Affairs and Employment Office at Port Pirie? In a newsletter issued by Mayor Jones of Port Pirie, he says that he has called upon the Government to rectify an anomaly in the Public Service Act which has left the city without a District Inspector in the industrial affairs and employment office as the inspector based at Port Pirie was granted a transfer back to Adelaide during 1980. Early last year, applications were invited for the vacant position, but the only application recovered was from an officer too junior to fill the position. Further, Mayor Jones said that a provision in the Public Service Act did not allow the position to be advertised outside the department until the person currently in the position had been transferred.

Mr. Keneally: Now quote what the member for the district said.

Mr. OLSEN: It is further stated in the newsletter that the member for Stuart had said that a refusal to provide Port Pirie and Port Augusta and the region with the services of a District Inspector from the Minister's Department at all times can only be interpreted as showing that the Government places a low priority on the region.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I was somewhat amazed to get the letter from the member for Stuart. I was even more amazed to find that there had been certain public utterances in the Port Pirie area concerning the lack of a District Inspector there. I would say that anyone who read those public utterances would get the impression that the Government is neglecting the area.

Mr. Keneally: That's right.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Nothing could be further from the truth. If the member for Stuart will allow me to point out the real facts to the House, I think it will allow other people to make their own independent assessment. The position of District Inspector became vacant at the end of January when Mr. Giles returned to Adelaide from Port Pirie. The vacancy was immediately advertised in the Public Service and also in the *Advertiser*. Applications closed on 18 February, and some of those applicants will be interviewed next week. As a member of this Parliament, the honourable member would know that Parliament has formally approved and upheld the principles of that Public Service Act, and I am sure he would not want to see the Government breach the Act in anyway whatsoever.

Mr. Keneally: How long—

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

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The implication, from the utterances of the member for Stuart, is that the area has been neglected. I shall point out exactly what the position is. Mr. Klitscher, the department's Industrial Officer who is stationed at Port Pirie, is taking over the role also of Acting District Inspector. In addition to that, a retired Industrial District Officer is living adjacent to Port Pirie and he has agreed that, when required by the department to do work in Port Pirie or the surrounding districts as a District Officer, he will be available on a day-by-day basis. So, we have a person with all the experience and knowledge of having been a District Officer there and able to carry out the work as we require it to be carried out.

In addition, the local people (particularly B.H.A.S., which was telephoned) have been informed that, if they want the services of an inspector for some reason, one would be sent immediately from Adelaide and that they are to telephone, if they have such a requirement, the Chief Inspector or the Assistant Director. I point out, as I pointed out in the letter sent to the honourable member in reply to his letter on 22 January, that Mr. Kilpatrick,

Assistant Chief Inspector, has already visited the district three times. I thank the honourable member who has asked the question for raising the subject, and I point out that obviously the member for Stuart is simply trying to create a little cheap political capital in his district. That is unfortunate, because the services are being covered very adequately by the department, and particularly by Mr. Burns, who is available on a day-by-day basis as the department requires, and also by visiting inspectors being sent to the district on any appropriate inspections.

PROSTITUTION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier say what action, if any, the Government now proposes to take to remedy the obvious deficiencies in the present laws relating to prostitution? So that you will not be on tenterhooks during my explanation, Mr. Speaker, I give you an assurance that I do not intend to reflect on the recent vote of the House on this topic. On all sides it is acknowledged that the present situation regarding the laws on prostitution in this State is quite unsatisfactory, but no-one who has been opposed to any change has put forward any positive suggestions—and that goes for people inside this House and for those outside, such as some of the churches and the Festival of Light. I know that the Premier several years ago expressed his support for some system of licensing, although during the debate he was quite silent. I assure him, as he already knows, that the problems concerning this matter are not going away, as so many people wish they would, and the ball now really is in the Government's court. I ask what he is going to do about it.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The member for Mitcham has said that no-one within this place or outside of it came forward at an earlier stage to make suggestions as to how certain legislation could be improved. It is important to add to that that the member for Mitcham, having acknowledged publicly that his legislation was not adequate, made no attempt to improve it. Therefore, I find his question on what the Government is going to do about the matter rather strange, to say the least. The matter will continue to be kept under review—

Mr. Millhouse: That means you are not going to do a damn thing.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:—but I am quite certain that the honourable member's very hurriedly introduced piece of legislation which he did not apparently have either the time or the inclination to improve when it came to the Committee stages—

Mr. Millhouse: Now you're reflecting—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: —has not done anything at all to help the situation.

NATURAL GAS PRICING

Mr. OSWALD: Will the Deputy Premier explain to the House the current position regarding natural gas pricing in South Australia?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I shall be pleased to inform the House about the situation regarding natural gas pricing. I did announce that, as a result of the vastly increased level of exploration that South Australian Oil and Gas Company intends to undertake this year, there would be a slight increase in gas pricing from 1 July to accommodate the levy paid on gas supplies. That levy is not a highly significant fraction of gas pricing.

I was interested to note that the Leader, in a speech he made last week to the Petroleum Exploration Society, a speech that I think is going to be quite an event as time goes on, was ruminating and cogitating on his attitude to uranium mining, and he indicated that his thinking was in a state of flux and that the Labor Party was not allowed to be emotional on the question.

Among other things, he made some reference to natural gas pricing, and he was so bold as to suggest that I should convene a round table conference at present and sit down and hammer out this matter; if I may say so, a quite nonsensical suggestion, because, instead of them proceeding to make one or two snide comments about the Government dithering, he should know, and anyone with elementary legal or commercial knowledge of the situation would know, that this matter is currently before arbitration. In those circumstances, any comments would need to be limited, and it would be quite wrong for me to convene a conference of the parties involved in those negotiations and procedures at the present time. Those procedures were set down back in 1977, I think from memory, when the unitisation agreement was agreed and confirmed under the aegis of the Leader's Party. The procedures currently being followed are set down in law.

The fact is that if agreement cannot be reached between the negotiating parties (in this case, the Pipelines Authority and the producers) the matter goes to arbitration, and that is precisely where it is at the moment. For the Leader to suggest, as he did, that we should convene a round table conference and hammer this matter out is absolute nonsense.

Instead of making specious claims publicly that the Government is dithering, as he did in that speech, I suggest that it would be timely for the Leader publicly to congratulate the Government for the initiatives it has taken in this area. The first matter to address in relation to gas supplies is the question of the continuation of supplies and of the most unfortunate position in which we find ourselves as a result of the negotiations of our predecessors. Having settled that question, we will then address ourselves to the long-term question of pricing, particularly after 1987.

Let me remind the Leader and his Party of some of the initiatives taken by this Government since it came to office, when I realised that this was a matter of great urgency which we had inherited and to which we must address ourselves. I set up, with Cabinet authority, the Natural Gas Supplies Advisory Committee. All of the relevant people we should have on that committee are, I believe, on it: representatives of ETSA, the South Australian Gas Company, and the Pipelines Authority, and Sir Norman Young, who was involved with the previous Administration and was appointed Chairman of the Pipelines Authority, chairing that committee. That is an expert committee which has given the Government excellent advice that the Government has had the good sense to accept.

As a result of that advice the Government has commenced negotiations with the Queensland Government. Our predecessor certainly saw that as one of the areas which should be pursued, going back to the days when the member for Baudin was Minister of Mines for a time. At that time, when the Premier was negotiating on gas prices, the Government was talking then about negotiations with Queensland. We have got on with that, and we have had discussions with the Northern Territory Government and the Federal Government. We are pursuing other matters also in relation to this vexed question. I repeat again that, in all of those circumstances, I believe the Speaker—the Leader—should curb his habit of making wild statements

publicly. I apologise to you, Mr. Speaker; I know you do not make wild public statements.

The SPEAKER: That is very dangerous ground.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I was about to apologise to the Premier; I thought I might have referred wrongly to him again. I believe it would be far more helpful if the Leader of the Opposition were to commend the Government for the positive way in which it is tackling these immense problems that we inherited as a result of their muddling.

MINISTERIAL CAR FLEET

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Can the Minister of Transport say why the Government has decided to alter the existing policy in favour of smaller Ministerial cars to return to gas-guzzling luxury V8 limousines?

Mr. Millhouse: They have grabbed the early numbers in the new number plate arrangement, too.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Why will the Premier and the Deputy Premier—

Mr. Millhouse: The Ministers have got to have them!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: —have LTDs while other Ministerial car pool vehicles will be Ford Fairlanes? Apparently, this Government has made a decision, against all advice as to economy, to reintroduce large luxury vehicles to the Ministerial fleet. During the life of the Labor Government, in response to higher fuel charges and the need to conserve scarce energy resources and on expert advice as to the economics, the Cabinet decided to introduce smaller cars to the Ministerial fleet. This matter was brought to my attention by a letter to me from an employee of a car firm which supplies cars to the Government. The letter states:

> Dear Mr. Duncan,
>
> I am writing to you as one who I know I can trust to raise a matter of extraordinary waste by the Tonkin Liberals. I refer to a decision which has apparently been made to buy luxury Ford cars for use by Ministers and other bloated fat-cats in the South Australian Government. I work for a South Australian firm which under the Labor Government supplied cars for the Ministers. Apparently Tonkin has decided to put his own luxury above the interests of the South Australian public. In complete disregard of the need for Ministers to set an example of restraint and fuel conservation, he is planning to purchase five-litre Fords. Not only is this grossly hypocritical in light of the Government's demands that the rest of us tighten our belts, but apparently they are out to deceive the public by purchasing two LTDs for the Premier and Deputy Premier and Fairlanes for the rest.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: You're wrong.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I would sit down before—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The letter continues:

> The deception is that the Fairlanes are to be built up with extras so that they and their costs will be about the same as the LTDs. No doubt they will get away with this outrage, but I hope you will do what you can to stop them.

In light of this situation, it would be interesting to know how much this indulgence is costing the people of South Australia and how much the decision to buy interstate cars, which has apparently been made, will cost industry in South Australia.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Government has changed its policy on the purchase of Ministerial cars, but it has not brought about a policy of going for V8 guzzlers, as the member for Elizabeth suggests. When we took over Government, the previous Government had made a decision to go to 6-cylinder Commodores for the Ministerial car fleet. I must say that the Commodore is an excellent car. I understand that the Minister of Industrial Affairs, the Minister of Environment, the Chief Secretary and the Hon. Mr. Hill have all bought Commodores as their private cars, so you can see that there is no set in the Cabinet against the Holden Commodore. I should recount to the House that, when the Hon. Mr. Hill was being driven to a function through Victoria Square in his dinner suit recently, his Ministerial Commodore broke down; the Hon. Mr. Hill had to get out and push, and he was heckled by the passers-by. There is no doubt that the Commodore is a bit on the small side for Ministerial business.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Rubbish!

Mr. Millhouse: That's absurd.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Well, I gave the member for Mitcham a lift to this House after picking him up—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: About 12 months ago I picked up the member for Mitcham in Victoria Square as he was about to catch a Beeline bus, although the honourable member did not have an apple with him at the time. The honourable member sat in the back of that car with my Ministerial assistant and he would recall the lack of room—

Mr. Millhouse: I had forgotten all about it.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: If the honourable member has forgotten, it is a matter of convenience. Quite seriously, I point out that most Ministers use their cars as a travelling office, and when you have one or two public servants in the car with you—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Especially if they are tall.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Minister always rides in the back of her car, and she would know that. There is little room in the car to be used for Ministerial purposes. The Government has therefore decided that it should move to another 6-cylinder vehicle and the only such vehicle that is suitable is the Ford Fairlane.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: It is made in Victoria.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I understand that, and I must say that Cabinet thought very hard about this before the decision was made. However, we are changing to a 6-cylinder Fairlane, not an 8-cylinder vehicle. Because we realise that car manufactures believe that to have vehicles in the Ministerial car fleet is a prestigious matter, we have also decided to buy two V8 Statesman cars for the Ministerial fleet; just two, which will be for the Premier and the Deputy Premier. They are the only exceptions. I can assure the member for Stuart that the Government will buy no more than three at the most V8 Statesmans. We are doing this—

Mr. Millhouse: Will you have the third one?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No, I will not have the third one.

Mr. Millhouse: Who will have it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: Heini Becker!

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Transport.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I am glad that there is so much levity in the House on this matter.

Mr. Millhouse: There should not be; it is a disgrace.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: You are helping to make the levity, I might add. The third Statesman will probably go to the Minister of Industrial Affairs because of his position.

Mr. Millhouse: Yes.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Mitcham that he is quickly earning demerits towards an expulsion.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Statesman is completely

manufactured in South Australia.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood interjecting:

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I am sure that the member for Baudin will remember what an excellent car the Statesman is.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Where is the engine made? How ridiculous!

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Statesman is completely constructed in South Australia.

Mr. Lewis: Where were your shoes made?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I did offer to General Motors, if it was prepared to make a special run with six cylinder engines, that we would be prepared to give an order for some quantity. Unfortunately, it was unable to do that. The Statesman comes only in the V8 form. Apart from those first three cars in the Ministerial car fleet, there is no change in Government policy; it will remain at six-cylinder vehicles and not the V8 guzzlers, as the honourable member suggests.

DEPARTMENTAL CO-ORDINATION

Mr. GUNN: Is the Deputy Premier aware that on the A.B.C. programme *Nationwide* this week some comments were made about co-ordination between Government departments on environmental matters? Do those comments reflect the proper situation?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I briefly comment on the programme. One of the stars on it was Dr. Hails, of Adelaide University, who said:

> In Adelaide at the moment, I think it is fair to say that we have very very poor co-operation between Government departments still, here in 1981. I think we need better communication between Government departments. But furthermore, we need this work to be co-ordinated and, if we are going to start looking at marine pollution or the consequences of marine pollution in the future, I hope that this Government will show the initiative by setting up some sort of research body or co-ordinated body and use the expertise that is available in this State.

Obviously, Dr. Hails is not fully aware of just what is happening in Government. As that was publicly aired, I think that impression should be corrected. A co-ordinated approach has been established for assessment by Government departments of projects such as the petro-chemical industry and the liquids pipeline. When the pipeline scheme was announced I immediately set up a high level Government committee of senior officers from Environment, Fisheries, Marine and Harbors and Mines and Energy. That committee has met a couple of times a week, at least, to co-ordinate Government activities in relation to that project.

Likewise, the Redcliff Steering Committee was established by our predecessors, and was strengthened by me when we came to Government. That committee comprises representatives of all of those areas of Government I mentioned. It is plainly not true that there is no Government co-ordination in relation to these environmental matters. In addition, the Government receives advice and co-ordinates marine investigation through the South Australian Marine Environment Advisory Committee, which reports directly to the Minister of Environment. On that committee are representatives of Flinders and Adelaide Universities, and the Departments of Marine and Harbors, Engineering and Water Supply, Health, Fisheries, and Environment. Since its formation in February 1977, the committee has been active.

One of the responsibilities of the new Department of Environment and Planning will be to draw up some legislation and present it to the Government and, in due course, to the House, to control discharges to the marine environment. This has become possible because of the co-operative effort with the Commonwealth in settling the off-shore oil legislation.

The other point which I think the programme failed to mention and which is significant is that the Dow company was designing a plant from which there was no discharge to the sea. That is a quite significant advance on plants of this type anywhere else in Australia. I am sorry that Dr. Hails made these comments. In fact, the Government has made a strong effort to co-ordinate activities of various departments to ensure that the environment is protected.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: WATER SUPPLY

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

Leave granted.

Mr. BANNON: Yesterday, in the House, the Minister of Water Resources made a Ministerial statement, in which he referred to statements made by me concerning Whyalla's water supply and the monitoring programme. He said:

> To substantiate his allegations, the Leader used stolen Engineering and Water Supply Department papers. These papers were uncompleted working papers. It has since been confirmed that standard monitoring procedures have been conducted without fail in December at Whyalla and in all other locations.

He went on:

> I deplore the Leader's irresponsible use of apparently official documents which can only erode public confidence in the water and health authorities of the State and create unwarranted levels of anxiety in the community.

This morning, in the *Advertiser,* the Minister's remarks were reported, and his statement that he deplored the irresponsible use of apparently official documents was quoted in full, and was placed under the headline "Bannon used stolen papers: Arnold".

I would like to make quite clear that the Opposition believes, as I believe the media would, that material provided to the Opposition that can be properly disclosed in the public interest can, as a matter of course, be put before the House without attracting the sort of statement that is being made affecting my personal integrity, as the Minister did yesterday.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: You condone the action by public servants in—

Mr. BANNON: I am attempting to ignore the—

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave has been granted to the honourable Leader to make a personal explanation. I ask that he be heard in silence.

Mr. BANNON: I am on public record as saying that, while the Opposition very often is in receipt of information of all types from a number of sources, including sources within the Public Service, and while I imagine that our predecessors were also in that position, that information is treated in a responsible manner, and the information disclosed is disclosed only where it is deemed in the public interest to do so.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BANNON: In explaining our position concerning

allegations made by the Minister, directed at my integrity and the way in which I use documents, I may say that the statement made by the Minister of Health today concerning amoebae in water supplies confirms the fact that this release was in the public interest, because indeed those documents, the subject of the Minister's allegation of irresponsibility, showed that at least on seven occasions during the period from November to the end of December, *naegleria* was isolated at 42 degrees centigrade, that is, a temperature at which at least in 30 per cent of the cases that *naegleria* would be *naegleria fowleri*, the particular causator of amoebic meningitis.

I support the remarks made by the Minister in relation to public alarm in this matter, but simply point to the fact that, without the responsible release of that material by the press and by the Opposition, this matter would not have been ventilated, and the Government would not have taken the belated action that it has taken in this matter of public health.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: INDUSTRIAL INSPECTORS

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. KENEALLY: Earlier today, during Question Time, in answer to a question from the member for Rocky River, the Minister of Industrial Affairs said, in relation to industrial inspectors at Port Pirie, that I was seeking to make cheap political capital in my district, as a result of the vacancy that occurred at Port Pirie. I do not have my file with me, but from memory I would like to explain the circumstances that led me, as the local member, to write a letter to the Minister. In January 1981, Mr. Giles, the local inspector at Port Pirie, was transferred to Adelaide.

The other industrial inspector at Port Pirie, Mr. Klitscher, then took annual leave, a fact that the Minister, in his reply, failed to mention. This meant that there was no industrial inspector at Port Pirie, and there were occasions on which an industrial inspector was needed. As a result, the Mayor of Port Pirie, Mr. Jones, wrote to the Minister, and made a public statement to the effect that Port Pirie needed an inspector. He asked the Minister to make amendments to the Public Service Act to ensure that this circumstance did not apply again.

I waited for at least two weeks after the Mayor of Port Pirie wrote his letter and made his public statement for the position to be rectified. No action was taken. In that time, I was approached by the Port Pirie city council, as was the member for Rocky River, by letter. I was also approached by union officials in the area, particularly a union official from the Shop Assistants Union, who was concerned that an employer was likely to leave town in circumstances in which he would owe considerable sums to employees, both current and previous. I attempted to get an inspector to Port Augusta. Port Augusta and Port Pirie are significant industrial areas in South Australia and should never be without such an officer.

In my letter to the Minister, I pointed out that, if there was any difficulty in obtaining a permanent appointment to Port Pirie, there would be no difficulty in having a temporary relief appointed to Port Pirie. The Minister replied to me in very civil terms, quite contrary to what he attempted to do earlier today. I contacted the Minister's department in Adelaide, members of which were very co-operative, and an officer was sent to Port Augusta almost immediately. I was able to get inspectors to Port Augusta within 24 hours of their being needed.

The point of my letter to the Minister and the point of the Mayor's letter was that Port Pirie and Port Augusta need the services of an industrial inspector on site so that, as incidents arise, they can be considered within the hour. That is the problem that arises in the district. Fortunately, the problem to which I refer will hopefully be overcome.

I believe that I have been totally misrepresented by the Minister when he said that my actions were taken for cheap political capital in my district: my actions were in support of the Port Pirie city council and the Mayor of Port Pirie, who wrote to the Minister in similar terms and made a statement to the press. I wonder why the Minister does not accuse the Mayor of Port Pirie in the way in which he accuses me.

At 3.25 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

HISTORY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion forthwith for the rescission of certain votes taken in the History Trust of South Australia Bill yesterday.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment): I move:

That the adoption of the Chairman's report and the resolution for the third reading of the History Trust of South Australia Bill be rescinded, and that the House do now resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for the reconsideration of clauses 18 and 21.

Motion carried:

Bill recommitted.

New clause 18—"Borrowing of moneys."

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I move:

Page 7, after line 5—Insert new clause as follows:

(1) The trust may, for the purposes of this Act, borrow moneys from the Treasurer, or, with the consent of the Treasurer, from any other person.

(2) A liability incurred by the trust under subsection (1) with the consent of the Treasurer is guaranteed by the Treasurer.

(3) A liability of the Treasurer under a guarantee arising by virtue of subsection (2) shall be satisfied out of the General Revenue of the State, which is appropriated by this section to the necessary extent.

This clause is a money clause that came to this House from the Legislative Council in erased type. Yesterday, the Committee passed the clause as though it was an ordinary clause, but it was in error. The clause did not form part of the Bill, and the motion corrects that error.

Mr. McRAE: I simply place on record the co-operation of the Opposition.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: One part of the Oppositon perhaps, but not this part of the Opposition.

Mr. Whitten: The official Opposition.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I suggest that the honourable member for Mitcham refers to clause 18.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was simply following my colleague who spoke immediately before me, and correcting him. One part of the Opposition, the less important part of the Opposition, may support the Government in this, but I certainly do not. Let me remind you, Sir, that the Speaker, I think, when the Bill was introduced, reminded the House that there were erased clauses in the Bill, that they were money clauses that could not originate in the Legislative

Council. We were given that warning at the beginning. The problem was that those who had engagements or something else to do last night were so keen to get the House up and not sit that they hurried the Bill through, and botched it. Now we have this retraction.

The Liberals would rather die than admit it, but this action is a complete humiliation of the Minister, because it means that he does not know what he is doing and cannot even pilot his own Bill through. We now have this situation. It is lucky that there is so little to do, that the House has so little business in the last few days of the session, that we can afford to waste time on trivia like this.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: To put the record straight, I point out that this is not the first time matters have been recommitted, as the member for Mitcham, who—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot permit a general debate. Honourable members must refer to the matter before the Chair.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will refer to the way in which this matter was overlooked. We were privileged to have the presence of the member for Mitcham yesterday (one of those rare occasions) when this matter was before the House.

Mr. Millhouse interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Mitcham has already been warned by the Speaker, and I warn him a second time.

Mr. Becker interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair does not need the advice of the member for Hanson.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I rise on a point of order, Sir. I understand that the Speaker did not formally warn me, and I hope that you are not under any misapprehension about that. The Speaker warned me that I would start earning demerit points if I did not shut up. That was not a formal warning, I suggest. I can see that the Clerk has given you, Sir, something to read out in answer, but that is the position.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out to the honourable member that he has now been warned officially for the first time.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not want to labour the fact, but there was an agreed programme yesterday that proceeded rather more quickly than we anticipated. I do not believe that the comments of the member for Mitcham are at all appropriate, because he always has other commitments; we never see him in the evening. I cannot recall when we last saw him in the evening.

Mr. Becker interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know what he does at night, but during the day he is in court earning a lot of money.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have made the point. If he is not in court, he is complaining about members of Parliament being overpaid. There was a slight omission because the Bill was called on before the Minister had had time to be properly briefed, and that is a fact of life.

New clause inserted.

New clause 21—"Stamp duty not payable on instruments of conveyance to the trust."

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I move:

Page 7, line 33—Insert new clause as follows:

21. No stamp duty is payable on any instrument by virtue of which real or personal property is assured to, or vested in, the trust.

I move that this be inserted in the Bill for the same reason as that related to clause 18.

New clause inserted.

Bill read a third time and passed.

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill provides for the implementation of a scheme designed to bring South Australia into line with other States, each of which has its own predetermined fees for the expiation of minor traffic offences.

It is the view of the Government that an expiation scheme similar to that currently operating in respect of parking offences under the Local Government Act will increase the efficiency of dealing with traffic infringements and reduce the enormous burden upon courts of summary jurisdiction and the police in this area. The scheme will work in the following fashion: An offence is observed. A traffic infringement notice will be issued, after which the offender will have 28 days within which to pay the fee fixed by regulation and appearing on the face of the notice. A fee will be paid by post or directly to a central office within the Police Department. If an offender does not wish to pay on the notice, he may await court proceedings, and will be dealt with as at present. If the police wish to exercise their discretion and decide to prosecute where the matter is serious, they must do so within 60 days, whereupon the notice will be withdrawn and any fee paid will be refunded.

The range of fees applicable will be from $20 to $80 and will apply to 173 offences under the Road Traffic Act and regulations and the Motor Vehicles Act. The number of offences dealt with annually in this range of offences is about 100 000. The expiation scheme will obviously reduce drastically the number of such offences dealt with by the court. In fact, it has been estimated that traffic cases will be reduced by over 60 per cent. This means approximately 42 per cent of all summary matters dealt with by the courts will be diverted through the expiation scheme. After a period, the backlog in cases before courts of summary jurisdiction will be reduced, enabling more important matters to be heard much sooner than at present.

There are advantages for the offender as well. The offender's right to have a matter heard by a court is in no way prejudiced by this amendment. An expiated offence is not recorded as a previous conviction, except in relation to demerit points, and in relation to breaching the probationary conditions of learners permits and probationary licences. There will be no court costs for the offender and the "penalty" will be known at once. For many offenders who previously chose to attend court to plead guilty to a charge, it will mean not having to take off time from work for that purpose.

It should be stressed that the scheme is not a scheme of imposing "on the spot" fines, a name that conjures up the idea of motorists having to hand over cash to police while out on the roads. It is predicted that approximately 90 per cent of persons given a traffic infringement notice will pay the expiation fees within 28 days. This will, it is estimated, save more than $450 000 in direct costs in each year. The estimated savings allow for the scheme to pay for itself in the year of introduction, and the savings will continue in each subsequent year. An additional benefit may be that penalties will prove to be more effective if imposed immediately after the offence has been committed, thus

resulting in improved driver behaviour. I commend the scheme to members.

I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 inserts a new section in the Act that provides for the expiation of certain offences under the Road Traffic Act and the Motor Vehicles Act. Subsection (1) sets out the necessary definitions. The offences to which the expiation scheme will relate are to be listed in regulations made under the Police Offences Act. Subsection (2) empowers a member of the Police Force to issue an offender with a traffic infringement notice. Subsection (3) provides that offences arise out of the same incident if they are committed at the same time, or in quick succession. Subsection (4) provides that a notice may be given for no more than three offences arising out of the same incident. The scheme does not apply in relation to children under the age of 16 years, as traffic offences committed by such persons are subject to the screening system provided in the Children's Protection and Young Offencers Act.

Where parking offences are involved, the notice may be affixed to the car, otherwise service must be effected personally or by post. Subsection (5) provides that, once a notice has been given, the offender may not be given a similar notice in respect of any other offences arising out of the same incident. Subsections (6) and (7) provide that if the offences specified in a notice are expiated by payment of the total amount of expiation fees within the 28 day period, then no person may be prosecuted for those offences, or any other prescribed offences arising out of the same incident. Subsection (8) provides for the withdrawal of a notice if it has been improperly given (for example, to a person under 16, or for an incorrect offence). Subsection (9) makes clear that such withdrawal may be effected notwithstanding that an expiation fee may have been paid or that the notice may have expired.

Subsection (10) empowers the Commissioner of Police to withdraw a notice, notwithstanding that the offences under the notice have all been expiated, if he believes that the offender ought to be prosecuted for any of those offences, or any other prescribed offence arising out of the same incident. In this case, the notice must be withdrawn within 60 days from the day the notice was issued. Subsection (12) provides that withdrawal of a notice must be effected by giving the offender further written notice. Subsection (13) provides for the refund of expiation fees paid under a notice that is subsequently withdrawn. Subsection (14) provides that, where an offender is prosecuted upon the withdrawal of a notice, the fact that he paid an expiation fee under the notice is not to be admissible against him in evidence.

Subsection (15) provides that payment of an expiation fee does not constitute an admission or establish civil liability in any civil proceedings. Subsections (17) and (18) provide the Commissioner of Police with a power of delegation under this section to certain police officers. Subsections (19) and (20) empower the Governor to make regulations for the purposes of this section. The regulations may specify expiation fees on a sliding scale for a particular offence, for example, a speeding offence expiation fee will increase according to the extent to which the speed limit was exceeded.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is consequential upon the Police Offences Act Amendment Bill relating to the expiation of traffic offences. It is necessary to provide in the Motor Vehicles Act that the expiation of a traffic offence is deemed to be a conviction, but only for the purposes of the points demerit scheme, and also in respect of offences that consist of contravening the probationary conditions attached to learners permits and drivers licences, the offences taken into account by the consultative committee in exercising its discretion to cancel or suspend a licence or a tow-truck driver's certificate. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 provides for cancellation of a permit or licence where the holder of the learner's permit or probationary licence expiates an offence of contravening a probationary condition. Clause 3a provides that expiation of an offence that attracts demerit points is deemed to be a conviction for the purposes of the offences that the consultative committee may take into consideration when deciding whether or not the holder of a driver's licence is unfit to hold that licence.

Clause 4 obliges the Commissioner of Police to notify the Registrar of Motor Vehicles where an offence that attracts demerit points, or that is an offence of contravening a probationary condition, has been expiated. The Commissioner must also notify the Registrar immediately he withdraws a traffic infringement notice under which the offences have been expiated. Clause 5 provides that expiation of an offence is deemed to be a conviction for the purposes of the points demerit scheme. Paragraph (b) is a consequential amendment. Clause 6 provides that expiation of an offence that attracts demerit points is deemed to be a conviction of that offence for the purposes of the offences that the consultative committee may take into consideration when deciding whether or not the holder of a tow-truck certificate is unfit to hold that certificate.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE secured the adjourment of the debate.

PRIMARY PRODUCERS EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Education Act, 1972-1980. Read a first time.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of the Bill is to amend the provisions for the registration of non-government schools. A Bill was before this House last December and certain amendments

proposed by the Opposition in the House of Assembly were accepted in good faith by the Government. Subsequently, representatives of the non-government schools expressed concern with those amendments. The Act has therefore not been proclaimed and the purpose of these amendments now before the House is to restore the spirit of the Act to that of the original Bill. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation of the Bill inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 increases the representation of the Catholic and non-Catholic independent schools on the Registration Board from one each to two each. Clause 4 makes a corresponding amendment to the provision for a quorum. Clause 5 removes the provision under which a registration fee was to be payable. Clause 6 removes the provision for a periodic renewal of registration. Clause 7 expands the categories of persons who may be sent by the Minister to assist and advise the administrators of non-government schools. Clause 8 makes an amendment for the purpose of administrative convenience. It will make it possible for numbers of inspectors to be authorised to carry out inspections of non-government schools.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD secured the adjournment of the debate.

CITY OF ADELAIDE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Planning) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976-1978. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976-1978, in a number of ways. It deals with the power to grant temporary approvals and with appeal conference procedures, clarifies certain appeal provisions and improves the ability of the council to have its decisions enforced.

The City of Adelaide Development Control Act was enacted in 1976 as a prototype form of flexible development control legislation which would deal with the city's special nature and problems whilst maintaining the State's interest in development in the city. To date the Act has worked very well and has drawn favourable comment from users and commentators. As with any experiment, however, some modifications are eventually needed and it is this Government's intention to make changes in a systematic, rather than a piecemeal, fashion.

For some time both the council and the City of Adelaide Planning Commission have felt the need to be able to grant time limited approvals to certain uses of land associated with special events or with cases of special need. The Act contains two provisions which could be enhanced by this ability. These are sections 24 and 25. The former is a general provision dealing with application for approval of development whilst the latter section enables council, with the commission's consent, to grant approval to development which does not conform with the regulations but is in accordance with the principles of development control.

Although the council is able to impose conditions under both of these sections it is arguable that it is not possible, by the imposition of conditions, to limit the time during which a development may continue. There are many instances, however, where council or the commission would wish to grant a temporary approval to development which it would not wish to approve on a permanent basis. Special events such as the Adelaide Festival generate a number of temporary uses from tents to street cafes. Persons can become ill and unable to carry out business affairs from their normal office but could carry out restricted activities from their home for a limited period. Development which is not listed as a use for a zone may nevertheless be considered to be in accordance with the principles where it is a temporary use (such as a car park) engaged on prior to the commencement of a listed permanent use (such as an office building). The amendment proposed removes any doubt that the council and the commission have the ability to deal with such circumstances in an appropriate and flexible fashion rather than prohibit them or turn a blind eye to them. A non-renewable time limit has been imposed on temporary development.

The amendment also seeks to clarify or strengthen the Act in a number of areas, one of which is that of enforcement. Under the Act as it stands, magistrates who preside over cases brought under section 23 of the Act may require restoration to its original condition of land on which an unlawful development has been carried out. No provision exists, however, for any remedy of the situation where the development is lawful but conditions imposed are breached. Accordingly, subsections (2) and (3) of section 23 of the Act have been redrafted to enable greater discretion to be exercised and more reasonable remedy given by the presiding magistrate. The amendment also changes the time limit within which proceedings for an offence may be instituted from 12 months after the commission of the offence to 12 months after the commission of the offence or to five years after the commission of the offence if the Attorney-General approves the prosecution.

A number of minor changes are made to various appeal provisions in order to strip some procedural red tape from one section of the Act and clarify the meaning of another section. The City of Adelaide Planning Appeals Tribunal is constrained by section 29 of the Act from hearing an appeal until it is satisfied that the parties to the appeal have conferred at a meeting, unless no useful purpose would be served by such a conference. The section as written, however, binds the tribunal—unwillingly—to require that for each conference council must seek the approval by the tribunal of particular persons that it wishes to represent it. Such a procedure involves unnecessary delays and administrative work. The section is also deficient in that no mention is made of the right of an appellant to appoint representatives to a conference.

The amendment resolves both of these problems by streamlining procedure and clarifying the position of both parties as regards representation. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation of the Bill inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation of Bill

The other appeal provision amended relates to decisions made by the commission in certain instances. Whilst the commission is subject to the appeal provisions of the Act in relation to its power to make decisions on development referred to it by the Minister or by council, it is not subject

to appeal in relation to its role under section 25 whereby it concurs with or disagrees with approval being given to non-conforming development. Not only is the commission not subject to appeal over its failure to concur with a decision made by council, but it is not required to give its reasons for failing to do so, whereas council must inform the applicant of its reasons in writing. The amendment remedies these two deficiencies in the Act.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clauses 3 and 4 make amendments to sections 19 and 20 respectively consequent on the repeal of the existing section 25 (2) of the principal Act. Clause 5 replaces subsections (2) and (3) of section 23 of the principal Act. The existing subsection (2) deems a development to have been undertaken without approval where it is undertaken in breach of a condition. The provision does not work where a condition (such as a condition to terminate a development and restore the land to its original state) is to be performed at the end of the period of the development. The new subsection makes it an offence to fail to comply with a condition and the penalties provided are the same as for the offence of undertaking a development without approval under subsection (1).

New subsection (3) enables a court when convicting a person of an offence under subsection (1) or (2) to order the person to comply with a condition to which the approval was subject, to restore the land to its original state or to modify a development already existing on the land or to undertake a new development as prescribed by the court. A recent instance where the last mentioned power was needed was a development that was approved subject to a condition that a large tree be retained. The developer breached the condition and removed the tree. Obviously it was then impossible to fulfil the condition and the court was not prepared to order that the building be demolished. In such circumstances the new power will enable the court to order the developer to remedy the position as far as is possible.

Clause 6 makes a consequential amendment to section 24 of the principal Act. Clause 7 amends section 25 of the principal Act. Subclause *(a)* makes a consequential amendment to subsection (1). Subclause *(b)* replaces subsection (2) with a subsection that makes it clear that the consent of the commission is not required where a development is limited to a period of six months or less. Clause 8 enacts sections 25a and 25b. Section 25 (1) provides that time limited approvals may be granted for any period up to a maximum of two years. If the period exceeds six months the consent of the commission is required. The effect of subsection (2) is to ensure that a time limited development cannot continue for more than two years. New section 25b replaces section 24 (5). It requires the council and the commission when refusing an application for approval or imposing conditions on approval and the commission when refusing consent under section 25 (1) and 25a to supply the applicant with reasons in writing. The effect of the amendment and the amendment made by clause 7 to section 28 is that in future applicants will be able to appeal against a refusal of the commission to consent to an approval under section 25 or 25a.

Clause 9 by subclause *(a)* makes the amendment to section 28 just referred to. Subclause *(b)* makes a consequential alteration. Clause 10 replaces subsection (2) of section 29 with a provision that allows parties at a compulsory conference to be represented by a person of their choice. The existing provision requires the approval of the tribunal for each representative at each conference. This is unnecessary and is very time consuming. Clause 11 makes consequential changes to section 32 of the principal Act. Clause 12 replaces section 43 (2) of the principal Act with two new subsections. New subsection (2) will allow the commencement of a prosecution for an offence under the principal Act within 12 months of the commission of the offence or alternatively, if the Attorney-General authorises the prosecution, within five years of the commission of the offence. Subsection (3) is an evidentiary provision.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1980. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The principal object of this Bill is to amend one of the evidentiary provisions of the Act that relates to the accuracy of traffic speed analysers (i.e. radar equipment). Radar equipment is tested against a speedometer that is accurate to an extent certified in a separate certificate. To say, therefore, as the section in question presently provides, that the equipment is tested against an "accurate" speedometer is incorrect and has caused unwarranted difficulties in some prosecutions for speeding offences. The Government is very concerned to see that there are no undue hitches in the system for dealing with persons who put lives at risk every day by speeding on our roads. The Bill also contains a further evidentiary provision relating to parking offences under the Act, thus bringing the Act into line with a recent amendment made to the Local Government Act in this respect. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation of the Bill inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 deletes the reference to an "accurate" speedometer from an evidentiary provision relating to the accuracy of traffic speed analysers. An evidentiary provision facilitating proof of the Commissioner of Police's approval of prosecutions for parking offences is inserted in the Act.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ADMINISTRATION OF COURTS AND TRIBUNALS) BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends several Acts with a view to bringing the administration of courts and tribunals under the umbrella of a Courts Department in lieu of the present scattered administration that exists for the Supreme Court, the Local and District Criminal Courts, the Appeals Tribunals and the Magistracy. It is the view of the judicial officers consulted by the Government that there must be a dramatic improvement in courts administration, and that the most effective way of achieving this is to establish a Courts Department, the function of which will be to

provide all necessary administrative services to the courts. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation of the Bill inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation of Bill

This approach has the advantage of broadening resources available to court administrators and providing a Permanent Head who will be responsible for co-ordinating and improving the quality of court administration to all jurisdictions. The Permanent Head will be responsible to the Minister for the Public Service staff and expenditure of the department, but will also be required to accept responsibility to appropriate senior judicial officers for actions affecting the business of their courts. Two positions of Registrar will be created, one for the Supreme Court, and one for all other jurisdictions affected by this reorganisation. The Registrars will be responsible to the appropriate senior judicial officer for the administration of the non-judicial aspects of court business, but will also be responsible to the Permanent Head for any aspect of the management falling within the normal ambit of Public Service administration.

Most of the new arrangements can be dealt with administratively, but the principal amendments proposed for the Supreme Court Act and the Local and District Criminal Courts Act carry a statutory recognition of accountability in registrars as senior public servants to the Judiciary.

These new administrative arrangements mean that the master and deputy masters can be freed from their present administrative duties and can concentrate on their judicial functions. It is thus appropriate that these officers should now be outside the Public Service, as they are in every other State in the Commonwealth.

The present arrangements whereby a particular judge or special magistrate is appointed to a board or tribunal creates administrative difficulties. Delays in hearing occur when the designated person is engaged in other duties. There are many administrative tribunals which would best be served by drawing from the full complement of the judges of the Local and District Criminal Court and the magistrates. Accordingly, the amendments empower the Senior Judge of the Local and District Criminal Court to call upon any judge or special magistrate to serve on a board or tribunal as appropriate. Incidentally, the Local and District Criminal Court will henceforth be called the District Court, as are courts of corresponding jurisdiction in other States.

Part I is formal. Part II amends the Supreme Court Act. Clause 6 makes various amendments of an interpretative nature. In particular a new subsection (2) is inserted in section 5 providing that subject to the rules of court, a reference in an Act or in any regulation, by-law or instrument made under an Act to the master or a deputy master of the court shall where the reference occurs in connection with the performance of an act of a judicial nature, be construed as a reference to a master and where the reference occurs in connection with the performance of an act of an administrative nature, be construed as a reference to the Registrar. Clause 7 repeals and re-enacts section 7 of the principal Act. The purpose of the amendment is to make it clear that the masters form part of the court. Clause 8 amends section 8 of the Supreme Court Act. The amendment provides that no person shall be qualified for appointment as a master unless he is a practitioner of the court of not less than seven years standing.

Clause 9 repeals and re-enacts section 9 of the Supreme Court Act. The purpose of the amendment is to deal with the tenure of office of a master. This is to correspond with the tenure of a judge, that is to say, the master will hold office until seventy years of age, but may be removed upon an address by both Houses of Parliament. Clause 10 repeals and re-enacts section 11 of the Supreme Court Act. The amendment adapts the existing provisions relating to acting appointments of judges to cover the acting appointment of masters. Clause 11 repeals and re-enacts section 12 of the principal Act. This section deals at present with the salary of judges. The new section relates also to the salary of masters. Clause 12 repeals and re-enacts section 13a of the Supreme Court Act. This section at present deals with retirement of judges. The re-enacted provision deals also with retirement of masters. A new section 13b is enacted dealing with rights to leave and superannuation of the existing masters of the court who will be the first masters appointed under the new amendments.

Clauses 13 and 14 make consequential amendments. Clause 15 provides that the Full Court of the Supreme Court may sit in more than one division. This is to deal with the possibility that three or more divisions of the Full Court may, on occasion, be required to sit contemporaneously. Clause 16 amends section 48 of the principal Act dealing with the jurisdiction of Masters. Clause 17 deals with an appeal from a judgment, order, direction or decision of a Master and provides that such an appeal shall lie to a judge of the court. Clause 18 amends section 62h of the principal Act. This section relates to the Land and Valuation Court. The new section provides for a Master to exercise jurisdiction conferred by the rules and provides that the Registrar shall have certain administrative powers, authorities, functions and duties. Clause 19 makes a consequential amendment. Clause 20 amends a heading in the Supreme Court Act.

Clause 21 inserts a new section 82 dealing with the office of a Registrar. The Registrar is to be appointed and to hold office subject to the Public Service Act. He is to be the principal administrative officer of the court and is to have such functions and duties as are assigned to him by Statute, by rules of court, or by the Chief Justice. The Registrar is to be subject to the control and direction of the Chief Justice in carrying out functions and duties so far as they relate to the business of the court. Clause 22 amends section 84 of the Supreme Court Act. The amendment makes it clear that the Sheriff is always to be a Public Service officer. Clause 23 amends section 106 of the Supreme Court Act. The amendment provides that appointments of tipstaves are to be made upon the recommendation of the Chief Justice.

Clause 24 amends section 109 of the Supreme Court Act which relates to the appointment of other officers of the court. A provision is inserted making it clear that appointments are to be made on the recommendation of the Chief Justice. Clause 25 makes various consequential amendments to the Supreme Court Act.

Part III of the Bill amends the Judges Pensions Act. The purpose of the amendment is to provide that a Master of the Supreme Court will be entitled to a pension under that Act. However, this entitlement will not apply to a person who presently holds the office of Master or Deputy Master. Part IV amends the Local and District Criminal Courts Act.

Clause 28 is formal. Clause 29 inserts certain definitions that are required for the purposes of the amendments. Clause 30 is formal. Clause 31 removes certain obsolete transitional provisions. Clause 32 deals with nomenclature. It provides that after the commencement of the

amending Act each local court to which full jurisdiction has been assigned shall, in so far as it is a local court of full jurisdiction, be known as a District Court and each District Criminal Court shall be known as a District Court.

Clause 33 amends section 5b of the principal Act. This section deals amongst other things with the administrative responsibilities of the Senior Judge. The amendment makes it clear that the Senior Judge has power to deal with administrative arrangements for the hearing and determination of proceedings not only in local courts and district criminal courts but also before courts, boards or tribunals that are to be constituted either of a judge or a special magistrate or of which the presiding officer is to be a judge or a special magistrate. Clause 34 amends section 5c of the principal Act. The amendment is consequential. Clause 35 deals with the office of Registrar of Courts of Subordinate Jurisdiction. The Registrar is to be appointed and to hold office under the Public Service Act. He is to be the principal administrative officer of District Courts and of local courts, and in relation to the performance of his functions so far as they relate to courts, boards or tribunals over which the Senior Judge may exercise supervision, he is subject to the control and direction of the Senior Judge. Clause 36 makes various consequential amendments to the principal Act. In particular, it should be noted that those officers who are presently referred to as Registrars of District Criminal Courts will in future be known as clerks of arraigns.

Part V amends the Justices Act. The purpose of the amendment is to provide that the Registrar of Courts of Subordinate Jurisdiction will have in relation to courts of summary jurisdiction powers and functions assigned to him by the Justices Act or any other Act, or by rules of court under the Justices Act or any other Act or by the senior magistrate. In relation to his performance of those functions or duties, the Registrar will be under the control and direction of the senior magistrate.

Part VI makes consequential amendments to the Oaths Act. These amendments relate principally to the oath that is to be taken by a Master of the Supreme Court upon assuming his office as such. Part VII amends the Planning and Development Act. The purpose of the amendment is to abolish the system under which a Chairman and Associate Chairmen of the Planning Appeal Board are appointed by the Governor, and to provide instead that the Chairman of the Planning Appeal Board is to be a judge nominated by the Senior Judge and that all other Judges of the District Court will be competent to act as Associate Chairmen of the board. Part VIII amends the City of Adelaide Development Control Act. The amendment makes it clear that the Appellate Tribunal constituted under that Act may be constituted of any judge of the District Court.

Part IX amends the Builders Licensing Act. Under the amendment any judge of the District Court is competent to act as the Chairman of the Builders Appellate and Disciplinary Tribunal. The amendments also make it possible for the tribunal to sit in more than one division. This should greatly expedite the business of the tribunal. Part X amends the Local Government Act. The Court of Disputed Returns established under that Act may by virtue of the amendments be constituted of any judge of the District Court. The power to make rules of court is to be vested in future in the Senior Judge. Part XI amends the Water Resources Act. The amendment provides that any judge of the District Court or any special magistrate authorised in writing by the Attorney-General may act as Chairman of the Appellate Tribunal constituted under that Act. Part XII makes corresponding amendments to the Motor Fuel Distribution Act. Part XIII makes corresponding amendments to the Superannuation Act. Part XIV makes corresponding amendments to the Police Regulation Act in relation to the constitution of the Police Appeal Board.

Mr. McRAE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTION OF SENATORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 February. Page 3000.)

Mr. McRAE (Playford): This Bill, while a machinery one, is nonetheless important because it is important indeed that the procedure for the election of senators proceed without a hitch. As I understand the situation, the original Election of Senators Act of 1903 has possible defects in certain circumstances. There is, first, a deficiency in the Act because it has been suggested that there is no power at present to deal with unforeseen but always possible adjournments. In addition, the 1903 Act is deficient in its reference to the writ and the appropriate days fixed in the writ for nomination and election. No time is specified in the present Act for the closing of the nomination. In the Bill, 12 noon on the day of nomination is the time fixed.

I have also noted that clause 3 allows changes to be made in the date of polling if there is some unforeseen event which prevents polling taking place. I have researched the matter and found that similar modern legislation has been enacted in other States in order to remedy the defects to which I have referred. In those circumstances, the Opposition supports the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (VALUATION OF LAND) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, line 37 (clause 6)—After "livestock" insert "or consisting of the propagation and harvesting of fish or other aquatic organisms".

No. 2. Page 3, lines 6 and 7 (clause 6)—Leave out "or road works".

No. 3 Page 4 (clause 7)—After line 26 insert subsection as follows:

"(2a) Where a valuing authority makes a valuation under the provisions of subsection (2), it shall inform the owner of the land, in writing, of the valuation and of his obligations under subsection (5)."

No. 4. Page 4, line 45 (clause 7)—Leave out "forthwith" and insert "within 28 days".

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am pleased to see that the suggestion I put forward that the matter concerning growth and propagation of fish, which we loosely described as "aquaculture", has been included in the Bill. I thank the Minister for keeping his word about this matter and taking the necessary action in another place. Regarding amendment No. 3, I raised the query how a person who might well be entitled to the kind of valuation proposed under the Act, which is, I think, notional valuation, would know that he or she had that entitlement and be able to ensure that he or she received that special

consideration if that were the case. I can see that that has now been taken care of. It was a fairly complex matter and I think it would be fair to say that I might have been only about 10 seconds in front of the Minister, but between us we did not have it fully in our grasp when we were discussing it.

The officers concerned who were advising on the matter at the time felt that the procedure they envisaged would take care of the matter. I am glad to see it has been put beyond doubt in the Bill by the simple procedure of requiring notification. That seems to me to be a sensible way out of the matter.

There is no mention here of another matter which occurred to me at the time, but as it is not covered in the amendments I will refer to it only briefly. The Minister told us in relation to this matter that there would not be dual valuation taking place in respect of the 10 000 properties, or thereabouts, that might be concerned. It would appear that the Valuation Department, in carrying out its work after the amendment of this Act, might well be doing dual valuations in respect of the 10 000 properties or so which are concerned.

In relation to the last amendment, I certainly had some misgivings about the requirement for forthwith notification, which refers to the fact that, where a person has been in receipt of that special consideration available to the property owner under the consideration of notional valuation, if, in the circumstances which entitle him to that special consideration change, there was a requirement that notification be made forthwith. I am pleased to see that wiser counsel has prevailed and we now provide for 28 days' notification. I am reminded that on an earlier occasion, when I required a similar amendment of the Premier in relation to notification of the valuation authority, the Premier agreed. The Opposition agrees with these amendments.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: Since the Bill passed this House concern has been expressed in the community about the word "forthwith", hence the Legislative Council's amendment to provide 28 days is very appropriate.

Motion carried.

POLICE REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:

Page 6—After line 30 insert new clause as follows:

19a. The following section is inserted after the heading to Part VI of the principal Act:

"51a. *Insertion of new s. 51a—Protection from liability for members of the Police Force*—(1) A member of the Police Force shall not incur any civil liability for any act or omission done in good faith in the exercise or discharge, or purported exercise or discharge, of any powers, functions, duties or responsibilities conferred or imposed upon him by any provision of this or any other Act whenever enacted or by law.

(2) A liability that would, but for subsection (1), lie against a member of the Police Force shall lie against the Crown."

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

This amendment deals with protection from liability of members of the Police Force. It was discussed with the Police Association after that association asked for it to be included in the Bill. It has been agreed to by the Commissioner and it has passed the other place, with the agreement of the Opposition.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: This amendment makes a substantial change to what was previously the liability for actions carried out by officers of the Police Force in pursuance of their duties. I accept that the request came from the Police Association and that the matter has been considered and carried in the other place. It has been my understanding that police officers presently enjoy a measure of protection, but they are not totally indemnified against the results of their actions. I can recall one instance which was put as evidence to a Select Committee on which I was serving four or five years ago in relation to entry for search, where the police officer has a reasonable belief that stolen goods may be on the premises. This matter has been covered more closely by the member for Playford, and I would appreciate a small adjournment to allow the Opposition an opportunity to consider the amendment.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: REDCLIFF PROJECT

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: My attention has been drawn to the fact that during Question Time today I said that there would be no discharge to the sea from the Redcliff plant. To make it perfectly clear, I wish to state that cooling water will be recirculated through the plant but there will be no chemical discharge as a result of the plant's operation.

IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 February. Page 3209.)

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell): This Bill has arrived in the House as a result of action taken by the previous Government. In 1976, the then Minister of Water Works (Hon. J. D. Corcoran) instigated an investigation into the metropolitan Adelaide water supply, and a large and well-produced document was subsequently presented to him late in 1978. I then had the honour in 1979 to release that report, which was entitled the Metropolitan Adelaide Water Resources Study. It was produced in a written form and also in a number of smaller publications, which included a great deal of diagrammatic information and an in-depth study of the salinity problems with which all members are familiar in relation to the Murray River. Various schemes were put forward in an attempt to help solve the problem. These schemes ranged from major works proposed for salinity control, where the river enters South Australia at Rufus River, to schemes such as those which are referred to in this Bill. The genesis of this Bill lies on page 175 of the report under the heading "3.4 Provision of Low Cost Finance for Replacement of Furrow with Improved Irrigation Techniques".

The recommendations contained in the Metropolitan Adelaide Water Resources Study were made available to the public in early 1979 for general comment, and they were adopted by the then Government as its policy on the provision of Adelaide's water supplies. I am pleased to note that that part of the previous Government's policy has been endorsed by the present Government, and the decisions which had been taken to proceed with the measures that were outlined in that report, such as the

Noora drainage scheme, are directly related to salinity problems associated with irrigation projects at present along the Murray River in South Australia. Such are the only irrigation projects over which the Government of this State has direct control and can cause proper action to be taken to improve the salinity position of the Murray River, at least in South Australia. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

> In 1973 the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works approved an overall programme for rehabilitation of the headworks in the majority of the Government irrigation areas in the Riverland region.

That is a fact. When that approval was carried out, a sum of about $5 600 000 was approved, and to the present day the cost has been about $15 000 000, and work is still not complete. The previous Government of the day and I, as Minister, had observed that it could be argued that there was some problem wherein expenditure was approved by the Public Works Committee but later much greater sums were required and the work was still not completed. It was thought sensible to refer the project back to the Public Works Committee to be amended and detailed in the light of the knowledge then available in 1979 and the experience gained through the progress of the scheme so far.

That decision of the previous Government was sensible. This Government has not done other than go along with it. When the project came before the Public Works Committee, approval was given to that major overall project after a good deal of investigation and further visits to the area by committee members, as is customary. That approval was given, as a result of the information provided. Information subsequently given to the Public Works Committee clearly showed that a very large cost increase occurred because of the connection problem at or within the immediate boundary area of an irrigator's property. The matter had reached a stage that necessitated resubmission to the Public Works Committee, possibly because there was a change of responsibility for irrigation matters from the Lands Department to the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Mr. Millhouse: That could only be for the better. To get anything away from the Lands Department is pretty good.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member is entitled to his view.

Mr. Millhouse: You share it, don't you?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I once relieved the Minister of Lands for 10 weeks and found the officers in that department had done their best and were helpful to me as relieving Minister. The Minister's secretary, Mr. Tucker, gave excellent service to me. I could not detect any difference in that department from the other 11 departments with which I have been involved.

Mr. Millhouse: I'm afraid that doesn't reflect very well on your perspicacity.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member's attempt to denigrate some members of the Public Service in this State is deplorable. He will not get any support from me in that. However, we are here to consider the matter before us. I think the term used by the E. & W.S. was a block connection, and it got somewhat out of hand. There was a desire by the previous Government not to disadvantage growers because of the change to more efficient methods pursued by the Engineering and Water Supply Department in irrigation water distribution to properties concerned. Decisions were taken to convert Government irrigation areas to a piped system. Members will see that the immediate advantage of that is that there is less loss from seepage, soakage, spillover banks and so on, because the water is contained within a fully piped system from the pumping point. It was at the block entry that the problem arose.

The committee was told, and I, as Minister was told, that some irrigators had a number of valves and distribution points, under the old system. In an effort not to disadvantage those people, Engineering and Water Supply Department officers consulted in regional areas and provided many blockowners with multiple arrangements. These proved far more costly than had been envisaged, certainly in 1973 and even in later years. For that reason, the Minister's proposition to provide methods other than those presently applied, where an irrigator's requirement is met, would have been put forward by the Opposition, had we been in Government. For that reason, I support the proposal before us.

The Bill says that financial assistance to lessees in the principal Act, Part VI, will be much simpler than the present system. That is in a bound copy of the Statutes, and covers several pages. It is not important, other than to point out that we now propose to replace that with about three or four subsections under new section 81. New section 81 (1) provides:

> The Minister may, upon such terms and conditions as he determines, grant financial assistance to a lessee.

Other provisions put limits on at least how easily the Minister may hand out the money. I am sure that members will be pleased with that. He can do it for the purpose of making improvements to land lease under this Act by the lessee, or for the purpose of discharging a mortgage over the land. He can also do it for the purpose of enabling the lessee to purchase implements, stock, seeds, plants, trees or other things required for farming the land. I take it that new section 81 (1) *(c)* is a direct reference to irrigation equipment. The words "implements" is antiquated and probably dates back to William James Farrer. I suggest that the Minister could have worded that a little better. I have no quarrel with that, as long as I have his assurance as to its meaning. New section 81 (2) provides:

> Assistance under this section may consist of a non-repayable grant or loan.

I think that is fair, in the circumstances. The requirement for improvements will benefit the State, and therefore nothing should stand in the way of the State, within bounds, making available the finance necessary to that irrigator. The Opposition agrees with the Minister on that. New section 81 (3) provides:

> Moneys required for the purpose of this section shall be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament for those purposes.

Is there some difficulty here? When these moneys are paid out, will they be moneys related to the total cost estimated for the completion of the rebuilding programme for the Government irrigation areas, and recently approved by the Public Works Committee, or will they be other moneys outside that? No doubt the Minister can explain that.

There may be a possibility of a further problem similar to that of 1973 to 1979, where a project grows beyond the bounds approved by the Public Works Committee, on behalf of Parliament. That can be cleared up by the Minister. Should this Bill be held in abeyance while this matter is re-referred to the Public Works Committee? In his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

> The farmers who would be eligible for this grant option would be those whose on-farm irrigation systems have not yet been connected to rehabilitated headworks. The question of assistance to farmers whose irrigation systems have already been connected is being considered by the Government.

That is a fairly murky paragraph for a second reading explanation. What does it mean? I understand the two categories spelt out there. There are some who have not

had the assistance previously provided under the complete scheme and others who have.

The Minister went on to say that whether or not they will receive any assistance has been considered by the Government. Obviously, some assistance has been given already, because they have been connected. I think the Minister means "further assistance".

The Hon. P. B. Arnold: You can't spend the money twice.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: By way of interjection, the Minister has demonstrated the incompleteness of the second reading explanation. When I raised the matter, it was cleared up immediately. Time can be saved if second reading explanations are as clear as possible. I know they cannot be perfect. That matter was ambiguous, and it has now been made clear. I take it that the Minister has said that they receive help only once, and then they are on their own. If that is the case, why is the Government still further considering the matter? So, the Minister has just advised us he has taken the decision in advance of the consideration he told us in progress.

The Hon. P. B. Arnold: I'll explain that.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Good. So we are to be treated to an explanation that will clear up this matter.

The Hon. P. B. Arnold: As always.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Minister has not been very successful in the past two days in clearing up other matters until a statement was made in the House by another Minister, who took over his responsibility in the area. I will leave the people of South Australia to make their judgment on that. I note that the scheme will be administered by the Minister of Agriculture on the advice of the Director-General of Agriculture. That is sensible, because the question of what irrigation system could be used, its efficacy and its applicability to the crop concerned is a matter for the expertise within the Department of Agriculture. Clearly, that makes sense. I suggest that the Minister might indicate the total sum being considered in the funds that will be provided when he is explaining whether those funds will come from the package amount in regard to the whole reclamation scheme. The South Australian River Murray Salinity Control Programme (Evalution and Recommendations), at page 175, states:

> It is recommended that finance terms be flexible with:
>
> • an interest rate of up to 7 per cent p.a.—

and that was before Mr. Fraser in Canberra took a couple of decisions for the worse in the interest area—

> • a repayment period of up to 20 years.
>
> • a holiday from repayments for up to three years.

It is also stated that the scope of the programme was, in truth, "minor effects on river salinity", and that it would become more effective progressively over a long period. As it would improve salinity, I believe that all members would support it. In relation to cost, it is stated:

> The cost of providing low cost finance and the necessary support facilities—$3 400 000.

If the Minister says that that figure has had to be increased, that would be understandable, because there have been inflation rises since then. An economic benefit is shown, and it certainly makes sense in that respect, because with correct irrigation methods for various crops (and the Minister referred to this in a report he made available to Parliament subsequent to his visit overseas—I do not say jaunt)—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not impute improper motives to other members.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: That is why I said I would not say "jaunt". I used the words "overseas visit". I am not knocking the Minister's report: I have read it, and I believe that the Minister put a good deal of work into it. The Opposition would have no quarrel with many of the conclusions and statements in the report. I simply point out that there are two viewpoints about overseas trips—that is all I suggest. The environmental impact was covered in the document. It was stated:

> Beneficial social impact is expected. Improved techniques should foster higher yields and greater on-farm efficiency . . .

I do not know why that comes under the heading "Environmental impact". I wondered about that when I first saw the report. I thought it would have come under the heading of "Agricultural impact", or something like that.

In short, the Opposition supports the measure. We are pleased that the Minister has had the courage and the good sense to endorse the recommendations of the previous Government and to proceed with some of them as soon as he has been able to arrange for the implementation of the necessary schemes, which were certainly only concepts at the time the document to which I refer was drawn up but which had been endorsed as policy by the previous Government.

I suggest that matters such as this and the Metropolitan Adelaide Water Resources Study will be landmarks in regard to the Murray River system as the State's main water source. It will be a fitting tribute to a man who spent so long in the chair looking after those matters. There is no contest about that. The report and the study that followed and the production of the documents from which I have quoted were set in train by the Hon. Des Corcoran. I know that all members would agree that that was one of the great achievements of his period as Minister of Water Resources. The Opposition supports the Bill, but we may have some queries during the Committee stage.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources): I appreciate the problems that the member for Mitchell has raised in relation to the Murray River and the irrigation industry. There is no substitute for experience and, unfortunately, the honourable member had only a short time in office. Not having been involved in irrigation professionally in his lifetime, the honourable member obviously would not have the same knowledge as would some other people.

The policy of the previous Government in regard to on-farm connections perpetuated poor irrigation practices, particularly in the Riverland. The overall policy of rehabilitation of Government irrigation areas to reduce salinity flow back to the river was good, but unfortunately the thought behind the on-farm connection policy was not considered to its end, and I can understand that, because no-one in the previous Government had had any real experience in that field. A sum of up to $15 000 for each property for on-farm connections was expended under the previous Government's policy. I have no argument with the previous Government's policy in regard to the fact that no farmer would be disadvantaged by the new irrigation distribution system, but to expend up to $15 000 on connection costs within a property to perpetuate what was a poor irrigation system shows that the Government's policy had not been thought through to its end.

This Bill will enable an amended policy, which will give the opportunity to farmers to accept the option of the average of on-farm connection costs to be made available by way of grants in lieu of the normal connection fee. Not only will this scheme not cost the Government any more money than would the previous policy but also it will go a long way to upgrading the irrigation facilities and systems that are used on properties. The objective of the rehabilitation scheme was to reduce the amount of water

that had to be pumped from the river and to make maximum use of the water, at the same time reducing the salinity returning to the river as the result of seepage and drainage, as referred to by the honourable member. It has been shown beyond any doubt that the major contributor of salinity and groundwater movement and flow back to the river is farming practices.

Our study tour overseas last year clearly proved that our argument in this respect was correct. In fact, I have been actively supporting that philosophy since my overseas study tour in 1977. On that occasion it became very apparent to me that the practices of irrigation had a great deal to do with the end result and the level of salinity returning to any of the river systems from which the water for irrigation was derived.

The basic purpose of this Bill is to enable the Government to offer to the irrigators or the farmers who have not at this stage been connected to the new irrigation distribution system to opt for having that connection cost met by way of a grant, rather than having their old irrigation systems, which are antiquated in many instances, connected at a substantial cost to the Government, and to no benefit to either the farmer or the State as a whole from the salinity control point of view.

The cost has escalated dramatically, and the whole project has been referred back to the Public Works Standing Committee for updating, and also to put before the Public Works Standing Committee alterations and amendments to the scheme which have been found to be necessary because of experience gained during the rehabilitation of the Waikerie irrigation area. Many of the items that have now been incorporated in the rehabilitation scheme at Berri are as a result of the experience gained during the Waikerie exercise. We are looking at up to $15 000 cost to the Government for farm connections. Cabinet has already approved a policy which contains a formula by which the grant moneys will be offered to farmers.

The grant moneys will not be offered in the form of cash; they will be offered on the basis of the farmers putting forward an approved irrigation system which will be approved by the Department of Agriculture and the Engineering and Water Supply Department. That money, and the moneys that are made available by the Government under the grants system, will be paid to the installing contract firm that puts in the irrigation system on the property. It will not be a cash hand-out for the grower. In other words, there is no way that the money will be handed over to the grower unless an improved irrigation system is installed. So, the moneys will be handed over only on the basis of the improved irrigation system being installed on the property.

The honourable member referred to the costs of providing the on-farm connection grants. The on-farm connection grants will be made out of the savings which will be achieved by not being committed to the full on-farm connection costs. In other words, where a grower opts for the Government to connect to his existing system, that will be done for the grower; where the grower opts to have the money by way of grants paid towards the installation of his new irrigation system, he will be able to have the grant moneys. However, the total expenditure will not exceed the moneys provided for in the Public Workings Standing Committee's revised estimates. In total, there will be no additional cost to the Government.

It has been mentioned on other occasions that the moneys will be made available for approved irrigation systems. The approved irrigation systems will amount to any form of improved or modern irrigation system, and also "approved" refers to the fact that the money will be made available only on the actual installation of that system. A grower will not be able to make the claim for the irrigation grant, accept the money, and then just continue with his old existing irrigation system. So, the grant moneys will be made available for the actual costs of the installation of that system. Not only will the grower get the benefits of being able to install the modern irrigation system on his property at a reduced cost, but the State will get a direct benefit in a reduced ground water movement and salinity flow back to the Murray River.

The honourable member asked who would receive the grants and what would be in it for those who had already been connected. The policy of the previous Government, which provided for all farmers to be connected to the system, or for their old irrigation system to be connected, perpetuated a bad system, and, what is more, the cost has been incurred by the Government in the total rehabilitation. It is unfortunate that the current policy being introduced at this time was not the policy right from the beginning. In hindsight, one realises that it would have achieved a great deal in the reduction of the overall salinity level of the Murray River in South Australia, and also, it would have done a lot for the efficiency of irrigation and for the increased productivity of the irrigation areas in South Australia. However, that is history, and, as I said before, one cannot spend money twice.

The intention is to make low interest moneys available, and that is available at the moment through the Department of Agriculture. What we want to do is supplement that. Twelve months ago the Federal Government indicated that it would make low interest moneys available for on-farm improvements. At this stage we have not received any of those moneys, because when the Federal Government went to make the additional $300 000 available, which it had indicated it would, it found that it would have been in contravention of existing Federal Acts, so amendments would have to be made before that can occur.

Moneys will be made available on the basis of low interest. It is my intention that those farmers who qualify for the grant moneys will not have immediate access to the low interest finance, because I wish to spread the incentives, if you like, for on-farm improvements, across the whole board—not only Government irrigators, and not just those who are yet to be rehabilitated, but I want to apply it to Government irrigation areas where the rehabilitation scheme has already gone through, to private irrigation areas, to the Renmark Irrigation Trust, and to other private irrigation schemes.

Basically what the Government is interested in is any incentives that will help to reduce the overall salinity flowing back into the Murray River. It is a very important part of the total Murray River salinity control programme to which the honourable member referred earlier, of which the Noora scheme is the backbone.

The provisions that have been made in this Bill will enable the Government to make much better use of the moneys which have been approved by the Public Works Standing Committee and by Parliament in the interests of controlling salinity in South Australia and upgrading productivity and efficiency of the irrigated horticultural industries in South Australia.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Financial assistance to lessees."

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Minister made some remarks in which I think he was trying to suggest that I did not have very much experience in this area. I had only four

months as Minister, but it has taken him 17 months to get this scheme before the Parliament.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 February. Page 3219.)

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): The Opposition views with some serious concern some of the proposals in this Bill. The Minister of Health, in the second reading explanation, and the Minister who introduced the Bill in the other place indicated that the amendments to the original legislation proposed in this measure were arrived at as a result of a report made by an interdepartmental working committee, in consultation with interested parties, voluntary groups, and so on, concerned in that area. The Minister of Health, in the second reading explanation, referred to the recommendations having been made after detailed consultation and discussions with interested parties, including the Real Estate Institute, the Landlords Association, the Tenants Association, South Australian Council of Social Service, Government departments, and authorities involved in renting premises.

I am given to understand that the Real Estate Institute and the Landlords Association certainly were asked to make submissions to the interdepartmental working party, but the South Australian Tenants Association was not invited to do so. The report which was placed before the Minister has not been made public, nor has it been made available to members of this Parliament for us to consider or peruse to see whether it contains the recommendations regarding the amendments proposed in the Bill, or whether proposals not contained in the report are included in the Bill; in other words, a report which is the basis of legislative change is produced, but the Parliament does not have an opportunity to consider it.

The Opposition is concerned about a number of the proposals in the legislation. The interdepartmental working party was chaired by Mr. Robert Nicholls, who was a defeated Liberal Party candidate, and who was appointed Chairman of this committee reporting on a matter which involved serious political controversy. The Government, when in Opposition, strongly opposed the introduction of the residential tenancies legislation and Mr. Robert Nicholls now finds himself, as Chairman of the committee, recommending in a report changes to the principal Act.

Some proposals in the Bill will have a serious impact on low income earners. The proposed increase from three weeks to four weeks rent in relation to the maximum security bond is a matter which causes us grave concern. I believe that it is a further opportunity to disadvantage the already disadvantaged by seeking a further amount of money, and providing an opportunity for the landlord to make the security bond on a four-week basis. Members on this side, almost weekly and sometimes daily, see people in desperate circumstances, people with families, low income earners, and people on benefits, who are facing severe difficulties in finding accommodation, and who would have greater difficulties if they had to provide four weeks rent for a bond.

I want to quote from a letter from the South Australian Council of Social Service Inc. regarding its views on amendments in this Bill. The letter states:

> The South Australian Council of Social Service views with concern three major proposals in the Residential Tenancies Act Amendment Bill which will contribute to the difficulties of low-income earners and their families in gaining access to adequate private rental housing.
>
> The proposed amendment to section 32 (1) *(b)* of the principal Act which would enable landlords to require payment of a security bond equivalent to four weeks rent would further disadvantage low-income groups, many of whom are already faced with considerable hardship in paying the three weeks equivalent currently required. An indicator of the existing problem for these groups, and particularly for those people who are wholly reliant on social security payments for their subsistence, may be found in statistics collected by the Emergency Housing Office, which has seen the rate of applications for assistance with tenancy establishment costs (and especially security bonds) double over the past 18 months. The proposed amendment would undoubtedly increase these difficulties, forcing more people into a choice between accepting cheaper, but unsuitable housing (where they can find it), or greater financial hardship: SACOSS is, therefore, strongly opposed to its implementation.
>
> The proposal to repeal sections 58 (3) and 58 (4) of the principal Act would, in the council's view, seriously reduce the level of protection afforded to families with children seeking rental accommodation, especially large families, or those with disabled or retarded children. Under the Act as it now stands, a landlord is prohibited from inquiring from a prospective tenant whether that tenant has any children, or whether it is intended that children should live on the premises. If this prohibition is removed, it will enable a landlord to seek information about a prospective tenant's children, and if a tenancy is refused on the basis of such information, the onus of proof of such discrimination will no longer be on the landlord. It will thus become considerably easier for a landlord to refuse a tenancy on grounds which ostensibly have nothing to do with the composition of a tenant's family.

The letter goes on to criticise the proposed amendment to section 63 (3) *(a)* which would reduce the period of notice of termination of a tenancy agreement from 14 days to seven days. It then states:

> It is already common for tenants, who, because of personal financial crises, are unable to maintain rental payments , to experience acute difficulty in establishing a new tenancy within 14 days of being given notice to quit. Legislation which would require them to achieve this within 7 days, and which would increase the amount of any security bond they had to find (having, in addition, just forfeited a proportion of the previous bond because of unpaid rent), is clearly destined to generate severe problems for low income households, and should, in SACOSS's view, be reconsidered.
>
> While it is pleased to note that tenancy agreements reached before December 1978 will, under the proposed amendments, be brought within the provisions of the Residential Tenancies Act, the council does not wish to see further hardship imposed on low-income tenants—especially at a time when the demand for public housing far exceeds the supply, and, as a consequence, when there is a growing upward pressure on rents in the private market.

I point out for the benefit of the House, and particularly the Minister and members opposite, that I have information that rental increases in the past three months have been about 15 per cent on the private market and, no doubt, will increase further. So, if people are to provide a bond, particularly those people on low incomes, it seems that it will be necessary for them to provide from $240 to $300 before they can become tenants of a private property. The letter concludes:

> It is hoped, therefore, that these comments will be taken into account by the Government while there is still time to

ensure that these amendments do not upset a proper balance between the rights and obligations of landlords and tenants.

I think that that letter, which is signed by the Executive Officer of SACOSS, demonstrates fairly conclusively the attitude of the council with regard to this Bill. It shows quite conclusively (and they are the people dealing with persons who run into a great deal of difficulty in respect to housing) that the amendments proposed by the Government should be considered seriously.

Is the Minister aware whether any family impact study accompanied the report? I believe it is Government policy at this time, particularly in matters of this nature, to obtain a family impact study, which should be made available. Can the Minister tell us what that family impact study contained? I am not aware that it is available to the public. I did not think it had been available to the Parliament, so I asked the Minister whether, in her reply, she would give some indication of whether a family impact study has been provided in relation to this report.

The Residential Tenancies Act was set up by the former Labor Government. It went a long way toward providing an opportunity for disputes which regularly arose between landlord and tenant about a number of matters to be dealt with. I believe that it was an important piece of legislation. The Liberal Opposition at that time opposed the legislation tooth and nail and claimed that the Government was over-regulating the housing industry. Since then, Liberal philosophy has changed a little. What the Government is trying to do on this occasion is obviate some of the good things that were part of that legislation. It probably seeks to take away some of the more effective measures which provide protection to tenants of rental housing. There is a tremendous problem in the community at present in finding rental accommodation at a reasonable cost. Perhaps the indication of this difficulty for people on low incomes is that 20 000 persons are now listed for accommodation with the South Australian Housing Trust. The waiting period, as I understand, is from three to five years for various types of accommodation. This indicates quite clearly the difficulty that people have in affording the rents that are asked on the private market.

Many of those persons who come to us as members of Parliament seeking assistance with regard to South Australian Housing Trust applications are people who are in private rental flats and houses and who, because of their income (if they are single parent families, unemployed, or seeking benefits of any kind) are paying nearly 60 per cent of their income in rent. The payment of rent leaves them in difficult circumstances. As I have said, rents are increasing fairly substantially, and people receiving welfare benefits are finding it more and more difficult to cope with the demands made on them for rent.

I think I have covered the main points of this Bill. The Opposition proposes to support the second reading, but will oppose certain clauses in the Committee stage.

Mr. MATHWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): There is a quotation which states:

When things are different they are not the same.

That quotation is rather obscure but, nevertheless, it has much currency in the corridors of Parliament House these days. It describes the actions of the Liberal Party when in Government doing things that when in Opposition it totally opposed. To bring this home to current events, I would like to relate that saying to the present Government's performance on noise. We know that as a result of bands like Police and AC/DC at Memorial Drive the citizens of Adelaide have been subjected to excessive noise and everybody, rightly, is concerned. An editorial canvasses that subject in today's *News*.

Both the Premier and the Lord Mayor of Adelaide have been vocal about a recent concert at Memorial Drive, where there were brawls and excessive noise. The Premier, in the traditional Liberal guise of being the only true custodian of law and order (even though violence has increased markedly since he came to power) spoke yesterday in terms of disapproval and concern about what had happened. It was not, he observed, a matter for politicking. That is quite true, but politicking by the Liberal Party has made the problem more difficult to solve. Members may have forgotten the stand taken by the present Government when in Opposition, when the Noise Control Bill was being debated. I have not forgotten. I was a member of the Select Committee that brought down a report to this Parliament with certain recommendations that some members of this Parliament sought to defeat. Had Liberal members in the Legislative Council not insisted on one amendment, there would have been far more effective means to use against promoters of excessively noisy outdoor entertainment. Should anybody doubt this, I invite them to look at the record of debates in this House on 20 April 1977.

There was argument then about exactly where noise readings could be taken. The Liberals, the then Opposition, objected to readings being taken on the boundary of premises emitting the noise. They clearly had industrial premises in mind. They wanted readings of noise levels to be taken at the nearest measurement place, as it was known, which is not the same thing as the boundary of premises emitting noise. The measurement place is defined as being any place outside the non-domestic premises at which any person resides or is regularly engaged in any remunerative activity—in other words, a living or working place. This could, for example, be 250 metres or more from the boundary of the premises emitting noise.

That brings me to a pertinent remark made at that time by the then Minister of Environment (the Hon. D. W. Simmons). I ask members of the Government to just listen to what the Minister of Environment said at that time when this important legislation, the Noise Control Bill, was being discussed. The Minister said:

Consider the situation on the banks of the Torrens River, with a rock group performing on the Memorial Drive tennis courts, where the noise level was far above what was satisfactory to people who merely wanted to sit on the southern bank and enjoy the peaceful night air. They would be subjected to the excessive noise coming from the other side.

Even though we could proclaim the Drive under the Places of Public Entertainment Act, or declare it under the legislation, nevertheless, by virtue of the amendment, the place where the family might be sitting on the banks of the Torrens would not be a measurement place because it was not a place where any person resided or was regularly employed.

We have had the example in the past two days of the Premier's giving an undertaking that the Government will have an examination of the noise control legislation to see whether something can be done to overcome the problems

with which we are faced from noisy concerts at Memorial Drive. When the Premier, and more particularly the member for Davenport, moved in this House amendments to the recommendations brought down by the Select Committee primarily to prevent noise measurements from being taken at the boundary of the premises from which the noise was being emitted, the Government members all supported their colleague, the member for Davenport. Now they have the total hypocrisy to say that they are concerned at the noise that comes from Memorial Drive when they and their colleagues in another place are solely responsible for the problem we face.

The then Minister (Hon. D. W. Simmons) asked for the Legislative Council amendment to be rejected and this House did so, but after a conference between the Houses the objectionable amendment was still there and is in fact in section 10 of the present Act. The Liberal Party Opposition in South Australia, in the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly, was prepared to see the Noise Control Bill lapse, rather than allow measurements to be taken at the boundary of premises, non-domestic premises, from which noise was being emitted. As the Government of the time was anxious to have this highly necessary legislation on the Statute Book, it was prepared to accept, only at the ultimate, for the sake of reason, for the sake of having legislation that was important, the amendment moved by the then Opposition. But the thugs in the Liberal Party were determined to insist on this amendment being in the Bill.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I draw to your attention the honourable member's remarks whereby he accused members on this side of the House of beings thugs.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. It is quite clear that, if aggrieved, honourable members have an opportunity to ask for a withdrawal but they cannot use a point of order to ask for a withdrawal. Is the honourable Minister asking for the words to be withdrawn?

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Yes.

Mr. KENEALLY: I withdraw the word "thugs". What the Minister offered them as an example has become reality and, if the Government is ready to look at what can be done about such occasions, perhaps it might consider reverting the wording of section 10 back to what was proposed by the then Minister. I can understand the feeling of disappointment by the Minister in those days, when he was faced with 25 Legislative Council amendments. Quite frankly, he told the House:

> It is hard to believe that the Legislative Council is sincere in wanting to see any effort to control noise in this State, because some of the amendments are specifically designed to thwart the imposition of any sort of control of noise.

Yet, despite the transparency of Liberal objections in 1977 to effective noise control provisions, when they were principally concerned to see that the screws could not be placed on their friends in industry, Liberal members are now posing as being genuinely upset about what happens with increasing frequency at Memorial Drive. Their own supporters want some control applied there. They object to this air-borne invasion of privacy being visited on them, and the Government does not want there to be any politicking.

The Premier is talking, with due ponderousness, as is his wont, about serious hearing loss and other consequences of over-amplified entertainment. I ask the Premier to come down from his platform and look at the key item of legislation, which is available, and to reconsider what the Liberals did in 1977 and whether they will now admit they were wrong then and amend section 10 back to its original form.

I end as I started by saying that when things are different they are not the same. The Liberal Party is either acting with extreme hypocrisy now or it has had a latter day conversion to reality. Liberal Party members had the opportunity in 1977 to provide in the Statute Book a remedy for noise such as is being emitted from Memorial Drive, but they were not prepared at that time to agree to the Government's sensible provisions. They forced us to a conference. They were ready to have that Bill lapse, and now we see the Premier's making statements that the Government is concerned about noise at Memorial Drive and will have an investigation into it to see what can be done to solve the problem. Citizens of Adelaide have been subjected to three years of noise that was unnecessary had the Liberal Party been as sensible three years ago as it now gives promise of being on this issue.

Mr. ASHENDEN (Todd): I rise to speak on the recently released report of the Industries Assistance Commission. The Federal Government rightly has been concerned about some issues in relation to motor vehicle manufacturing in Australia, but the way in which the I.A.C. is recommending that corrective action should be taken could not be further from the mark. The Federal Government has been looking for greater recognition of the importance of the motor industry in Australia's industrial structure and the need for companies to become more competitive in both domestic and export markets. There is no doubt at all that any action that can be taken to ensure that that comes about must be for the good particularly of industry in South Australia, which is so heavily based upon the automotive factor.

However, the proposals put forward by the I.A.C. in no way go toward meeting those criteria. I believe that the continuation of a local content plan, as we presently have, but at a reduced rate would bring about a marked improvement in the situation. For example, if the content requirement was reduced to 75 per cent, it would give Australian manufacturers much more flexibility in their manufacturing programmes but, at the same time, it would not effect either their employment or the final cost of the vehicle.

Again, we certainly should retain the export facilitation of 7½ per cent. This of course means that an Australian manufacturer can gain "credit points", if you like to call it that, by exporting certain manufactured products overseas that can then be "cashed in" for imports.

I also believe that there should be a much tighter restriction on the importation of completely built up units into Australia. Companies, for example, such as Mazda, are presently able to compete most unfairly in the Australian market. They have quite a high percentage of the vehicle sales in this country, but they provide virtually no employment, apart from sales, whatsoever. At the moment, they have no manufacturing or assembly facilities, yet they are able, because of what I believe is a complete anomaly in the Federal Government's policy on motor manufacturing, to bring in far too many vehicles and compete quite unfairly against Australian manufacturers. Why it is that that company, in particular, is able to import to the extent that it does, while manufacturing companies like Mitsubishi, Ford and General Motors, are subject to very severe restrictions, is beyond my ken.

The continuation of the basic elements of the present assistance structure, combined with the continuation of export facilitation, would achieve the criteria that the I.A.C. says it wants to achieve, but at the same time protect employment and investment in Australia. Already, there has been a significant rationalisation of the industry in this country. The quality of the Australian-

made vehicle now is certainly at least equal to that of the major manufacturing companies overseas.

I realise that members would know that I came from Chrysler, or now the Mitsubishi Company, and I can therefore speak with the greatest knowledge in that area. It is not advertising when I say that there is not a shadow of doubt that the present Sigma is one of the best finished vehicles that Australian manufacturers have ever turned out. This is for two reasons. One rests very much with the worker himself. At the moment, the company is enjoying worker-management relations, the like of which it has never had before, because there is tremendous co-operation between management and the unions. We have seen schemes set up by that company which have resulted in a product second to none. Workers are now able to achieve significant results for themselves by turning out a very high quality vehicle.

There is no doubt that the fact that Mitsubishi is now No. 3 in Australia has a lot to do with the very positive contribution of its present Australian management, and the very astute business acumen of the Japanese company, behind the Australian management. Some years ago, it took over 80 man hours for a car to be built at Chryslers. At the moment, it takes less than 30 man hours for the vehicles to be produced in exactly the same factory. The result is that the company can turn out a product, the main seller being the Sigma, which is of very high quality, and at the same time has increased in price considerably less than the c.p.i.

If ever the I.A.C. needed to see an example of what industry can do with monitored protection, I think that is a perfect example. The removal of that protection can only result in disaster, particularly in South Australia. The motor manufacturers, General Motors-Holden's, Ford, Mitsubishi, and so on, are all aware of the changes that have taken place throughout the world. They are all moving to smaller vehicles and much better management techniques, and closer relationships between management and the unions. The result can be seen. Whereas not too many years back an Australian vehicle was not only perhaps not as well made as an imported vehicle, it also cost more, but that is no longer the case.

I have in front of me some figures that I think are most interesting. I would like to compare the sales prices of some vehicles in Austraia with exactly the same model in the United Kingdom. We find that the Toyota range, for example, sells at anything from $500 to $1 500 more cheaply in Australia than in the United Kingdom. For the Datsun, it is any thing up to $2 500 difference in price; for Ford, almost $3 000; for Mitsubishi, it is about $2 000. In other words, the Australian manufacturer is becoming extremely efficient and productive. It is grossly unfair of the I.A.C. to state, as one of its tenets, that the Australian motoring public is being denied some vehicles available overseas, and using quality control, investment, and keeping up with know-how, as the reason for allowing more imports.

Certainly, there is no doubt that senior management, particularly of the company based here in South Australia, Mitsubishi, showed some years ago that it could see coming trends. That is why that company, in particular, is today No. 3 in the market place, because it saw that it was not the big car that was the future in Australia, but rather the smaller car.

The local content plan certainly needs to continue. Without that, how can we expect investment in this country? And again I refer, particularly, to South Australia, where industry is so heavily based on motor vehicle manufacturing. Can anyone put forward any reason why General Motors or Mitsubishi would go ahead with the tremendous investment programmes that have been announced, if the I.A.C. recommendations were to be adopted? There is no way in the world that any company would do that, because it could keep its money in its home country and export to this country, still having its product available for the motoring public. But in doing so, no longer would it be using the Australian work force to the present extent.

The Federal Government's current industry assistance policy results in a very competitive market. In Australia that market is more competitive than that in any country of which I know overseas. There are more manufacturers per head of population than anywhere else, and that results in very strong competition and this is reflected in the product available now to the Australian motorist.

There is significant on-going structural change within the industry, but without undue disruption. That cannot continue if the I.A.C. recommendations are adopted. It would cause tremendous disruption, and probably about 7 000 jobs would be lost in this State and over 11 000 jobs lost in this country. There would no longer be any incentive to export, as there is now, because of the export facilitation programme. The I.A.C. recommendations can result only in a major step backwards for motor manufacturing in this country, and I certainly hope that the Federal Government does not adopt them. I was delighted to hear the Minister of Industrial Affairs earlier today very strongly supporting the industry of this State and of this country.

Mr. HAMILTON (Albert Park): I was hoping the Minister of Transport would be here. Shortly after coming into office in October 1979, the Seaton High School directed my attention to the narrowness of the road between Frederick Road and the Trimmer Parade intersection, and the narrow portion of Frederick Road to the railway line and Trimmer Parade. I have a letter addressed to me by the Secretary of the Seaton High School, Dr. D. Mackay, who expressed concern about this narrowness. He said:

> A large number of our students have to use this portion of Frederick Road, and the council is most anxious that improvements be made before a serious accident occurs.

On behalf of the school, I took up the matter with the Minister. He subsequently informed me, in correspondence dated 6 December 1979, that the responsibility for the upgrading of this road belonged with the council, and suggested that I take up the matter with those bodies. I subsequently did so, on 2 January 1980. I addressed my letter to the Town Clerk, Corporation of the City of Woodville, Mr. Doug Hamilton, and said:

> In view of the abovementioned, I personally feel that it is indeed necessary to have a bike track between Trimmer Parade and the Seaton High School. Also the Trimmer Parade and Frederick Road junction is badly in need of traffic lights because of the danger to those children.

I wanted also to know what the council was doing about upgrading this road, in light of what the Minister said. I subsequently received the following reply from the Town Clerk, dated 16 May 1980:

> In reply to your letter of 2 January 1980, you are advised that council has been discussing the reconstruction of Frederick Road from the railway to Trimmer Parade and the Frederick Road-Trimmer Parade intersection with representatives of the Highways Department for some time now as it is considered that these projects should be undertaken without delay.

He further stated:

> Recently council made application to the Commissioner of Highways for such a grant and a copy of the letter is enclosed

for your information. Any assistance you are able to give towards the granting of these funds would be greatly appreciated.

In the minutes of a high school council meeting on Tuesday 26 September 1980, under the heading "Business arising from minutes", it was stated:

Frederick Road—No further correspondence has been received on this matter. It was reported that there had been a number of accidents at the Frederick Road-Trimmer Parade intersection recently. The shoulders of Frederick Road are again dangerous and Mr. Cratchley will take up the matter with the City Engineer. Ms. Buckingham advised that two reminder letters had been sent to the Minister of Transport by Mr. Hamilton, but to date no reply had been forthcoming. She would again follow up the matter.

That was on my behalf. Mr. Cratchley is from the Woodville council, and Ms. Buckingham is from my office.

It is rather disconcerting to find that I cannot get anywhere on this question of the allocation of funds. There have been numerous accidents on that road. I do not want to see some child or anyone else seriously injured at that intersection, and I have written to the Minister asking him for lights to be constructed there. I have been informed that a recent letter from the Commissioner of Highways has been sent to all metropolitan councils advising that the provision of bus stopping bays on unkerbed roads is being investigated. Agreement has been reached between the State Transport Authority and the Highways Department to contribute one-third each towards the cost of constructing necessary bays on unkerbed roads on the condition that the council involved agrees to pay the remaining one-third.

Within Woodville, the only bus route on an unkerbed road is along the section of Frederick Road from Trimmer Parade to the Grange railway line. Four bus stops are located within this section of road with two adjacent to the Sylvan Way South Australian Housing Trust subdivision, presenting particular maintenance problems with subsequent discomfort for intending bus passengers. It is considered departmentally that these four bus stops should be provided with parking bays and that the offer of the State Transport Authority and the Highways Department is a fair one. I understand that the recommendation is that the Woodville council approve in principle the construction of bus parking bays in Frederick Road.

I hope that the Minister can influence the Highways Department so that money is allocated to the Woodville and Grange councils to overcome this problem, because this action is long overdue. The road should be upgraded. As I have said, children travel along this section of road on their way to Seaton High School and Seaton Primary School. The Government has procrastinated long enough on this issue. I do not want to have to tell the House some day that a child has lost his life because of lack of Government action in this regard.

I refer now to the chaos that exists in my district, particularly in the West Lakes area, as was reported in the *Weekly Times* on Wednesday 4 February. Unit dwellers on the southern foreshore at West Lakes are experiencing problems in relation to fishermen and other persons who, at all times of the day and night, fish in that area and disturb the peace. I checked the regulations, and I found to my dismay that hardly anyone was prepared to take responsibility for the policing of this area, because West Lakes Limited, the Woodville council and the Government are involved. One of my constituents informed me that the lake will be owned by West Lakes Limited until the company fulfils its obligation under its indentures, pays a large sum to the Government (about $1 000 000) and formally hands over the management of the lake to the council. The company is reluctant to pay the money because of a slump in the building industry. Until the Government takes over the lake, it cannot be handed over to the Woodville council for administration. The council has approved a by-law to control the lake and surrounds.

It is very disconcerting, not only to me but also to those residents in that area, that they cannot get action because of the buck-passing that has been going on. I would like to hear from the Minister when action will be taken on this matter so that the residents in that area can apply to the appropriate authorities, whoever they may be, to achieve a bit of peace and quiet.

Finally, I refer to the matter raised by the member for Stuart—noise control legislation. In the Royal Park area particularly, problems are experienced in regard to Allied Engineering. Because of the noise from this company, many shift workers and families experience difficulty in getting to sleep. The Government has been requested to relocate this company at Wingfield, and I hope it will accede to that request so that people in the area, in accordance with the Noise Control Act, can obtain a bit of peace and quiet. The industrial site could be used for pensioner flats, erected by the South Australian Housing Trust.

Motion carried.

At 5.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 3 March at 2 p.m.