

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 2 June 1981

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Audit Act Amendment,
 Building Societies Act Amendment,
 City of Adelaide Development Control Act Amendment,
 Companies (Acquisition of Shares) (Application of Laws),
 Companies and Securities (Interpretation and Miscellaneous Provisions) (Application of Laws),
 Education Act Amendment 1981,
 Election of Senators Act Amendment,
 Electoral Act Amendment,
 Food and Drugs Act Amendment,
 Hairdressers Registration Act Amendment,
 Harbors Act Amendment,
 History Trust of South Australia,
 Industrial and Commercial Training,
 Irrigation Act Amendment,
 Kangarilla Temperance Hall (Discharge of Trusts),
 Motor Vehicles Act Amendment,
 National Companies and Securities Commission (State Provisions),
 National Parks and Wildlife Act Amendment,
 Petroleum Act Amendment,
 Pitjantjatjara Land Rights,
 Police Offences Act Amendment,
 Police Regulation Act Amendment,
 Port Pirie Racecourse Land Revestment,
 Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act Amendment,
 Prisons Act Amendment,
 Public Finance Act Amendment,
 Public Service Act Amendment,
 Recreation Grounds Rates and Taxes Exemption,
 Residential Tenancies Act Amendment,
 Road Traffic Act Amendment, 1981,
 Road Traffic Act Amendment (No. 2), 1981,
 Securities Industry (Application of Laws),
 Soccer Football Pools,
 South Australian Meat Corporation Act Amendment,
 State Transport Authority Act Amendment,
 Statutes Amendment (Administration of Courts and Tribunals),
 Statutes Amendment (Valuation of Land),
 Statutes Amendment (Water and Sewerage Rating),
 Tea Tree Gully (Golden Grove) Development Act Amendment,
 Urban Land Trust,
 Workers Compensation (Insurance) Act Amendment.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

PETITION: DISTRICT COUNCIL OF MURAT BAY WATER SUPPLY

A petition signed by eighty residents of the District Council of Murat Bay praying that the House urge the Government to extend a reticulated water supply west of Ceduna within the District Council of Murat Bay was presented by Mr Gunn.

Petition received.

PETITION: PORT BROUGHTON SCHOOL

A petition signed by 188 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to have the replacement of the school at Port Broughton completed by September 1983 was presented by Mr Olsen.

Petition received.

PETITION: NOISE CONTROL UNIT

A petition signed by seventy-eight residents of Flinders Park and Underdale praying that the House urge the Government to make sufficient funds available to the Noise Control Unit to enable inspection facilities to be available at all hours was presented by Mr Plunkett.

Petition received.

PETITION: SHEIDOW/TROTT PARK BUS SERVICE

A petition signed by 227 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to extend the Sheidow/Trott Park bus service to include the residents of Hallett Cove Beach was presented by the Hon. D. J. Hopgood.

Petition received.

PETITION: HALLETT COVE SCHOOL

A petition signed by 275 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to take immediate steps to undertake the design and construction of a new school at Hallett Cove to accommodate students from years 1 to 12 was presented by the Hon. D. J. Hopgood.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: DOG CONTROL

A petition signed by fifty-six residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to amend the Dog Control Bill to maintain a South Australian Canine Association representative on the advisory committee; to provide for the wearing of collars and discs on dogs only in public places; and to define 'authorised person' in relation to the destruction of dogs was presented by the Hon. D. C. Wotton.

Petition received.

A petition signed by fifty-two residents of South Australia praying that the House refer the Dog Control Act Amendment Bill to a Select Committee was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

PETITION: TAPLEYS HILL ROAD

A petition signed by 1 123 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to abandon the scheme for the erection of a median strip along Tapleys Hill Road from West Lakes Boulevard to Old Port Road was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: SCHOOL ASSISTANTS

Petitions signed by 210 residents of South Australia, 193 staff, parents and friends of Goodwood Primary School, and seventy-eight teachers, parents and residents of Parkside-Unley districts all praying that the House urge the Government to ensure entitlement hours for school assistants are not reduced were presented by the Hon. H. Allison, and Messrs Ashenden and Langley.

Petitions received.

A petition signed by 119 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to reverse its decision to reduce school assistants' hours and increase assistants to schools in the ratio of forty to 100 teachers as recommended by the Karmel Report was presented by Mr Whitten.

Petition received.

PETITION: RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

A petition signed by 175 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to give due consideration to objections lodged on behalf of landlords in relation to the Residential Tenancies Act Amendment Bill was presented by Mr Millhouse.

Petition received.

PETITION: THIRD PARTY INSURANCE

A petition signed by 2 917 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to give consideration to reviewing the high rate of registration and third party insurance placed on motor cycles was presented by the Hon. M. M. Wilson.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: HOUSING TRUST RENTS

Petitions signed by 387 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to introduce a fair and equitable system of rent payments for all Housing Trust tenants were presented by Messrs Bannon, Crafter, and Hamilton.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

Petitions signed by 251 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to tighten restrictions on pornography and establish clear classification standards under the Classification of Publications Act were presented by Messrs Abbott, Peterson, and Schmidt.

Petitions received.

PETITION: PROSTITUTION

A petition signed by 106 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to strengthen existing laws against the prostitution trade, reject any proposal to legalise the trade and request the Commonwealth Government to sign the United Nations Convention on Prostitution was presented by the Hon. M. M. Wilson.

Petition received.

PETITION: CONTRACTS

A petition signed by 1 619 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ensure that it does not let contracts to private enterprise to the detriment of Government employees was presented by the Hon. J. D. Wright.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: JOB CREATION PROGRAMS

Petitions signed by three Public Service Association members, 129 residents of South Australia, and 1 316 Public Service Association members all praying that the House urge the Government to reverse its policies and begin job creation programs which will stimulate the South Australian economy and result in more jobs in both the public and private sectors were presented by the Hon. J. D. Wright and Mr Hamilton.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: EMPLOYMENT

Petitions signed by 131 residents of South Australia and 2 890 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to implement policies that will increase the number of citizens in employment in South Australia were presented by the Hon. J. D. Wright and Mr Hamilton.

Petitions received.

PETITION: EDUCATION CUTS

A petition signed by eighty-six residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to stop cuts in education funding and maintain and extend development in education at all levels was presented by Mr Schmidt.

Petition received.

PETITION: CUT-BACK IN EDUCATION FUNDING

A petition signed by forty-six residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose a 3 per cent cut-back in funding for the Education Department was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

PETITION: HACKHAM TO HALLETT COVE RAIL LINE

A petition signed by seventy-nine residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to

oppose the reopening of the Hackham to Hallett Cove rail line was presented by the Hon. M. M. Wilson.

Petition received.

of Adelaide Planning Commission to determine, in accordance with the provisions of the City of Adelaide Development Control Act.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: all the questions on the Notice Paper except Nos 598, 751, 887, 927, 944, 962, 988, 1054, 1059, 1063, 1065, 1080, 1086, 1144, 1153, 1157, 1170, 1233, 1245, 1246, and 1251.

ELECTRICITY

In reply to **Mr PETERSON** (4 March).

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Magneto-hydrodynamics (M.H.D.) is periodically assessed by the Energy Division of the Department of Mines and Energy and also by the Electricity Trust of South Australia in reviewing options for future electricity generation in the State. Whilst the article in the *National Times* indicates the potential fuel savings that can be obtained with M.H.D., it fails to mention some of the problems associated with this technology and its high cost compared with some other alternative technologies. The Electric Power Research Institute (E.P.R.I.), the leading authority on electric power technology in the U.S.A., indicates that M.H.D. combined cycle technology will not be available for commercial orders until 1995 and for commercial service until 2001.

In addition, E.P.R.I. estimates capital costs for a 1 000 mW plant of U.S.\$960 000 000 in 1978 dollars. This compares with capital costs for a similar size plant of:

	United States \$
Coal fired flue gas desulphurisation	810 000 000
Oil fired	500 000 000
Coal gasification combined cycle	795 000 000
Coal gasification fuel cell	910 000 000

Whilst the heat rate with M.H.D. is more efficient (about 7 640 B.T.U./kWh compared to 8 300 B.T.U./kWh for coal gasification combined cycle), it is not as efficient as the fuel cell technology (7 130 B.T.U./kWh) and its greater capital cost offsets the attractiveness of this efficiency. At this stage, therefore, the assessment of the potential for M.H.D. technology in this State is cautious and before adoption would require significant improvements in the technology and its cost competitiveness. Nevertheless, it is recognised that M.H.D. has many potential advantages, and developments in the technology will be monitored closely and compared with developments in alternative technologies.

BOTANIC HOTEL

In reply to **Mr CRAFTER** (3 March).

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The Botanic Hotel is being considered for inclusion on the fifth interim list of items intended for the State Heritage Register. The list is expected to be published in the near future. It is pointed out that the protection of a building on the Register of State Heritage Items and which is situated within the boundaries of the City of Adelaide is a matter for the City

SOLAR PONDING

In reply to **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (25 February).

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Solar Desalination Group of the Department of Chemical Engineering, University of Sydney, presented two papers at the International Solar Energy Society conference in Melbourne on 10-12 November last year. The papers were entitled 'Solar-Thermal Electricity Generation in Remote Areas of Australia'. The economics of power generation presented in these papers indicate that, whilst solar pond power systems appear to be the cheapest option of all solar-thermal power generation systems, they are not economically competitive with traditional large-scale base load systems for a city such as Adelaide or indeed with some other remote area electricity generation alternatives. This point I have indicated on a number of occasions.

However, when the question of remote area power supply is considered, solar pond power generation appears to offer some potential advantages relative to diesel generation or the extension of the electric grid system. For this reason, apart from continuing with in-house assessment of this and other renewable technologies, the Government has recently commissioned a preliminary feasibility study by two members of the Sydney University Solar Desalination Group to determine the optimum size, location and cost of a demonstration pond in a remote area in this State. Pending the outcome of this study, progress and evaluation of the Alice Springs solar pond project funded by NERDDC and our continued correspondence with solar pond researchers in Israel, the Government will then consider the justification for further action in the area of experimentation and demonstration of solar ponds.

MINE DEWATERING

In reply to **Mr BLACKER** (25 February).

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Underground Water Technical Advisory Committee has been formed to deal with this particular problem. It consists of officers from the Department of Mines and Energy and the Engineering and Water Supply Department and has the following roles:

- (1) to advise the Government on the technical implications of large-scale mining and development projects in respect of underground water resources;
- (2) to assist and advise any company engaged on such projects; and
- (3) to arrange for the hiring of consultants and, where necessary, to carry out any underground water investigations and assessments which may be required.

A letter is being sent to all mineral companies operating or likely to operate in South Australia informing them of the existence of this committee and its purpose. The Department of Mines and Energy has already been closely involved with investigations for the coal deposits at Poldia and Port Wakefield; currently it is keeping a close watch on the investigations at Kingston and has established a network of observation wells to monitor any effects on the regional groundwater.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

- Ceduna Courthouse and Office,
- Glenside Hospital—Organic Dementia Unit and Infirmary,
- Loxton North Primary School Redevelopment,
- Mines Department Building, Glenside (Core Library Extension),
- Novar Gardens Police Complex (Phase II),
- Port Augusta North West Primary School—Stage I,
- Stirling East Primary School—Upgrading and Redevelopment,
- Thebarton High School Redevelopment.

Ordered that reports be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PORT PIRIE FLOODING

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 wish to pass on to the House information which has come to hand since this morning relating to the impact of yesterday's rough weather at Port Pirie. As a result of the high tides and storms yesterday, sea water filled the Rare Earth Corporation tailings dams, 1, 3, 3A and 3C, as indicated on a diagram which I will table, adjoining the former treatment plant at Port Pirie. In addition, the storms have caused a breach in the top of the north wall of dam 3A, allowing water collected in the dams during the storm to run back into the tidal flats. This breach in the wall is approximately one metre wide and 300 millimetres deep.

Arrangements have been made for the breach in the wall to be plugged as a short-term measure, and an abutment to the wall will be constructed to provide additional protection against future storm damage. The dams constructed to hold tailings material from the former uranium treatment operations were not affected by the storm. The Rare Earth Corporation dams contained wastes generated from the processing of beach sands between 1970 and 1972.

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Between 1970 and 1972, during the life of the Labor Government. Monazite beach sands contain thorium, a naturally occurring radioactive element, as well as other non-radioactive constituents, including the rare earths which were extracted in the treatment process.

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the honourable member will be patient all will be clear to him. The principal radioactive material in the wastes in these dams is thorium, along with its decay products. It is not possible to say at this stage how much, if any, of the material stored in the dams would have been washed out in the storms. Sea water samples have been taken to determine whether the water draining from the dams through the breached wall was contaminated in any way.

These materials may pose a hazard to health in either of two ways. External radiation emitted from the tailings falls off rapidly with distance and, as the area is fenced and distant from habitation, this risk to humans is negligible. Internal radiation exposures from ingestion or inhalation of the wastes is a theoretical possibility but here, too, the risks to human health from this breach are negligible. However, environmental considerations dictate that

further rehabilitation of these tailings should occur.

Honourable members may recall that earlier this year, the Government announced plans to rehabilitate the land at Port Pirie occupied by the former treatment plant. These plans are proceeding, but they have not been proceeded with to the extent, so far, that they have been able to avert this situation.

While it has taken the highest tide in almost fifty years to create this situation. I have asked my Department for further advice on priorities for implementation of the rehabilitation program, to ensure that these dams are not overlapped again. The Government will keep the public informed as further information comes to hand on this matter.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. D. O. Tonkin):

Pursuant to Statute:

- i. Stamp Duties Act, 1923-1980—Regulations—Credit and Rental Stamp Duty.

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy):

Pursuant to Statute:

- i. Explosives Act, 1936-1974—Regulations—Various Amendments.

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

Pursuant to Statute:

- i. Hairdressers Registration Act, 1939-1981—Regulations—Fees.
- ii. Rules of Court—Industrial Court—Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972-1979, and Workers Compensation (Insurance) Act, 1980—Appeals.
- iii. Motor Fuel Licensing Board—Report, 1980.
- iv. Industrial and Commercial Training Act, 1981—Industrial and Commercial Training Regulations, 1981.
- v. Revocation of Regulations.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. H. Allison):

By Command:

- i. Advisory Council for Inter-government Relations—Report for the year ending 31 August 1980.

Pursuant to Statute:

- i. Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, 1979-1980—Regulations—Forms—Various Amendments.
- ii. Education Act, 1972-1980—Regulations—Reduction of Salary.
- iii. Hartley College of Advanced Education—Report, 1980.
- iv. Justices Act, 1921-1980—Rules—Fees.
- v. Local Court Rules, 1970-1981—Local and District Criminal Courts Act—Costs.
- vi. National Companies and Securities Commission—Report for the period 11 March 1980 to 30 June 1980.
- Rules of Court—Supreme Court—Supreme Court Act—
 - vii. Various Amendments.
 - viii. Appeals.
 - ix. South Australian Teacher Housing Authority—Report, 1980.

By the Chief Secretary (Hon. W. A. Rodda):

Pursuant to Statute:

- i. Boating Act, 1974-1980—Regulations—Caloote Landing Zoning.

Friendly Societies Act, 1919-1975—Amendments to General Laws.

- II. Independent Order of Rechabites.
- III. The South Australian District No. 81.
- IV. The United Friendly Societies Council of South Australia.
- V. National Health Services Association of South Australia.
- VI. Prisons Act, 1936-1976—Regulations—Payment of Prisoners.
- VII. Correctional Services, Department of—Report, 1979-1980.

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. W. E. Chapman):

By Command:

- I. Australian Agricultural Council—Resolutions of the 109th Meeting held on 4 August 1980.

Pursuant to Statute:

- I. Dried Fruits Act, 1934-1972—Regulations—Board Fees.
- II. Meat Hygiene Act, 1980—Regulations—Licence Fees.
- III. Metropolitan Milk Supply Act, 1946-1980—Regulations—Discontinuance of Brucellosis Vaccinations.
- IV. Vertebrate Pests Control Authority—Report, 1979-1980.

By the Minister of Forests (Hon. W. E. Chapman):

Pursuant to Statute:

- I. Forestry Act, 1950-1974—Proclamation—Section 274, Hd. of Kennion—Ceasing to be Forest Reserve.

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

Pursuant to Statute:

- I. Beverage Container Act, 1975-1976—Regulations—Plasti-shield Bottles.
- II. Local Government Act, 1934-1980—Regulations—Crown Solicitor's Settling Fee.
- III. City of Adelaide—By-law No. 2—Vehicle Movement.
- IV. By-law No. 10—Street Traders.
- V. By-law No. 13—Signs.
- VI. By-law No. 40—Trishaws.
- VII. City of Burnside—By-law No. 25—Lodging Houses.
- VIII. Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully—By-law No. 46—Keeping of Dogs.
- IX. District Council of Clinton—By-law No. 23—Keeping of Dogs.
- X. District Council of Meadows—By-law No. 40—Repeal of By-law.
- XI. District Council of Ridley—By-law No. 7—Control of Horses, Cattle and Sheep.
- XII. Local Government, Department of—Report, 1980.

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

Pursuant to Statute:

- I. Planning and Development Act, 1966-1980—Metropolitan Development Plan—Planning Regulations—Corporation of Burnside—Zoning.
- II. Corporation of Glenelg—Zoning.
- III. Corporation of Noarlunga—Zoning.
- IV. Corporation of the City of Port Adelaide—Zoning.
- V. District Council of Munno Para—Zoning.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. M. M. Wilson):

Pursuant to Statute:

- I. Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act, 1956-1978—Regulations—Fees. Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1980—Regulations.
- II. Motor Cycle Number Plates.
- III. Registration and Licensing Fees. Road Traffic Act, 1961-1980—Regulations.
- IV. Traffic Prohibition—Berri.

v. Traffic Prohibition—Hindmarsh (Variation).

vi. Traffic Prohibition—Noarlunga (Variation).

vii. Traffic Prohibition—Enfield (Variation).

viii. Third Party Premiums Committee—Report, 1981.

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

Pursuant to Statute:

I. Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1980—Regulations—Sale of Tickets. Racing Act, 1976-1980—Dog Racing Rules.

II. Qualifying Trial.

III. Amendment.

IV. Revocation of Rebate Regulations.

By the Minister of Health (Hon. Jennifer Adamson):

Pursuant to Statute:

I. Chiropractors Act, 1979—Regulations—Registration.

II. Commercial and Private Agents Act, 1972-1978—Regulations—Licensing Fees. Fees Regulation Act, 1927—Regulations.

III. Licensing Act—Fees.

IV. Places of Public Entertainment Act—Fees.

V. Food and Drugs Act, 1908-1976—Regulations—Lice Infestations.

VI. Health Act, 1935-1978—Regulations—Licence Fees.

VII. Land and Business Agents Act, 1973-1979—Regulations.

VIII. Agents, Manager and Salesmen—Fee. Land Brokers—Fee.

IX. Land Valuers Licensing Act, 1969-1974—Regulations—Land Valuers—Fees.

X. Noxious Trades Act, 1943-1965—Regulations—Noxious Trades Area.

XI. Packages Act, 1967-1972—Regulations—Brand Fee.

XII. Residential Tenancies—Report upon the Administration of the Residential Tenancies Fund, 1979-1980. South Australian Health Commission Act, 1975-1978.

XIII. Wallaroo and District Hospital Inc.—By-laws—Control of Grounds.

XIV. Elliston Hospital Inc.—By-laws—Control of Grounds.

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

Pursuant to Statute:

I. South-Eastern Drainage Act, 1931-1980—Regulations—Various Amendments.

COURTESY TO CHAIR

The SPEAKER: There is a courtesy, which has been time honoured in this House, of obeisance to the Chair when an honourable member leaves the Chamber. It is the intention of the Chair to request and require that that recognition be given, and back-chat about having been called to order on the matter will not be tolerated: it will be looked on as being a case that can lead to the removal of an honourable member from the Chamber.

STATE FINANCES

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Mr BANNON: I move:

That this House deplores the gross financial mismanagement of the Government which, even with unscheduled massive rises as in State charges taken into account has resulted in a forecast Budget deficit ten times that contained

in the Budget passed by the House seven months ago and calls on the Premier and Treasurer to resign.

Not only the Opposition in this Parliament but the people of South Australia as well are viewing with grave concern the rapidly deteriorating state of Government finances. Much will be said about them over the next couple of weeks in the context of a number of debates in this place. Today's debate will concentrate on the broad situation relating to State finances, and we will demand an honest and measured response from the Government to the call in the motion that it should resign.

Last year, the Premier, as Treasurer, confidently announced that he was budgeting for a \$1 500 000 deficit for the current financial year. Later, in February, the Premier, obviously embarrassed and under pressure, at the end of a tortuously lengthy answer to a question, revised his supposedly firm Budget estimate and announced that his deficit could be as high as \$9 000 000 or \$10 000 000.

Last week, the August 1980 Budget was again revised, just a month or so before the end of this financial year. The Premier told South Australians that, in this financial year, instead of \$1 500 000, the Budget deficit was likely to be \$15 000 000, a ten-fold increase. What it will be next month is anyone's guess. What it has deteriorated to in the month just concluded we will not know for a short while. But, like all South Australians, we are concerned about the financial mismanagement of this State and the sheer incompetence that results in a Treasurer making what is, in effect, a 900 per cent Budget bungle. Frankly, we cannot afford a Treasurer whose estimates are only pure and wild 'guesstimates' and whose other statements, commitments and promises cannot be taken seriously.

In fact, the State's finances are in a far more serious situation than the Premier is so far prepared to let on. He scoffed and tried to attack the Opposition when we quoted his own words back to him, his warning to his Ministers of a \$40 000 000 deficit on the Revenue Account in this current financial year. Whenever that issue has been raised again, he has rejected the accusations. Yet, that sort of deficit certainly would have eventuated if the Premier had not dramatically increased State charges. Even after that, and a short-term, short-sighted rescue program that includes the cutting of vital public works, we are still facing, according to the Premier, a \$15 000 000 deficit overall, and a far worse position in relation to the Revenue Account itself.

The State's financial papers, as of April, reveal that the Premier, if he is to meet even his latest deficit prediction, will probably have to raid the State's reserve accounts in order to cook the books to come out with a result that is in any way acceptable. He will have to juggle his accounts and his reserves. I have been told that not only is the Treasury looking at new revenue sources for next year but that its officers, at the Premier's behest, are running around looking for the cosmetic devices that are needed to disguise the mess that this year's accounts are in. That is the politics of panic, a strategy that puts short-term political advantage before the public interest. It certainly puts way to the background honesty about the State's true financial position.

Let us look at the budgetary situation as it was in April, according to the Premier's own figures. At the end of April 1981, the overall State Budget position had deteriorated by a massive \$47 700 000, compared with the figures for April 1980, when the combined accounts showed a \$38 700 000 surplus. The Treasurer has got himself into serious problems with his Revenue Account. In April last year that account showed a surplus of \$27 400 000. Twelve months later it was in the red to the

tune of \$34 300 000. That is certainly nudging close to the \$40 000 000 figure that the Premier predicted and then denied. This means that the Revenue Account has deteriorated by a massive \$61 700 000 since the same time last year.

The Premier seems to be trying to blame the Commonwealth Government for his financial problems in this current financial year. He called the Premiers Conference cuts by the Prime Minister a sordid affair about which he was absolutely disgusted. Unfortunately, that just will not wear. The Premiers Conference cutbacks, horrendous and severe as they may be, relate only to next year's State Budget. They have absolutely no bearing on this financial year, and the mess that the Government currently is in.

There is every indication that the Premier will persist in this smokescreen, even though his Minister of Transport was caught out only last week in trying to blame the Prime Minister for fare increases that were approved before the Premiers Conference. I am sure that the Premier has been advised that he can deflect criticism and gain public relations points by appealing to State pride if he blames the Federal Government for his financial woes. It is a bit like his weekend threat to cut off the gas to New South Wales: it sounds good but does not amount to much when you start looking behind it.

It is interesting that the Premier's bluster about the Commonwealth comes from a man who only in March of this year sent Federal Ministers a paper which contained some very telling points. The Premier said in that paper:

We agree that public expenditure needs to be restrained; that the Federal Budget deficit should be contained, that the aim should be to reduce the burden of taxation; and that firmness in the application of monetary policy is essential.

The Premier promised in his paper delivered in March that his Government 'shall seek to avoid public criticism of the decisions made at the Commonwealth level, which, while they may be unpopular in some quarters are clearly desirable in the long-term interests of the nation'. The Premier knew what was going to happen at this year's Premiers Conference. In fact, he supported it, and he told the Prime Minister that his criticisms would be muted. The Prime Minister has now discovered something about his faithful Premier in South Australia; his words have not been too valuable in this context.

With regard to this financial year, the facts show that income tax sharing payments to South Australia from Canberra have matched the 9.7 per cent inflation rate. The real problem in the current financial year, a problem that will be compounded by the action of the Federal Government next financial year, is that this State is receiving very little revenue growth from its own sources, and that growth certainly is not matching inflation. It reflects the poor economic situation in South Australia, and the major financial miscalculation made by the Premier when costing his election promises in 1979.

To help extricate himself from his financial problem, the Premier, who promised to slash taxes and indeed reduced some taxes, has instead increased State charges. The Premier's action concerning State charges fits a pattern that has marked his Ministry. Issues and problems are not confronted honestly and openly. Instead, the Premier opts for back-door taxation which he hopes the public will not notice and which does not have to be argued for in the same way.

Week by week various charges have been put up to help the Government out of its budgetary problem. Every possible licence, permit, and registration fee, or fare has become dearer. The Premier hoped that, as these charges were not consolidated and because they fall in different

areas on different people, no-one would realise what was going on. Strangely enough, however, the Premier said in February this year that, if charges did not go up, the taxpayer would have to meet the bill. This curious statement showed clearly how his mind was working. Who are the people who pay charges but the taxpayers, and what indeed are most of these charges but taxes? That is what he said in 1978 when he denounced increases in charges by the then Labor Government, and said that to call them charges was to deceive South Australians—they were taxes.

We are aware from yet another document which has been issued to the public that the Premier sent word to all his Ministers to review all charges with a view to introducing appropriate increases as soon as possible. That was in February, and since then a whole range of charges has been increased. Many have not been publicly announced, so unless people study the official *Government Gazette* each week (and that is getting harder to do because the cost of that publication has been increased substantially, making it more difficult for people to obtain it), they will not be aware of the increases which apply to them.

I do not think the Premier should be allowed to get away with drip feed taxation which he hopes the public will not notice. I have made a count of the charges that the Government has increased since July last year in large and smaller areas, and I would like them recorded in *Hansard*. In the time taken to detail them to the House probably one or two others have been put up. Bus and tram fares have gone up 25 per cent. Train fares have risen between 17 per cent and 100 per cent. Irrigation charges are up 12½ per cent. Water and sewerage rates are up by various amounts. Water charges have risen 12½ per cent. Electricity charges are up 12½ per cent. Motor vehicle registration fees have risen 12½ per cent to 20 per cent.

Boat registration fees have increased by 71 per cent, building fees between 7 per cent and 18 per cent, liquor licence applications and renewals are up by 100 per cent, abalone permits are up by from 308 per cent to 485 per cent, prawn permits have risen by from 33 per cent to 76 per cent, licences for private hospitals, nursing homes, etc., are up between 140 per cent and 200 per cent, charges for the Northfield wards of the Royal Adelaide Hospital have increased by 11 per cent to 13 per cent, and charges for inpatients at Ru Rua Nursing Home have increased by 11 per cent to 13 per cent. Pilotage fees are up by 12½ per cent, and wharfage fees by 25 per cent. Port MacDonnell and Robe boat haven charges are up between 50 per cent and 81 per cent, North Arm fishing haven charges are up between 64 per cent and 82 per cent, fees for testing electrical articles and materials between 27 per cent and 74 per cent, licence fees for hairdressers between 40 per cent and 42 per cent, registration of commercial premises are up 25 per cent, registration of industrial premises are up 25 per cent, local court fees are up between 8 per cent and 16 per cent, and class 3-5 ship's master's certificates are up between 1 000 per cent and 1 900 per cent. Learner driver permits are up 33½ per cent; trader plates, 11 per cent; driving tests, 67 per cent; driving instructors' licences, 150 per cent; personalised number plates, 20 per cent; extracts from motor vehicle register, 100 per cent; registration fees for motor cycles, towtrucks, caravans and trailers, up between 12 per cent and 20 per cent; permits to keep native animals, up between 33½ per cent and 50 per cent; drainage fees, up between 14 per cent and 20 per cent; restoring water supply, up between 25 per cent and 33 per cent; *Government Gazette* charges, up 100 per cent; *Hansard*, up 1 225 per cent; Acts of Parliament, up 140 per cent; and advertising in *Government Gazette*, up 200

per cent. The Government has also put up land and business agents fees, valuers licence fees, fees for hotel brokers, Registrar-General's fees on documents, and national park caravan and camping changes, and new fees have been imposed for registration of chiropractors and the lodging of documents under the Company Take-overs Act. On my count, there have been more than 40 increases in State charges since last July. That, in the opinion of the Opposition, represents a widespread, if covert, assault on the pockets of South Australians.

Government documents made public by my Deputy only a week ago show that we are soon in for yet another round of increases in State charges in the coming financial year. Bus, tram and train fares will rise by more than 20 per cent, and there will be more water and electricity rises. Also, a range of other increases is already planned for the second year running.

The Premier, invoking the so-called 'user pays' principle to justify these increases, publicly clings to the myth that he is a low-tax Premier, yet the same Premier is putting up all these charges, which he said three years ago were indistinguishable from taxes. There is another, the cigarette tax, which even his Budget papers list as a tax and not a charge. That is to go up. The Premier says he is planning on more Budget deficits in future. He is telling the journalists that Budget deficits do not really matter, even though he told the Parliament in 1978 that deficits were money down the drain, money from the taxpayers' pockets, and the result of irresponsibility that would 'bring South Australia to its knees'. That was then; today, they do not matter. They are not terribly relevant.

Mr Keneally: It's a Liberal Party deficit.

Mr BANNON: To be fair, I am willing to concede that the next deficit will be at least partly the result of the Federal Government's new federalism policies, something which, in logic, I would have thought, the Premier could not possibly complain about. After all, this was the Premier who, last October, went on television and bought space in newspapers piously to tell South Australians to vote for the Fraser Government, 'for South Australia's sake'. We remember the advertisements placed in the South Australian press at that time. Let me read the words written on behalf of our Premier:

Under Malcolm Fraser's strong leadership, Australia is on a firm course of growth, security, and prosperity. To us, South Australia is a very important part of Australia. Together, a Liberal Federal and a Liberal State Government will work to keep South Australia moving. Lead on, Liberal.

Within seven months of that endorsement, Malcolm Fraser has definitely shown what he, together with David Tonkin, can do for South Australia: there has been no better symbol of this Government's concern for the State than the situation in our hospitals, which I will mention in a minute. The Premier, who now attacks the Prime Minister's new federalism policy, and the Prime Minister once endorsed that policy; in fact, the Premier took great credit for the way in which that policy was formulated. I can quote his words. On 7 April 1977 it was stated in the *Advertiser*:

Dr Tonkin said he would support the new federalism policy no matter what Government brought it in. 'It is in the best interests of South Australia,' he said.

I wonder whether the Premier is prepared to repeat that after a Premiers' Conference that really spelt out the logic of what new federalism means. The Premier will have to come to grips with the fact that the Prime Minister has not done anything that he did not promise to do. New federalism, which this Premier claimed as his own back in 1975-1976, when his Party formulated its policies, involved the States being told to raise revenue for their own

expenditure, and that is just what the Premiers are being told to do now. We have opposed that approach to what we believe should be a co-operative Federal-State relationship, but the current Premier and his Prime Minister did not oppose it, and the Premier is now reaping in this State and unfortunately forcing down our throats the fruits of that miscalculated and misconceived policy.

The sad fact is that, unlike Neville Wran, Doug Lowe, Don Dunstan and the member for Hartley, the present Premier of this State never understood what new federalism would mean for a State like South Australia. Malcolm Fraser, like Margaret Thatcher, Ronald Reagan and one or two other people, is pursuing relentless monetarist policies that simply do not work. The message from Europe and North America is quite clear, and enough Government members have been to those places since taking office to be aware of that fact. The economies which have performed best during the recession of the past years and which are now in the most favourable positions to accelerate their growth are those with governments which developed an active public sector and were not afraid to use direct job creation schemes to ensure that employment was maintained. Not all of those Governments are social democratic party Governments: there has been more willingness on the part of conservative ideologies in Europe to embrace policies of growth, employment and Government participation.

One example is Austria, which has a Social Democratic Government and which has the distinction of presiding over the lowest unemployment rate, the highest growth and the lowest inflation rate in Europe. In fact, the city province of Vienna's unemployment rate of less than 2 per cent probably makes it among the most successful of all Western economies, and it has been achieved without high inflation. On the contrary, it has the lowest inflation rate in Europe.

I was told only two or three weeks ago by members of that Government that employment was made the Government's first priority once it became clear that Europe was facing difficult economic times. There was no sham talk of small government and no borrowed slogans about getting out of the way of business. Results speak for themselves. Active participation and boosting of the public sector of the economy, which helps stimulate the private sector and gives it prosperity, too, is shared by the whole community.

The Canadian province of Alberta, with which some members opposite would be familiar, is wealthy and is governed by a Conservative Government with an overwhelming majority. It has played an active role in planning and developing the provincial economy and participating directly in that economy. It does not have a Government that is restrained by ideology or adherence to some nebulous concept of small government. Alberta was not well served by the Canadian Pacific Railway, for instance; its wheat crop was not getting to coastal ports. A thousand grain cars were constructed by the provincial Government and leased to the railway, and 500 more are on order. A special environmental development fund is used by the public sector for a range of projects in the public interest, and the prosperity of that province reflects those things.

Airline companies have been acquired, light rail transport systems are being put into the major cities, and major recreation projects and water supply projects are being encouraged. They are examples of a provincial Conservative Government that is not falling for this monetarist ideological rhetoric that we are finding in relation to the current Government of this State. Even in Japan, certainly where free enterprise flourishes and

where there are major private corporations, we find that there is a closely-knit association between the Government and its participation in the economy and association with those companies and with those enterprises. France, after going through a torrid economic time for the last few years, has rejected those policies quite soundly and has turned towards the social democratic policies, in this case espoused by Monsieur Mitterand. I predict that, in the elections shortly to be held in France, enormous support will be shown for the Socialist Party and the sort of policies that are propounded which talk about the public sector and job creation and partnership with the private sector, not the nonsense which is being talked about by this Government and by the national Government.

The U.K.—the bastion of monetarism and the philosophy of public sector cut-backs, where the philosophy of public sector cut-backs is being applied rigorously indeed—is in an economic crisis of enormous dimensions. It has massive revenues from the North Sea oil boom and it looks as though they are simply being frittered away to finance unemployment relief. The U.K. has burgeoning unemployment and economic downturn, and this is destroying the manufacturing industry of Britain, particularly in the Midlands and the North. There are none of the imaginative projects of places like Austria, the Western Provinces of Canada, and so on, or the European social democracies—none of those are in evidence, and the result at the moment is total disaster for that country.

Certainly, British industry needs basic restructuring, but this process is not being assisted by a Government whose only commitment is to getting out of the way of business. An example of this on a smaller scale can be seen in the city of Boston, Massachusetts, where there has been a massive reduction in the taxation burden, voted for by the people following Proposition 13 of California, saying that by doing that they would be making their Government smaller and they would be ensuring that more money would be spent in the private sector and there would be prosperity. Again, it has resulted in economic disaster, with schools being closed, fire brigades and police departments being reduced in size, and the roads getting into an appalling state. The people who were so enthusiastically endorsing this reduction in property tax some time ago are now clamouring to get it reinstated because their areas and their social services and the fabric of their communities are suffering. So it leads on: as the community services break down, so does the quality of life and so do crime and unrest increase. Let us look closely at what is happening in South Australia in that context.

That exercise was aimed at demonstrating clearly that, if we are going to have to put up with more of this outdated and failed economic nonsense in this State, we are heading for absolute disaster. Where is this ideology leading us in South Australia? Over the next few days we will be exploring many specific instances, but today we will look at one mess into which the joint ideology of these two Governments is leading us, and that is in relation to hospital funding. That can be blamed squarely on the State Government, which has aided and abetted the Federal Government in what it is doing to health and hospital funding in this country. Members will recall the Minister of Health loudly condemning the hospitals funding agreement negotiated between the Dunstan and Whitlam Governments. That agreement bound the Commonwealth to pay 50 per cent of this State's hospitals expenditure until 1985 and provide free hospital care. It was a good deal, as we said at the time, and as the Minister of Health has only recently discovered. Yet what did she call this in this House earlier this year? She called it an anti-federalist

product of a socialist Government.

She chose, like her Premier, to put ideology before the State's best interests. It was reported that she lobbied in Canberra for lump sum grants and for the termination of South Australia's agreement before its expiry date. We saw at the Premiers and Health Ministers Conferences the results of that ideology put into practice. We saw the Minister suddenly complaining very loudly indeed about the results. She, like the Premier, did not fool anyone. This is what the *Financial Review* had to say on 1 May:

South Australia could be expected to take it all lying down, since they loudly advocated health changes very similar to those adopted and have already gone through their own razor gang exercise.

Just as the Premier can tell Neville Wran that he does not really mean what he says about cutting off gas supplies, perhaps a similar PR exercise is going on over Federal cuts. The message is quite plain: privately the Premier is no doubt assuring his friend Malcolm, 'We do not really mean it; these statements are just for home consumption'. After all, the Federal election is two and a half years away. They will be great mates again then, and the Prime Minister can afford to have his troops play up so that they can look good in their own constituencies.

There is another piece of cynicism I want to expose. Last year, on three occasions, including the celebrated London Chamber of Commerce speech, where South Australia's economy was supposed to be charting ascending curves, the Premier publicly referred to the possibility of a State sales tax. It was, in political jargon, a kite flying exercise. The Premier raised the possibility of a State sales tax, which was unconstitutional, in fact, a value added tax and an across-the-board sales turnover tax. Whatever they are called and however they are collected, these taxes have the same impact. They will hit the consumer hard, severely damage South Australia's retail industry, and raise the level of inflation.

When pressured in this House about these sales taxes, the Premier, stung by criticism from the retail traders, and from his own Party members I imagine, dropped plans for this new form of State revenue. Now it is on the books again. Last week, in information released by my deputy, it was revealed that the Premier has again asked his officers to examine the possibility of some form of sales tax as a new revenue source for this State. When this was stated, the Premier described this as 'fantasy' in the Deputy Leader's mind. But his timing was not quite right.

That same day, in an interview in the *Melbourne Age*, the Premier again raised the spectre of what he now calls a 'consumer tax' as a revenue source for the State. Again, he is not coming clean. He has told the *Age* in Melbourne something entirely different, something that he denies having said here in South Australia. Any form of sales tax, whatever the Premier chooses to call it, will not only hit consumers hard but also will severely damage the retail industry and fuel inflation. The Opposition will fight hard to stop the introduction of such a tax in South Australia, and we will not be alone.

I am told that in recent months the Premier tried to blame the State Treasury for the perilous budgetary position this State now faces. That is grossly unfair, and it is a slur on what I believe is the finest State Treasury in the Commonwealth.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: That is a lie.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Premier to withdraw the word 'lie'.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, I withdraw the word 'lie', and call it a terminological inexactitude.

Mr BANNON: I repeat (and the Premier can make his reply in due course) that it is reported that the Treasury is

being blamed for the position of the State finances. It is being suggested that its calculations were wrong and that the Premier's Budget was formed in error as a result of those calculations. That is grossly unfair and a slur on the Treasury officers of this State. He cannot blame his Ministers of Health and Education for significantly underestimating their expenditure for this financial year, a situation which is probably causing Treasury concern. He cannot blame Treasury for miscalculating the level of wage increases in the Public Service. The fact is that the Premier gave his Treasury an impossible brief. The Premier told it to slash revenue but to maintain expenditure in a range of areas. He gave Treasury the impossible job of juggling with the costing blunder he made himself during the election, a blunder that was central to his ideology and no doubt important to his election victory. As we told him at the time, and now Treasury must be telling him, his figures do not and cannot compute.

The unfortunate fact for South Australia is that the increases in Government charges and the massive cutbacks we have already seen in public works do not compare in their impact with what the Premier has planned. He is emulating the Prime Minister, whose discredited economic policies are now beginning to bite very hard into the services of this country. The Premier is setting up his own razor gang, and this year's Budget will see major cutbacks in the human areas of Government—the services which affect people, particularly people in the poorer sections of our community. We have already seen what is proposed for health and industrial health and safety programs. The consequences of these cutbacks will be tragic and long-lasting. My Deputy will expand on these later.

The Government claimed its right to be elected above all on its ability to manage the State's finances and encourage development. The Government has now had over half its time in office. If we judge the Government on no criteria other than those key election planks, it can be seen that it has totally failed, and it should resign.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): This would have to be one of the most unnecessary and cynical no-confidence motions ever brought before this House. With great seriousness the Leader stands on his feet, rushes off and launches into his attack, and says with great seriousness that he demands an honest and measured response from the Government on the matter of the State's finances. In so doing, he totally ignores the fact that a full picture of the State's financial position will be outlined by the Government this afternoon as a normal part of the process of Parliament.

The Leader knows perfectly well that, if we had not been subjected to this motion of no-confidence, within a very few minutes, probably at about twenty minutes past three, I would have been on my feet giving him the Supplementary Estimates, the information he wants. The Leader knows this perfectly well, and I cannot believe that this is an honest attempt to express a concern which is honest.

He says that there has been much concern in the community over recent weeks. I am not quite certain how he knows, because he has not only been away for six weeks but also has quite obviously been out of touch, and I can only suppose that he is suffering from a circadian dysrhythmia following his six weeks away. Jet lag is the only reason I can think of for this extraordinary action by the Opposition. Perhaps the reason is that the Opposition could think of no other topic on which to attack the Government following the recess. That may well be so—who knows? Perhaps this material had already been prepared for the Leader and it seemed a pity not to use it.

Perhaps it was to provide a background for the travelogue with which he has been pleased to entertain us. The fact is that, if this boring and repetitious nonsense had not been raised, in only a few minutes I would have given the House a very comprehensive report on our latest financial position, and tomorrow the normal processes of the House will allow for a full and wide debate not only on that matter but also, during the grievance debate, which is associated with the movement into Committee, on many other matters which could have been canvassed far more capably, I would suggest, than the Leader has done this afternoon.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Are you still bluffing, David?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: For some reason known only to the Leader and to his negative forces, the Opposition has chosen to waste the time of the Government, the Parliament and the people by taking this action today. In fact, I and other honourable members could be forgiven for believing that we were back to last February, when much the same speech, except for a few modifications, was made by the Leader. I cannot understand why the Leader is so desperate to delay my statement on the Supplementary Estimates.

I resent in the deepest possible way the disgraceful slur made on the officials of the State Treasury by the Leader of the Opposition. I totally reject it, and I will have no part of it. I think the Leader has been here long enough to know that it is not the done thing, and it is not a fair and gentlemanly thing to do. It is yet another example of the strong trait of the Opposition to knock, criticise and distort the truth with opportunist, ill-conceived statements, regardless of the adverse effect that they have on South Australia. The Leader has become obsessed with the negative and it is beginning to show more and more. I suspect that the Leader is worried about the opposition within his own Party at the forthcoming week-end convention. Let us look at what the Leader has done since returning home at the week-end. First, he said that there is no resources boom and that this State has no future. I refute those comments totally.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Premier please resume his seat. The lead speaker for the debate was heard in silence. It is the intention of the Chair that other speakers in this serious debate will likewise be heard in silence.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There is no question that the Leader has said that there is no resources boom and that we have no future. I simply say that there is no doubt at all in my mind that under my Government we have the brightest possible future that South Australia has seen for many years. I am equally certain that, should a Labor Government be returned to power, the Leader would be quite right—there would be no future for South Australia. That is a fact that the people of South Australia will bear in mind at the time of the next election. Without Roxby Downs and other minerals, this State's future would indeed be problematical.

I think that honourable members will have read the press reports concerning the Leader's very positive approach towards Australia's future that he took when he came back—no progress, no boom, no future. Under the Labor Party, these developments involving the mining of uranium, of course, would never go ahead. These developments have the power to bring tens of millions of dollars into this State and create thousands of new jobs. We are talking not about the distant future but about this decade, the 1980s. We are talking about jobs and security for our young people, for our children. This is not some pipe dream. This is not some fantasy that the Labor Party

wants to sweep under the carpet for its own narrow and selfish political reasons: it is a reality. It is a reality in the same way as resource development has improved the lifestyle and economic development and stability of Western Australia and Queensland, to name just two States. There is an abundance of evidence that South Australia is already responding positively to the economic policies of this Government, and at the appropriate time I shall give figures to support that claim.

The Opposition has already attacked my statement of concern about the Murray River. According to the Labor Party, as I understand it, a couple of showers of rain will clear a path to the sea without any problem at all, and apparently all the water pollution will be washed out to sea. This is another example of ideological myopia. There is no doubt that matters concerning the quality of Murray water as far as South Australia is concerned are desperate, and are becoming more so. However, the thing I find quite remarkable is that this fearless Leader of the Labor Party will defend his own Labor Party colleague, Mr Wran, before he will stand up for South Australia. I think that is disgraceful.

The Opposition in this motion implies that the deficit facing this State in the combined account will be ten times higher than was our original prediction of \$1 500 000. Members opposite believe the deficit will be \$15 000 000 and, bearing in mind their attitude to South Australia and its prospects, I suspect that they are very disappointed that they can say only \$15 000 000. They would have liked that deficit to be way above that level so that they could proceed on their path of knocking and denigration. That is another example of Opposition members thinking the worst.

If they had had the patience to wait for a few minutes this afternoon, they would have found that the probable deficit will be about \$10 000 000. No Budget deficit represents good news; certainly, however, a \$10 000 000 deficit is manageable and acceptable. The Opposition has consistently criticised our Budget performance by comparing the monthly result for the corresponding month last year, a deliberate distortion of the true picture, and Opposition spokesmen cannot be so naive as not to be fully conscious of that.

Last year's result was unusual, because the Government's cost-saving methods were already biting, while we were still receiving the remainder of the high tax revenue from policies initiated by the previous Government. It must never be forgotten that this Government has abolished death duties, succession duties, and gift duties, and has reduced land tax—and we are proud of that record. In a full year, that represents a tax cut of about \$22 000 000 for the people of South Australia. That is what the people of South Australia voted for in 1979. We have honoured our promises, and we will not support the Labor policy of returning to those taxes or of imposing new higher taxes. A glance at the agenda for this weekend's A.L.P. conference shows clearly which way that Party is moving. There are references in many motions to wealth tax, death duties, and so on.

Let us turn to details of the year's performance, and in doing so let me emphasise one point which the Leader has chosen to ignore completely. The State Government does not exercise sole control over State finances, revenue or other expenditure. In the first place, there are decisions of wage fixing authorities which are binding on the Government, as upon all employers, and for which additional expenditures must be found. I shall expand on this matter later. Secondly, there are interest payments to be met on the public debt at a rate which is subject entirely to the requirements of the Commonwealth Government

and Loan Council, and is therefore beyond State Government influence. Thirdly, there are revenues from the Commonwealth Government in the form of general tax grants which are subject to variation during the course of the year and which in this year have proved to be less than expected.

Fourthly, there are events which can be described simply as acts of God, such as drought conditions and bush fires, which require substantial financial assistance from the Government. Fifthly, a number of payments have been made necessary because this Government has had to pick up the pieces left behind from the disasters of the former Administration. While work is still proceeding in assessing and planning for the future, the Riverland Co-operative Cannery has cost \$1 300 000 to date this year. Payments to the Commonwealth in respect of the Monarto debt have reached \$5 300 000, and \$2 300 000 has been involved in the restructuring of Samcor, which was allowed to become overcapitalised and inefficient under the previous regime. This Government has even had to pay nearly \$500 000 to honour an undertaking apparently given by a former Premier, without documentation, to an agricultural implement firm in respect of pay-roll tax remissions.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I hope the Leader of the Opposition is not suggesting that we should not have paid that sum. All of these sums, due either to circumstances beyond our control or to requirements imposed upon us by the actions of the former Government, total an additional expenditure of \$46 700 000 and, if we include the \$1 300 000 for additional pumping costs for water because of the conditions this year, that figure reaches \$48 000 000. It is a matter of great good management that last year some \$37 000 000 was set aside in anticipation of a difficult year this year. That was the first year of good management. I shall demonstrate to the Leader that this will be a second year of good management, in spite of the enormous pressures that have been put on our Budget. Let us analyse in more detail some of the payments made, because I believe that it is right that this Parliament and the people of South Australia should know where the taxpayers' money has gone. First wage increases—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Down the drain.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: If the member for Mitchell thinks that is down the drain, that is his opinion. Wage increases, particularly work value wage increases, have far exceeded the substantial allowance incorporated in the original Budget. These are record increases, and have required about \$17 000 000 over and above the allowance; in other words, wage and salary increases in the current financial year have exceeded inflation significantly, and in some cases by as much as 9 per cent.

That is not the end of it. Teachers are presently proceeding with a claim before the Teachers Salaries Board for substantial increases in salaries; if granted in full that claim could cost the Government \$28 000 000 in a full year. That is worth remembering. It is worth bearing in mind that at present 90 per cent of the education budget goes in salaries, and consequently this increase would add further to budgetary pressures without in any way improving the quality of education for our children in this State. I have said previously, and it bears repeating, that pay increases of this magnitude limit the Government's ability to outlay funds on new or expanded services. They impact considerably on the availability of funds for other purposes and lead to an inevitable reduction in employment opportunities and to increased charges. If members of the Opposition cannot relate those two factors, there is no hope whatever for them.

I note in a press report that the Premier of New South Wales intends to cut employment in the Public Service. I think that, following the Budget pressures which we have seen and which have been forecast, the Leader of the Opposition should say quite clearly what he would do if he were in charge of this Government. Would he indeed, in the face of those budgetary pressures, increase State taxation? Apparently, if one looks at the agenda for the A.L.P. conference, that is what he would do. Or would he increase State charges? Obviously, after what we have heard this afternoon, he would not. He has left us in no doubt that he totally and absolutely rejects any suggestion of increased State charges, no matter how justified by inflation and increasing wage costs. So, he will be left with supporting Neville Wran, in New South Wales. He will be left with sacking members of the Public Service, because there is no other way to go. If we have to choose between increasing charges or sacking members of the Public Service, we will stick to our policy of no retrenchment. Obviously, the Opposition will support no increased charges and Public Service retrenchment, just as Mr Wran is doing. Also beyond the control of the State Government is interest on the public debt.

It has exceeded Budget expectations largely because of changes made by the Commonwealth Government in the timing of issue on the interest dates of stocks that it has allocated to finance borrowings by the State. Present indications are that interest payment increases due to these reasons are likely to exceed the Budget estimate by about \$11 000 000. Thirdly, again outside the State Government's control, South Australia's general revenue grants from the Commonwealth will be below the Budget estimate. As honourable members would know, for this year only an interim formula based on individual State c.p.i. movements between March 1980 and March 1981 has been used for the calculation of each State's general revenue grant. Honourable members would also know that South Australia's inflation rate is now lower than the figure forecast in the last Federal Budget and, as a result, the State's grant is some \$5 000 000 below the estimate determined by the Commonwealth Government. It is a matter for congratulation that the c.p.i. figure should be at a low level but a matter of regret that we should be penalised for it.

Fourthly, the Government introduced a voluntary early retirement scheme in September 1980 in the Public Buildings Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department in order to bring about a more appropriate relationship between the resources of the public sector and those of the private sector, to bring the burgeoning public sector down to a reasonable level and to avoid those retrenchments that it is our policy not to inflict. Is the Leader saying that we should go on with what he obviously espouses and sack public servants, or is it better to have an early retirement scheme and pay out that money? I know what this Government will continue to do, and I do not much care for what the Opposition is obviously thinking. This action will have a significant financial benefit for the Government in subsequent years: it will save us literally millions of dollars in years to come, but it has had a heavy impact of about \$4 300 000 in the current financial year.

Finally, the Government has chosen to make additional funds available to beat demands in a number of areas, particularly for education, for apprenticeship training undertaken by the Department of Further Education, and to overcome those urgent problems that arose in the Riverland. The whole thrust of an urgency motion of which I have some vague recollection earlier this session was that the Government should be spending more money

on education and should not be cutting the spending in any way. The Supplementary Estimates (and I apologise for the delay in presenting them, but I have been held up by some rather garrulous people opposite) provide for an additional sum of \$7 700 000 for the Education Department. During the year, the Government approved such initiatives as an extension of the policy of replacing classroom teachers who are on long service leave, appointment of additional staff for migrant education programmes, replacement of ancillary staff to cover absences on long service or other extended leave, and an increase in primary text book allowances; in addition, specific appropriation is now being provided for the cost of flow-ons from national wage increases that do not qualify for automatic increases in appropriation and for increases in charges incurred by schools particularly in respect to fuel and power.

This additional \$7 700 000, when coupled with funds made available to the Education Department from the round sum allowances to cover national wage and other wage increases handed down by the Industrial Commission in 1980-1981, will bring the total allocation of funds to the department in 1980-1981 to \$403 700 000. After making allowance for an additional pay period falling due in 1980-1981, this allocation represents a 12.3 per cent increase over the actual expenditure of the department in 1979-1980, and that figure, accordingly, makes a nonsense of the current campaign of denigration of the Government for its alleged cuts in education. Do the Leader and his Party suggest that that money should not have been spent? Would the Leader have withheld that money? I cannot believe that that is so, yet he is criticising this Government for spending that money and for doing something that his shadow spokesman has been urging most volubly be done. Where is the Leader's credibility?

There will be an additional appropriation of \$1 200 000 for Further Education, and this is in respect of apprenticeship training. Industry demands for skilled tradesmen, particularly in the metal trades and building industries, is still high. This allocation will also cover the extension of the adult migrant education programme, which is subject to reimbursement by the Commonwealth, but we have to have that appropriation authority. An additional \$1 250 000 is required for the Police Department. Is the Opposition seriously suggesting that the Government should be criticised for spending that additional money in an area where again it has been most vocal in its criticism, and unfairly so. The sum of \$800 000 is required for increased salary costs, and \$450 000 is to cover additional contingency charges and terminal leave payments. There is no way that we cannot continue to support our Police Force and give it every benefit and help to combat what certainly is an increasing incidence of violence. Is the Leader seriously suggesting that that is a desirable course? His silence, I take it, is agreement. We must support those services, and support them where we can with the necessary funds.

I have already mentioned the payment of \$2 300 000 in regard to Samcor. A number of other matters will be dealt with if the Leader can contain his impatience: perhaps we may even cut short this debate so that we can get on to the Supplementary Estimates a little earlier than 5 o'clock, and then we will all know what is going on. All of those matters will be dealt with in the Supplementary Estimates.

I find it very difficult to understand the Opposition's motives in bringing forth a motion such as this. Far from demonstrating managerial incompetence with State finances, as the Opposition alleges, the Government has managed quite superbly in keeping the Budget within tolerable limits and firmly under control. My only thought

is that the Opposition wanted to get its no-confidence motion on quickly before that became apparent in the statement associated with the Supplementary Estimates.

I have no hesitation in choosing the description 'managed superbly' in a climate in which so many demands beyond the Government's control have been forced upon it. There certainly have been severe pressures on the Budget, as I have demonstrated. Nearly \$50 000 000 in additional expenditure and revenue shortfalls has been forced upon us, and yet by prudent management the deficit on the combined accounts is likely to be no more than \$10 000 000. There will be further pressures on the Budget in the future: let there be no mistake about that. We have already been warned of the shortfall in funds for next year that will come about from Commonwealth actions. We will continue to apply the same controlled approach that has already kept the State's finances under firm control in the face of similar difficulties in the past, and we will be successful.

We have shown quite conclusively (and the evidence is based on hard facts, not the sort of wild allegations and guesstimates that we have heard from the Leader) that we can manage in the face of very great adversity, and we are not going to change that record. We will continue to manage the affairs of this State firmly, carefully, and for the benefit of the people of South Australia. I reject the motion so cynically and precipitately moved by the Opposition: I reject it utterly and with contempt.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Adelaide): The last challenge by the Premier to the Opposition was that he could not understand the motive behind this motion. My motive in supporting the motion is clearly one of concern for the people of South Australia. I do not care where you go at the moment—you can walk into almost any category of lifestyle in South Australia, into any business house, into middle class or working-class areas, and you will find genuine, utter and strong concern about the mismanagement by and the incompetence of the Tonkin Government. That is clear, and I will demonstrate it further. There is no shadow of doubt that that is the situation in South Australia at the moment. Liberal members of Parliament know it, Labor Party members know it, as do the Ministers. I believe that this Government stands condemned.

The Government has got itself into this financial position because of its own policies in the first place, for its misunderstanding of how to manage the affairs of a State, and for the promises it made to the people at the last election which it has found not merely difficult but impossible to fulfil. First, we were given assurances that 7 000 jobs would be found in this State, and then we were told that 10 000 jobs would be found in this State. All sorts of promises were made about how the economy would be uplifted, and so forth. It is because of the lack of uplifting in the economy that the Government now finds itself in this parlous situation. In fact, there is no revenue. The Government has misjudged the revenue possibilities: there is no doubt about that. No matter who you talk to, it is clear that the Government has got itself into this situation, and it cannot fulfil its promises.

In order to overcome the revenue deficiency, what line has this Government taken? It has taken the line of all conservative Governments through the world, which is to cut services which should be provided by the State to the community. That is the first thing that this type of conservatism produces in any country in the world. It is no good the Premier's now running away from Fraserism and the policies which he has supported since 1975. Since 1975 the Premier has given strong support to the Fraser

federalism. It is no good his now saying that this Prime Minister dealt him a blow at the last Premiers Conference. Maybe he did, but he cannot have it both ways. The Premier cannot tell the people of South Australia, as he has done several times, that he supports Fraserism and then come away from a conference at which he finds he is affected by cuts and then try to condemn Fraserism. This is clearly what this Premier has been trying to do. In my view, that has been done simply to cover his own incompetence and mismanagement. There can be little doubt about that. I will now refer to the antics of the Premier. I have never thought for very long that the Premier was a serious and honest person. I have always thought there was buffoonery about him. A person telephoned me from Canberra this morning to tell me that the Premier appeared on Canberra television last week and said that he was only bluffing and it was a political stunt when he threatened to turn off the gas.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It was a concerned person in Canberra who telephoned me about this matter, and it also came to me through a second person. Let us try to put things in their proper perspective if we are going to talk about cutting gas—we know that is impossible. It was probably a stunt of Rex Jory's, the new adviser to the Premier, making him this big tough guy.

Mr Mathwin: Was it a political stunt to sell it cheaper?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It is quite clear that the member for Glenelg has not caught up with some of my press releases. I have given that credit to Mr Hall. Mr Hall said in 1973 that he was the originator of the policy to sell it cheaply. Mr Hall said that Mr Dunstan should not run away with the idea that the Labor Party was responsible, because the Liberal Party was responsible when he was in Government. That is the claim of Mr Hall. I do not want to take the credit away from Mr Hall. Let him have the credit. I know there are some people in here who do not like Mr Hall, but he has proved quite useful to the Labor Party in some of the statements he has made over the years.

There is clear evidence that in order to get out of the budgetary problems in which this Government finds itself, there is only one solution, and that is to cut, as conservative Governments all over the world do. The other area into which this Government will go is to increase State charges and State taxes. This Government has boasted for quite some time that it does not raise taxes, but it will put up State charges. My Leader said today that more than forty charges have already been increased in this State, and that is what the problem in the community is all about: do not let us under-estimate that. I do not care about it, because the Government is getting strong, consistent and continual criticism about the hypocrisy of saying that it is not a high taxation Government. It is not a high taxation Government to its own people. The people who actually pay succession duties and gift tax are the people the Government is looking after, but to the ordinary people who count to me and my Party the charges are—

Mr. Keneally interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Stuart.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The charges are put on to those people who can ill afford them, and that is the way this Government is collecting taxes, that is the way it will continue, and that is what will destroy this Government before very long.

I have just stated the Opposition's attitude towards this problem. Let me now quote some words I heard on Sunday from a person who I suppose would be in the

middle of political opinion, although I have no idea where he stands politically. I would strongly advise the front bench, including the Premier, to read Leigh Hatcher's resume last Sunday afternoon which I heard at half past one, in which he attacked the Premier. He told the Premier that the problems of the State were not caused by the media. We know that every time something adverse happens to the Premier he blames the media. Someone has to be responsible for the inefficiencies caused by his leadership, and Leigh Hatcher made this point. He said, 'I will tell the Premier what is wrong. South Australia has the highest unemployment on the mainland of Australia, and it is now getting close to being the State with the highest State charges in Australia. We are told that transport costs are going up in the near future, and that electricity and gas charges are going up.' He went on to name more and more State charges that will be going up. He also said that the Premier should take some cognizance of the following. He said, 'I have a very good friend who is an accountant, and he said that Mr Tonkin is making a fortune for him through winding down small business.' That is what Mr Hatcher said about this Government. He said, 'Businesses are closing by the dozen almost daily. The Government knows it and I know it. What is the Government doing about it? In no way is it trying to generate the economy.'

While I am talking about surcharges and charges, I would like to hear some response from the Premier or from his Ministers in relation to a radio and television broadcast I did a few weeks ago in relation to the proposed threat from the Federal Government to place a surcharge on whitegoods. I do not have to demonstrate to sensible people in South Australia exactly what the circumstances would be here if, as stated in the Federal Government reports that are available, which have now gone from Treasury to the Minister but of which the Minister may not be aware, recommending that a surcharge be placed on whitegoods. I would not have to tell him what would happen to Simpson Pope and other stove and refrigerator makers in South Australia if a surcharge were imposed. The trade union movement, with its responsibility, took this up at the Trades and Labor Council a fortnight ago, and has written to the Premier, the Federal Government, and to me opposing any such move. I have heard no statement from any Minister about this. I ask that the Minister look at this matter seriously and take it up with his colleagues. This will have a dramatic effect in South Australia if we are faced with more surcharges and taxes from the Federal Government.

Why has this Government been so quiet about this issue of utmost significance in this State? It should be taken up at trade union, Government and Opposition level. On the one hand, the Government says it does not matter about State charges, and that we have to look at these charges or start retrenching. My Leader did not mention anything about retrenchments. It has not been the Labor Party's policy in the past, present or in the future, to retrench workers. Our policy has always been to protect them. I want to draw the Minister's attention to a letter written by the Principal of Adelaide High School to me as follows:

The school has been getting a copy of the South Australian *Government Gazette* for some years, because it does assist the administration of the school in keeping up to date with the number of changes to various Government regulations. According to the school treasurer, the cost has been increased—

listen to this; it is another State charge—

from \$40 to \$70—

I calculate that that is about a 75 per cent increase—

for the next financial year. I am debating at the present moment whether I can justify that sort of expenditure from

my library funds. Do you know of any price reduction applicable to schools for the *Government Gazette*, as this can, in the ultimate, be a deciding factor in my decision to retain the *Gazette* or not?

Here we are, under this Government, stopping information about what is contained in the *Government Gazette* going to schools. If Adelaide High School cannot afford it, certainly many other schools cannot do so, as that school would be in a much better position financially than many other schools in my area would be.

The Hon. H. Allison: How many schools take it?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I do not know, but here is a school that has elected to take it, and because of your Government's actions it finds that it cannot afford to do so. That is an increase of some 75 per cent, and that applies across the board in many areas where the Government has dealt with State charges. I was talking about the absolute hypocrisy of comparing taxes and State charges made by the Premier. On 12 June 1978, when he was talking about electricity tariffs, he said:

The tariffs have gone up, so the Government's cut is increased. This year it will be more than \$8 000 000 . . . It is a tax . . . The Government has been trying to deceive South Australians.

Clearly, in my view, increases in State charges are just as significant and as factual as putting up taxes, except, of course, that they affect more people, the people that the Liberal philosophy demands that they affect, rather than their own wealthy supporters from walks of life from which most of them come.

The Dunstan and Corcoran Governments set a proud record in managing the State's finances. When the member for Hartley, when Premier, left office he left behind a Budget surplus. After years of administering the Engineering and Water Supply Department and other departments, he knew how Budgets worked. But, in less than two years, the State's healthy financial situation was frittered away, not by over-spending but by sheer incompetence. It is true that in 1978 there was a substantial Budget deficit, but the difference is that that was a planned deficit. The Government deliberately planned it to pump money into job creation schemes.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Education does not have the call.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The sad fact is that this Budget deficit is not planned. The Premier, as State Treasurer, is constantly revising what are supposed to be firm Budget estimates. Last week, on the Premier's own admission, not on the figures supplied by the Opposition, we learned that there could be a deficit of some \$15 000 000. He does not know. He cannot add up. He has not been able to add or subtract since he took over the Treasury. I do not know how many guesstimates he has had of the Budget situation, but today he has told us the Budget may be in deficit by \$10 000 000. He is \$5 000 000 out in a week. Nobody knows what the deficit will be when the accounts are finalised.

The Opposition, and the people of South Australia, will watch very carefully to see whether any money is transferred from reserves. That is an important factor. I would not be surprised if the Premier has not already made arrangements through Treasury to transfer reserves, the fat that was put away by men like the member for Hartley and the Hon. Don Dunstan. This Budget deficit cannot be attributed to any Government move to lessen unemployment in this State. Instead, unemployment has increased to record levels under this Government, despite all the grandiose promises and public relations puffery we heard from the Premier, both before and after the

election. Instead, more and more young people are being alienated from society, being driven, by constant knockbacks, from the social and community commitment that characterised youth in the early 1970's, into despair and disenchantment. The budgetary promises made before the last election account for nothing. For example, the Minister of Transport promised that the Stuart Highway would be sealed within five years. It is no good the member for Eyre looking at me. He knows I am quoting what the man said—that he would use his Federal Liberal contacts to ensure it. A few months later, five years became seven years. Now the Minister is blaming his Federal contacts, whom he once cherished, for a further shortfall in road grants. He has not had the courage to tell us, however, which major programmes will be cut.

Mr Mathwin: Geoffrey Virgo's record wasn't that good.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Geoffrey T. Virgo never made a promise on time in relation to the Stuart Highway. The dire situation of the State's finances was highlighted last week by the leaking of the Minister of Industrial Affairs recommendation to Cabinet of cutbacks in his own department. Typically, the Minister put health and safety areas at the top of his hit list. By so doing, he has again demonstrated his Government's lack of concern for the welfare of working people.

Let us have a look at what he wants his Cabinet colleagues to slash in his own department. The list is very interesting, indeed. He recommended that the number of health and safety inspectors be reduced, and that staff numbers in the Noise Control Unit be cut by half. Significantly, one of the areas where two health and safety inspectors positions will not be filled is Whyalla, a city whose heavy industry puts workers most under threat. I am sure that the member for Whyalla and the people in Whyalla will be most concerned about that cut. Similarly, the Bowden health and safety group will be reduced from three to one, if the Minister gets his way. Obviously, the Minister could not care less and was eager to help the Premier get out of his financial mess.

Top of the list is the recommendation that the arbitration inspectorate will no longer carry out routine inspections. After the Budget, the inspectorate will act only on complaint, even though the section is understaffed and the number of cases of illegal payment of under-award wages is rising. One can imagine the increase in under-award payments if there are no on-the-spot inspections! The one thing that protects workers in relation to avaricious employees who will not pay the award rates is the fact that an inspector may bob up, or has bobbed up in the district, and this frightens the employer into adjusting wages to a proper award rate.

The Government is also relinquishing its inspectorial powers over lift and crane safety. I am sure people working in high-rise office buildings will be impressed by this news! The widely praised home handyman scheme (and I am sure that people in your district, Mr Speaker, have had the help of this scheme) will also be discontinued if Cabinet accepts the Minister's recommendations. I am sure many of the local authorities currently involved in the scheme will be disappointed, and so they should be, because it is one of the most humanitarian schemes ever introduced by any Government. The Labor Government introduced the scheme and, to give this Government at least some credit, it has kept it going. It is now recommended that it be cut out.

Another of the Minister's confidential recommendations calls for the scrapping of what was once described as this Government's bold new initiative, the pay-roll tax refund scheme. That is the famous scheme that was going to create 7 000 and then 10 000 jobs. We have seen

unemployment rise to record levels under this Government, yet the Minister of Industrial Affairs somehow had the gall to trumpet the success of his scheme, which has been an all-time flop. It does not matter to whom one talks in Government or in Public Service circles, not one person with any association with the Government or any knowledge of the activities of government generally or of the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment in particular who will say that this scheme has had any success at all, and I will demonstrate why.

Yet the Minister kept resisting my calls for details of how many jobs this scheme had created. I have written to the Minister and I have requested him in this House to give me details about those matters. He refuses to do so, saying that it is confidential. He refuses to do so because the facts will indict him as being guilty of masquerading as to the effectiveness of this scheme. At first I put the Minister's attitude down to modesty but, when I released details of Public Service recommendations that the scheme be dropped because of its failure, the Minister tried a half-hearted defence. That defence defied logic because the Minister claimed that 2 000 jobs had been created. How this could have been done when only \$129 000 of the \$2 500 000 allocation had been spent on the scheme last financial year astounds me. It must be the cheapest scheme in history. It is certainly the cheapest, because it is not working, and the Government does not need to allocate money for a scheme that does not work.

It is time the Government was honest. It is time the Government decided to drop this scheme and introduce job creation, if it wants to get the economy moving. Yet the leaked Cabinet recommendations show that the Minister has tried to fool the public. This scheme, which was supposedly so successful, was the last item on the Minister's eight-point plan for cut-backs. That fact in itself is strange because the advice I have is that his department had recommended, in fact, that it be first on the list of recommended cut-backs, because it had not been working. However, the Minister saw fit to change its position from one to eight.

Despite the financial pressures from Cabinet to help bail the Premier out, the Minister of Industrial Affairs could not face the political embarrassment of admitting that his scheme was a failure. So, the Minister changed the order and put the abolition of the scheme last on his list. I know that that is the case because morale in the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment, because of the proposed financial cut-backs, is almost as low as it is in the Premier's department and, in fact, right throughout the Public Service. The information that we are getting is that morale is at an all-time low, and that it is getting lower. Of course, when morale is at a low level people want to talk to you, and that is why the Labor Party is getting information day by day.

The response to this leak has been a witch-hunt in the Minister's own department. The details I released were also contained in the house journal of the Minister's own department. However, I would like to place on record that I received those details separately, together with the information that the Minister had changed the order of the proposed cuts. That was not in *Dialog*, the department's newsletter, and the Minister should have been aware of that.

Yet in shot-gun fashion, the accusing finger of the Minister has been pointed in a somewhat scattered way. The end result of a Ministerial tantrum was that the Director of the department, Mr Lindsay Bowes—a man for whom I have the utmost respect, having worked with him for four and a half years in an excellent

relationship—was apparently asked to heavily castigate the P.S.A. job representatives who publish *Dialog*. In a letter to the Chairman of the job representatives, the *Dialog* information was described as 'inaccurate, misleading and, I regret to say, I consider it has been published in an attempt to unnecessarily upset and concern the staff of the department'.

I know, as does the staff of the department, that the details published in *Dialog* were not 'misleading and inaccurate'. I also know that the information in *Dialog* would not have unnecessarily upset staff members any more than they were already upset. The fact is that an instruction had come down from the top that details of the recommended cuts should be made known by the divisional heads to all departmental staff. If anyone is to blame for the leaks, it is the Minister.

The letter also unfairly implies that the P.S.A. job representatives leaked this information to the media. That is simply not true, because I did that. I take full responsibility for it. The information in *Dialog* only confirmed the information that I had already received.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: They leaked it to you.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: They did not leak it to me at all. The Minister would like to fit somebody for this but he is not fitting them on my say so. The Minister should be ashamed of the tone and content of the disciplinary letter sent to the Chairman of the job representatives. Instead of being sent only to that officer, as would be common courtesy, if there was a need to send it, that letter was sent to every member of the department in a crude and vicious attempt to embarrass the Chairman of the P.S.A. job representatives, who were doing what they were told to do. I believe the Minister should apologise and ask that this letter be withdrawn. Mr Speaker, I now seek leave to table this letter in the House.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader would appreciate that he is not able to table any document.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Thank you. It was probably worth a try. I will see that *Hansard* is rewarded at some stage, as I will read it in later.

It is not just the Opposition that is concerned about this Government's financial incompetence. The polls show that this Government is on the nose with the electorate for exactly the same reasons as I have talked about today. In one poll conducted in March this year, the State Government's health and education cuts were listed as the issues most concerning South Australians, after rising unemployment and the quality of South Australia's water. That second issue of concern, to the everlasting shame of the Minister of Health, is a clear example of just what can happen when petty ideological considerations are put before the public's health and safety. A cost-saving exercise involving minor expenditure was placed before the health of South Australians. The tragic results of the amoebic meningitis episode speak for themselves and are a shameful indictment of this Government's policies.

The Saturday before last the Premier was featured on the front page of the *Advertiser* bleating that his Government faced a tough job to win the next election. I'll say he has a tough job, because the results of a recent poll show that the support for the ALP is 44 per cent, for the Liberal Party 28.2 per cent, for the Australian Democrats 6.6 per cent, and undecided 15.9 per cent, with the percentage of those who refused to answer being 4.8 per cent.

It could be that these results have been leaked by the Premier's own Party in an attempt to embarrass him. If the figures are not correct, perhaps the Premier will come up with the correct ones, because I am told that this was a Liberal Party poll. If such results continue, very soon the

Premier's colleagues—

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

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): This is a most unusual motion, indicating the melodramatic way in which the Opposition is approaching this topic. Opposition members have talked about a multiplier effect of ten in relation to the Budget. They talk of a deficit of \$15 000 000 in relation to a projected deficit of \$1 500 000, and in itself I do not believe that is particularly significant. If the Government had budgeted for a deficit of \$250 000, and that is multiplied by ten, the factor of ten is seen in its proper perspective. The whole tenor of the motion is to overblow the Budget situation. Members opposite have talked of massive increases in State charges. Even a simpleton would know that those charges will have little effect on this year's Revenue Budget. Opposition members have attempted to overblow the situation with talk about a factor of ten, which is quite meaningless, and the dramatic increases in charges which will have little impact on this year's Revenue Budget.

What is the financial policy of the Opposition? The Leader has been overseas and he has learnt a new word. He has talked about the Liberal Party's monetarist policy. He has come back and given rise to some headlines which I thought were very appropriate: 'No boom, Bannon.' What an extraordinary description! Members opposite condemn what the Leader calls the monetarist policy, although he did not tell us exactly what it was. What is the Labor Party's financial policy? In brief, I can tell the House what it is. The first point is: do not reduce the number of people on the Government pay-roll; in fact, put more on. Do not even reduce the numbers by attrition. The second point is to not raise any State charges or taxes. That point is made by the non-monetarists, whatever they are. The third point is to not oppose any pay claims and to support the A.C.T.U. in relation to the thirty-five-hour week. The fourth point is to balance the Budget.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: By increasing expenditure.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. That is how the policy has been explained to the public of South Australia, and it is absolute nonsense and claptrap. Even a simpleton would recognise that approach as farcical and irresponsible. However, all of these points are key points in the Opposition's financial policy. I will indicate to the House that this is a fair and concise summary of the financial policy of the A.L.P. I want to repeat the points, so that they will sink in. The first point is to not reduce the numbers on the Government pay-roll. Let me highlight that. The Deputy Leader, who waxed so eloquent, said that we must not run down the Public Buildings Department, that that department is the biggest builder in South Australia and we need it, even though it has a couple of hundred carpenters with nothing to do. The other area where the Government has made significant cuts is the Engineering and Water Supply Department. In the last year of office of the Labor Government, Parliament had to vote more than \$500 000 to keep the fellows down there doing nothing. But the Opposition would not take anyone off the Government pay-roll or reduce the Public Buildings Department or the E.&W.S. Department. The Deputy Leader is on record to that effect.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: We have had further affirmation of the point. The first point means that we have been badgered to put more on the public pay-roll. The Labor Government for years neglected the prisons.

The former Premier is quoted as saying that there were no votes in prisons, but I think he meant the remark in a wider context. This Government has put on extra correctional services personnel, and it is being pressured to put on more. The Labor Party policy is to not reduce the Public Service, but to get more people on. That is one of the lessons the Leader learnt when he was overseas.

The second point relates to not raising State charges or taxes. These savage increases! Even a simpleton could find increases of the magnitude of those in the list produced by the Deputy Leader. The Leader has been away, and the Deputy Leader has been the spokesman, the sage who has been educating the public. The second point refers to not raising Government charges, but I have a rundown of a whole range of areas in which the Labor Government was involved in raising charges. The Labor Government slapped on taxes for electricity and a new tax for gas, but of course the little people do not use those commodities. The Labor Party is the champion of the little people and it wants to scythe off the tall poppies. The Labor Government raised charges on water in 1975 by 27.2 per cent. I have a whole range of other charges of the same order.

Mr Slater interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am quoting these figures to show what irresponsible nonsense the Labor Party has churned out, expecting the public to swallow it. Are those four points not fundamental to its economic outlook and policy? The Labor Government increased the cost of commercial fishing licences by 100 per cent from 1976 to 1977. Fish dealers licences rose by 100 per cent in that year, from \$100 to \$200. Prawn authorities, single rig, increased 900 per cent from \$200 to \$1 830, and for a double rig by 600 per cent.

On every page of the document from which I am quoting there are examples, and the list is endless. In many cases, these were yearly increases. To suggest that the Labor Government did not increase charges is absolute nonsense. In the area of motor charges, South Australia led the Commonwealth by far. Do not let the Labor Party perform about increases in State charges, because this State led the nation in the area of increases during its tenure of office.

The third point was to not oppose pay claims and to support the A.C.T.U. and the 35-hour week. It means giving the Public Service everything it asks for and putting more people on the pay-roll. It is all part of the Labor financial policy. The fourth point is to balance the Budget! How can one take seriously criticisms of this Government in terms of the Labor Party's non-monetarist policy?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The last great disciple in that area was Gough Whitlam.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. This Government has recorded some real achievements in what is happening in South Australia. Before I deal with some of the recent utterances of the Leader of the Opposition, let me deal with a matter raised by the Deputy Leader, who said that, everywhere he looks, there is gloom in South Australia. In every nook and cranny where he peers, he finds nothing but gloom. As the Premier suggested, I think he might have myopia. The claim is that this gloom occurs across the whole gamut of society, from little people to big people. I suggest the Deputy Leader look at the recent survey of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, which predicts and spells out a degree of optimism in South Australia. The Deputy Leader does not bother to read publications such as that because, in his thinking, those people are insignificant. He espouses the policy of his Leader—let the Government own everything. Yet those people happen to be the major employers in the

State, and they are optimistic.

Mr Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: You were talking about Government intervention. One of the things that the Leader learned in Alberta and Saskatchewan was that there should be more Government intervention via the heritage funds in the resources area. We must have an interventionist Government. The Deputy Leader talked about employment in relation to the gloom that has descended on South Australia. Members opposite certainly love it. What are the facts in relation to employment? The facts are that since the Liberal Government has come to office there has been a real growth in employment. The labour force statistics for real growth in employment show that in August 1980 there were 555 400 people in employment; in November 1980, 554 500; in February 1981, 560 200; and in March 1981, 568 300, a rise of 20 900 since we came to office. What happened in the declining years of the Labor Government? In August 1977, 568 000 people were in employment.

Mr Bannon: What about the unemployed?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: There was a reduction in real terms in employment during the declining years of the Labor Government. Does the Leader suggest that these figures are not significant and do not indicate trends? They show that the number of employed declined during the latter years of the Labor Government's term and has increased during this Government's term. There has been an increase in excess of 20 000 real jobs since this Government came to office, and there was a real decline in the last three years of the Labor Government. Let the Leader get around those statistics; I invite the Leader to comment. There has been a real achievement.

Mr Langley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Unley is out of order injecting, particularly when he is out of his chair.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: We hear that the State is being run down. I have a list of enterprises that have been attracted to this State since the Government has been in office.

Mr Slater: Why don't you give us a list of people who have left the State?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Do your own homework. You get a list of people who have left the State; I would be interested to see it. An article in the *News* states:

South Australian oilseed group plans expansion: A South Australian based vegetable oil manufacturer is spending more than \$500 000 expanding its plant at Brukunga near Nairne in the Adelaide Hills. The firm, Australian Oil Seed Industries Limited, crushes seeds for oil which it then refines and sells for cooking oil.

The *News* says, 'Let us back South Australia' and that is what I say. What does the Opposition say? It says, 'Let us knock South Australia.' No wonder the Leader was called 'No boom, Bannon' in the headlines. I can cite some of the industries that have announced expansions or new activities in South Australia, as follows:

January 1981: ICI Australia announces \$2 000 000 expansion at Osborne.

February 1981: Abbott Australasia Limited announces establishment of intravenous solution manufacturing plant at Elizabeth West. Estimated cost: \$2 000 000.

February 1981: Kimberly-Clark Australia will spend \$15 000 000 upgrading its Apcel pulp.

February 1981: Tradigrain Proprietary Limited, provides bagged grain for countries without bulk facilities.

February 1981: Hoteliers International announces plans

to construct Chateau Adelaide, a ten-storey, 260 bed hotel, at a cost of \$18 200 000.

We see the Hotel Hilton rising in Victoria Square after Premier Dunstan announced and reannounced that project *ad nauseum*, as he did the petro-chemical plant. The list continues:

March 1981: Opening of the Craigmore Foodland Village Complex which cost \$2 500 000.

March 1981: ANZ Meat Exports and a Murray Bridge food manufacturer have won a contract for \$1 200 000.

March 1981: Panapac Pty Ltd awarded \$1 000 000 contract.

March 1981: Simpson Ltd announces construction of a \$6 000 000 dishwasher factory.

March 1981: Clyde Industries Ltd won a \$12 000 000 contract to build ten locomotives for Australian National.

March 1981: Port Lincoln Ship Construction Pty Ltd has been established at a cost of \$1 000 000.

March 1981: Unico Securities Ltd established by S.A. businessmen to provide a range of merchant banking facilities principally in this State.

March 1981: Rubery Owen Holdings Australia Pty Ltd has expanded into Taiwan which, together with the company's Philippines operation, will further strengthen this Adelaide-based manufacturer.

March 1981: Steetley Industries Ltd acquired Australian Barytes. The new company plans for expansion consolidate employment in both mining and crushing of baryte ore.

Mr Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: This is the bad news, the gloom and doom from 'No boom, Bannon'! The list continues:

March 1981: Sapfor announces decision to install a new log mill at Tarpeena. \$3 000 000. Employment impact, 80 new jobs.

April 1981: Codan Pty Ltd local manufacturer of specialist high frequency communications equipment is to expand into satellite communications.

April 1981: W. P. Crowhurst Pty Ltd paint and varnish manufacturing company announced \$500 000 expansion of its Devon Park operations.

April 1981: Australian Paper Manufacturers Ltd submitted proposals to establish a wood pulp plant at Snuggery, cost \$52 000 000, employment 110 new jobs.

The Opposition knocked such projects and says there is no electricity. What about the Indian project? We lost that project, and it was going to run on fresh air. Talk about hot house plants! The list continues:

April 1981: Softwood Holdings Ltd plans \$4 400 000 expansion programme to instal the first texpan thin board system in Australia.

April 1981: Malco Industries, Croydon Park, will invest \$10 000 000 in self-discharging equipment for vessels.

May 1981: Grundfos Pumps will employ fifty people at new Regency Park factory.

May 1981: Adelaide-Port Pirie Rail project, 300 jobs directly and a further 450 jobs in support activities.

May 1981: Raytheon International Data Systems has chosen Adelaide in preference to other States. Between seventy-five and 200 new jobs. That announcement attracted quite a large headline and story in the *Age* in Melbourne. What is happening in South Australia is of interest interstate and the complimentary comments of the *Managing Director* of that firm were reported faithfully in the *Melbourne Age*. He indicated quite clearly why the company came to South Australia ahead of other Australian States.

Is that a picture of gloom? When we look at the employment figures at the end of this 12 months, we will

find a further increase, not the downhill slide of the latter years of the Labor Government. Where is the gloom that the Deputy Leader talked about? He should look a bit harder into the nooks and crannies; he might learn what is going on. He should read a few more economic books, as should his Leader, because what he has said is economic nonsense. I have not yet referred to other projects by companies such as Eglo, Safcol, Omark, A. G. Petzetakis and Auger Plastics. There is nothing the Opposition would like better than to find gloom and doom wherever it looks.

However, all of the indicators are optimistic. I could mention Roxby Downs; employment has increased from 100 to 200.

That does not sound like a great boom but things are going in the right direction. In the time available I also want to discuss briefly what 'No boom, Bannon' said on his return. One article states:

Leader of the State Opposition, John Bannon, flew into Adelaide yesterday after a six-week overseas visit—with a bucket of cold water for the hopes of South Australia.

At least he could have drunk the wine on the aircraft, which would have cheered him up a bit. The article continues:

Mr Bannon dismissed all ideas of an imminent resource boom for the State—

I think he ought to go away again and stay away—

and said Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser's predictions 'of sunshine, sunshine for Australia' were unreal.

I thought the Prime Minister talked about life not being easy, but it is all 'sunshine, sunshine' now, so I think he has been misquoted. The article continues:

We're competing with all the other States in Australia and a country like Canada which is aggressively selling its own enormous resources.

The Leader seems to be saying, 'Let us lie down and die, because we have competitors in the field.' That is socialism and pessimism. The article continues:

The United States is using its technology to re-work old resources while it develops new resources. South Korea, the cornerstone of growth in Asia, has dropped to zero growth and doesn't need the resources everyone predicted it would.

There is enormous pessimism in Western Europe—

he caught a dose of it, didn't he?—

and with Mr Mitterand in power in France we will have to look again at uranium exports.'

I did not even think the Labor Party was looking at it.

I do recall that the Leader made a speech one Friday when he said that we must not be carried away by our emotions; we must really weigh up the uranium issue and take a responsible view on questions like Roxby Downs. I have been told reliably that Mr Bannon had a telephone call on the Friday night from the United Trades and Labor Council in which he was told, 'Pull your head in John, or you will get the chopper.' Sure enough, his head was pulled in by Saturday. He had to eat humble pie and he retracted what he had said on the Friday. Mr Cornwall jumped on the bandwagon on the Friday night and supported his Leader and that is probably how he finished up No. 5 on the ticket.

The Leader also said that Alberta, Canada, has a heritage commission. He said that he was highly impressed with the system of direct public investment in resource development which he saw in Alberta. He also went to Saskatchewan, I am told, which is run by a socialist interventionist Government. It took over the potash industry because it was profitable and it had captive markets in the United States, so it could not lose. I went there, too, and talked to Mr Blakeney, the Premier of Saskatchewan, and he told me that he was left-wing and

socialist. That Government took over the potash industry and the Americans had to live with it because they could not get their potash anywhere else. But what the Leader did not tell us was that in Saskatchewan the uranium industry makes a sizable contribution to the heritage fund. The socialist left-wing Government is mining uranium quite happily. The Leader went overseas to be educated, but he only looked at the bits which were not embarrassing. He went to Alberta, which has a progressive conservative Government, and he quoted that in debate this afternoon.

He also went to Saskatchewan where he heard about this wonderful heritage fund which is propped up by the resources boom which he says has no future in South Australia. I find that most contradictory. He says that we have to have a heritage fund and we must have resources so that payments can be made into that fund so that we can hand them out, but we are not going to have a resources boom. The sooner the Leader sorts himself and his Party out in relation to the developments which we are accelerating in South Australia and which are creating employment the better. We are co-operating to accelerate the flow of oil, and we will get some of the benefits. The following are conservative 1980 figures which will flow to this State from the resources boom. These are projected royalties from the resources boom which will not occur under Labor but which, under a Liberal Government, has every chance of occurring.

	Royalties (\$ million)			
	Coal	Copper	Petroleum	Other
1978.....	0.15	0.1	2.6	1.1
1980.....	0.2	0.3	6	1.5
1985.....	0.5	5 } copper	25	1.5
		20 } uranium		
1990.....	0.7	20 } gold	20	1.5

Compared to the heritage funds in Saskatchewan and Alberta, they may appear fairly modest, because royalties there are about 50 per cent. Here we have the Leader saying that we have to spend money and we have to have a heritage fund. Where will the money come from, unless we have a resources boom?

In relation to gas, the Deputy Leader said quite clearly that the Hall Government made the arrangements with the New South Wales Government for the sale of gas. I have a quotation from *Hansard* in which former Premier Dunstan puts the record straight and says just who it was who was smart enough to write the contract with Sydney. In *Hansard* of 31 March 1971, the then Premier said:

The negotiations were suspended, simply because at that time [the time of the Hall Government] there were no reserves which could be proved and which could form a basis of a supply to New South Wales. That was clear, and no negotiations were taking place at the time this Government [the Dunstan Government] took office.

Negotiations which commenced after this Government took office and after the proving of additional supplies, proceeded on an entirely new basis.

Steele Hall has never claimed the credit for the existing contracts, because he did not write them. It is one matter to open negotiations and another to finalise them. The sales to Sydney were predicated on the basis that they would sell enough gas for a petro-chemical plant and that was the most announced and reannounced project the Labor Party has ever been involved with. The Labor Party announced many projects, hoping to accomplish a few of them. It said that it would sell enough gas for a petro-chemical plant, a project that it never brought to fruition, and that it would find enough gas for our needs. It was on that basis that Dunstan signed the contract. I have evidence that Mr Dunstan was warned that that was not a

very smart thing to do. I believe that the attack mounted by the Opposition is nothing short of claptrap.

Mr TRAINER: You wouldn't know a claptrap from a Fallopian tube.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If you were to shut up—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will not get personal, but the fact is that the Labor Party financial policy to save this State is as follows: first, do not reduce the numbers on the Government pay-roll at all, put more on; secondly, do not raise any State charges or taxes, despite what they did to record levels in Government; thirdly, do not oppose any pay claims, but support a thirty-five-hour week claim by the A.C.T.U.; and, fourthly, balance the Budget. How can one support this nonsense?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): Like the Deputy Premier, I spent some time as a schoolteacher. I am well aware that there are times in the learning process when the teacher takes the decision that some entertainment is what is required, perhaps to stimulate the students. Indeed, it can be a stimulating break in the learning process. I think, however, that it is my sad and melancholy task to return this debate, as sometimes it is necessary to return the class, to sober realities, to remind the House what it is we are discussing. No matter how entertaining the Deputy Premier may be (and he was, indeed, entertaining—he seems to blossom in this character in Government), nonetheless, what he had to say was largely irrelevant to the matters which are before us.

Let me make two points arising out of what the Deputy Premier has said to us, and then proceed with what I originally intended to say. First, in relation to the resources boom the point which my Leader makes and which the Opposition wishes to make as seriously as it possibly can is that there is no way that the resources boom can help this Government now, or help any South Australian Government in the next three or four years. It is faced with a problem right now, one that it has to talk about and resolve. A resources boom may be very well for the year of grace 1987 or 1988, but it is irrelevant to the problems which face this Government now.

The second point is that, in a sense, there is a good deal of cheek in the attitude which the Deputy Premier takes. He is really in the position of a driver of a motor car who, having let it get out of control and hit a tree at the bottom, and the car having turned over, and he, having found himself upside down in the car with his foot lodged somewhere underneath the steering wheel, then turns to somebody else and says, 'What would you do in this situation?' The point is, of course, that it is he and his Party, Federal and State, which have got South Australia into this position.

I like his cheek to be saying to the Labor Party, 'Well, what would you do in this situation?' when it is the Liberal Party, Federal and State, which has got us into the position to which we are addressing ourselves at present, and to which the Premier addressed himself in the words 'It is going to be difficult for my Party to win the next State election.' There is something somewhat pathetic (and I mean that in the old fashioned sense of the term) about the plight in which this Liberal Government finds itself. There is always a strong element of pathos about the collapse of ideals, of cherished hopes and cherished ambitions. Some people on my side of the House will disagree with me; they will say that we are faced with cynical and ruthless men who threw out a set of self-contradictory promises to gull the electors in the knowledge that they were largely

immune from penetrating journalistic analysis.

I do not see it this way. I believe that those people who sit opposite us genuinely believed that they could make it work. For the most part, they were not hardened professionals. They were not from smoke-filled back rooms. Some were from the rural and, hence, conservative wing of the old non-conformist conscience. Some were simply fresh-faced youths, not only new to politics but also new to the Liberal Party. I will not go on with this analysis of the various positions in which honourable members opposite find themselves, because I think it may be somewhat painful to them, as indeed it is painful to me. However, to call the Liberal members of this Parliament innocent in intention is not to call them innocent in effect, because in their innocence they have been playing a very dangerous game indeed. The Premier has not understood the explosive nature of the ideology he has been so enthusiastically peddling. The Minister of Health has been incredibly foolish in her utterances as to Commonwealth-State finances for hospital services. The Minister of Education has said very little indeed, except where he has been forced to defend himself, which necessity has arisen from the various blunders and miscalculations of his fellows. But through all of this runs a rough justice. Somebody once said, 'He who lives by the sword shall die by the sword.' Similarly, 'He who lives by monetarism shall die by monetarism.' Someone has also said, 'There is no such thing as a new morality; there is only the old immorality dressed up in new clothes.' Similarly, there is no new conservatism; it is only the old conservatism tarted up with a new jargon.

I want to look at the central strategy of the Fraser Government, aided and abetted by the Liberals in this State since it came to office. Of course, it was very much influenced by the events of the early 1970's. Gough Whitlam was able, in the early 1970s, to achieve two necessary pre-conditions to electoral success. First, he was able to point out successfully to people the glaring deficiencies in public services, in education, health, social welfare, urban development and renewal, and so on. Secondly, he was able to convince them that the Federal Liberal Government was to blame for these deficiencies because of its inactivity. The result was the moral victory of 1969 and the actual victory of 1972. Perceptive people in the Liberal Party realised that, whatever happened in the future, they would always be subject to similar attack unless they changed the rules of the game. They could, of course, acquiesce in or co-operate with the Labor programme, thereby ridding themselves of the source of discontent, but this programme meant a large-scale redistribution of wealth from their natural supporters, and that, of course, was intolerable to their Party machine. The rules had to be changed. Canberra had to be got off the hook.

One person who was very much responsible for the thought and work that went into the Liberal effort to get off the hook was, of course, John Carrick, for many years a Party functionary in New South Wales and then a Senator. He was one of the architects of what emerged. A formula for changing the rules was worked out. It is new federalism. All that remained once the formula had been worked out was to get back into office. That proved fairly easy. The match was simply called off at three-quarter time because the Liberals were then ten goals ahead. It is nice when you can make your own rules. A few league football teams this year would like to have called off the match at three-quarter time, and perhaps should have done so, because the result of the game would have been somewhat different.

But, in any event, what has happened now is that the

Fraser Government has had an opportunity to introduce a dose of new federalism. Let us first remind ourselves of the deal which the States received before new federalism was introduced. Let us find out what the Canberra octopus was doing to the States in those days before the change of Federal Government. Gough Whitlam, in 1973, put to the States a formula which would automatically tell them what they were to get. The factors were a base (what they got the year before), plus wage inflation, which could have been 8 per cent or 10 per cent, whatever it was; then a factor for population growth, which could have been 1, 1.5 or 2 per cent; and then a betterment factor of 1.8 per cent.

In 1975, Federal Treasurer Cairns increased this third factor, the betterment factor, to 3 per cent. So, in real terms at that time the State revenues were increasing by 3 per cent per head of population per year. This was the Canberra octopus! This was the Government which was supposed to be strangling the States. This was the Government of which Sir Charles Court, Mr Bjelke-Petersen and other people complained, because federalism apparently was not working properly. In addition to those payments which were being made to the States, there were quite large so-called section 96 or specific purpose payments. In Opposition, the Liberals came up with what was virtually the Canadian tax-sharing system. That gave the States overall 33.6 per cent of Federal income tax collections.

The new Prime Minister, Mr Fraser, had a series of meetings with the States and told them that they would be \$350 000 000 per annum better off under this new arrangement, and the States believed it. Why should they not? Surely Prime Ministers are supposed to tell the truth. They took the bait, but, of course, tax indexation was almost immediately introduced and the \$350 000 000 became \$89 000 000. One Premier smelt a rat. One Premier said, 'Hang on. Just in case this is not as rosy as it might seem, let us have the Whitlam formula as a fall-back position. That was just as well because the States did no better under the new scheme. They were back on the formula in the very first year of new Federalism. Indeed, had Don Dunstan not picked up that point, had he not insisted that the Whitlam formula should continue as a fall-back position, the States would have been materially worse off from 1975 than in fact they were, under what was supposed to be a new deal from a new federalist Government, concerned for the States, not a centralist Government or an octopus or anything else like that.

However, that new arrangement (the fall-back position to the Whitlam formula) had a time limit written into it. That limit was 1979, and towards the end of 1979 the betterment factor went, the Whitlam formula was done away with altogether. So, the States had been able to buy three or four years on the Whitlam formula, but that was all. Time ran out.

The States put several propositions to the Commonwealth at that time. One of them was that the Commonwealth replace the old betterment formula with a 1 per cent betterment formula. Members will note how the bargaining position of the States had been so eroded at the time that they thought that they were not in a position to ask for the restoration of 3 per cent or 1.5 per cent. The figure for which they asked was 1 per cent, and that was knocked back. Mr Neville Wran of New South Wales requested that the Commonwealth give 42 per cent or 43 per cent of the income tax revenue, thus returning to the Whitlam formula in real terms, but that was also knocked back.

I do not think it is necessary for me to go into a great deal of detail as to what has happened since then: we are all aware of what has happened. The situation has become

worse and worse for the States. Their bargaining position has declined—their ability to get more money from the Commonwealth, remembering that this is an on-going thing from 1942 when the States surrendered to the Commonwealth their income taxing powers, has been progressively eroded.

It is now clear that the States will get considerably less in the next financial year than they had assumed when they went to Canberra, quite apart from what they had budgeted to get. The Liberals in this State by their rhetoric and by their advocacy have aided and abetted the Commonwealth in what it has done. We have only to look at the Premier's policy speech given in 1979 or, rather, his special Treasury policy. This is what he said:

Governments must always be conscious that the money they spend comes from taxes paid by people who elect them.

That is good grade five economics stuff, I suppose. He said:

Some revenue comes from the Commonwealth with a proportion of income tax shared out to the States on a population basis and some from the local State taxation measures.

That is good grade six economics, I guess. He said:

The Government must ensure that its administration and its spending is always directed at achieving the best possible in terms of results and value for the taxpayer's dollar.

That is good motherhood stuff. He then went on to say:

The setting of priorities as to how this taxation revenue will be best spent is entirely the responsibility of the State Government.

That is not quite what we got from the Premier this afternoon about arbitration commissions, industrial courts, and all that sort of thing. In fact, 'entirely the responsibility of the State Government' of course is new federalism. The Premier said:

The Liberal Party does not believe that bigger Government is better Government or that bigger spending makes for better programmes.

That is Fraserism. Those two things combined, those things which were dangled to attract the electors' support in 1979, are precisely what this Government is copping now, and it is now squealing and saying that it might not win the next election because of what Mr Fraser is doing. The Premier said, 'We may have a great deal of difficulty in winning the next election as a result of what has happened at this Premier's Conference.'

I made a fairly strong statement earlier in relation to the Minister of Health and what has been said about Commonwealth-State health funding. I said that the Minister had been incredibly foolish. I will go further and say that she asked for what she is getting. We read in the *Advertiser* of 28 January 1981 first of all somewhat of a deathbed repentance:

South Australia firm on health funding. The South Australian Government will not accept any moves to abandon present Commonwealth funding arrangements for Government hospitals.

At that time the panic was on—the red light was flashing. However, then the Premier, on the advice of his Minister said:

The South Australian Government is in favour of change. The Government wants the States to have more responsibility for the financial management of hospitals, not less. This could be achieved by absorbing present Commonwealth grants to the State for health purposes into the State's general purpose funds, their tax sharing entitlement.

Here we come to the nub of the problem. What this portrays on the part of the Premier, his Ministers and various other people supporting him is an incredible naivete about the political process. One would have

thought that they would learn from what happened in relation to pre-school funding during the last three or four years. The Whitlam Government funded 75 per cent of the salaries of people working in that system. That was a commitment from the Commonwealth right down to the local kindergarten level, the local pre-school centre. Where that commitment was in any way downgraded, obviously the political flak would explode on the Federal Government.

However, along comes the Federal Liberal Government saying, 'That is not good enough. What we want is real Federalism. We want the States to be making their own decisions in this matter, so we will give you a lump sum, and you will make your own decisions.' At that point, when the States were finally forced to accept that, the political pressure went right off the Commonwealth altogether. It is individual interest groups that mount pressure when it comes to the reduction of expenditure. They must know where the decisions are being made so that they can mount that pressure. As soon as the specificity of the funding is removed, that pressure goes right off, and that is what happened. What was the Commonwealth able to do? Of course, it was able not to index that block grant in the following years in the way that the 75 per cent had been indexed.

The result now is that the Minister of Education in this State has to find perhaps 75 per cent of the total whereas in those halcyon days I had to find only 25 per cent of the total, because the Commonwealth found the rest. The Commonwealth was able to get itself off the hook because the funds were no longer specific.

Moving from a specific grant to block funding is one thing. Going further and simply absorbing it into the general revenue grants is another. Where is the earmarking? How is it possible for the nurses, the hospital administrators, the consumers of those services to hit the Government over those reductions, to say that it has reduced its commitment in this area, if there is no way of quantifying what that commitment is? How does one know next year, if one will get simply an amount of money which is submerged within the overall tax sharing formula, whether the Commonwealth is maintaining its commitment to health or not? One will not know, because there is no way of tracing that money back. That is the problem.

We know how the political game operates. We know that politicians will endeavour to satisfy the demands of pressure groups, where possible, particularly in important and sensitive areas, such as education and health. The move to block funding or, even further, to the submergence of the whole of the funding in the general revenue grants is to remove that pressure altogether. The pressure then suddenly comes on the State. People say, 'The Commonwealth is giving you money, Mr Premier Tonkin (or Mrs Minister Adamson), so you make it up. You do the job.' Too bad if in fact the real effort from the Commonwealth has been substantially reduced and, on top of that, a Government has irresponsibly cut away its own taxation base. The pressure is still there. People say that there was a certain level of service last year, and they ask why that is not maintained for the present year.

In all of this, the Liberal Party in South Australia has aided and abetted its Commonwealth colleagues in their getting themselves off the political hook in these sensitive public funding areas, be they education, health, community welfare, or even now certain aspects of Aboriginal funding that are coming up for criticism. They have only themselves to blame. When last these matters were debated in the broad public forum of the Federal election, the Premier, one might have thought, might have distanced himself somewhat from the Prime Minister in

the matter, but no, his advocacy of the Prime Minister was quite outstanding. I mean that it was outstanding not in the sense that it had any particular merit but rather in the sense that it stood out indeed. Mr Hamer was not prepared to go to the wall for the Prime Minister in the way that our Premier was. Sir Charles Court certainly was not, and Mr Bjelke-Petersen, in Queensland, if in any sense he fell on the neck of the Prime Minister, did it not as a lover but as a vampire. Our Premier was prepared to take full-page advertisements and to praise to the skies the record of the Fraser Government, and now the chickens are coming home to roost. We can see the result of four or five years of advocacy of those conservative policies.

This Government, I am told, is reduced to the situation where its own razor gang is in fact determining the spending priority of Ministers. If the Premier is prepared to deny that this afternoon, I will be very pleased indeed, but it is well known and it is widespread in the Public Service that the Minister of Education will not be determining his budget, that the Minister of Health will not be determining her budget, and the Minister of Community Welfare will not be determining his budget. The razor gang will determine—our own local razor gang. Ministers have become quite irrelevant except as they go cap in hand to those three gentlemen in Cabinet who will make the final decision.

We are faced with a crisis in Australia and in this State because of the way in which the Liberal Government, throughout the country, has endeavoured to push its 'get off the hook' policies everywhere it has gone, and we see a hardening of attitude in the other States in this matter. To use Mrs Thatcher's language, everywhere around the country in the Liberal Party the wets are being knocked off and replaced by the dries. We see it with Mr McDonald now having gained leadership in New South Wales, with the coup exercised against Dick Hamer in Victoria, and in the way in which 'Red Fred' Chaney was passed over for preselection for the Lower House in Western Australia, because he was regarded as being too far to the left.

And so we go on. There is a crisis in Liberalism, because it has produced a crisis in this country. I never thought I would find myself saying this, but I must. If we have to put up with a Federal Liberal Government for the next two and a half years, or whatever it is—and I guess we do—it seems a pity that we have not got a Menzies around the place. Most of my adolescence and my young adult years were taken up with blaming every conceivable evil in the country on that man Menzies, but, looking back, we recall that he was basically a pragmatist. I should like to quote Mr Peter Tiver, in an article in the magazine *Politics of 1976*. Under the title *The ideology of the Liberal Party of Australia: A Sketch and Interpretation*, he said on page 159:

While Menzies sounded as vigorously anti-socialist as any in the 1940s, he held the view that capitalism must be managed and controlled so as to allay its known historical faults. In government, Menzies justified State expenditure and interference, not only on grounds of national security or practical urgency, but also by the argument that State action in providing facilities and information was a necessary complement of private enterprise activity.

That meant State action not only at the Commonwealth level but also at the State level. The Commonwealth is strangling the States at present. It has been calculated that costs of Commonwealth Government will continue to increase by a little more than 13 per cent per annum, while the States are faced with an increase for the next financial year of between 9 per cent and 10 per cent, once we take into account some making up for the loss of specific purpose grants. The Commonwealth is prepared to deny

the States that amount of largesse which it itself continues to exercise.

There are those people who say that lean government can very quickly become mean government. I disagree. I say that lean government always means mean government, and we see it and its ramifications now. Back in February of this year, the Police Commissioner had to plead for more police from a Government which, before it came to office, made such a song and dance about law and order. It may well be that the documents that have come before us show that at least some of the desires of the Police Commissioner have been met, but it is interesting that it was necessary to air this matter publicly. Why is it that this Government had to be so intransigent in relation to the whole matter of the school assistants? Why was it necessary for the Minister of Industrial Affairs and the Minister of Education to say that there was one aspect of the matter which was non-negotiable? It is because they had got themselves into such an appalling budgetary situation.

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

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (23)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin (teller), Wilson, and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mr Hemmings. No—Mr Becker.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1), 1981

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for all the purposes set forth in the Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure for the financial year 1980-1981 and the Appropriation Bill (No. 1), 1981.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act for the further appropriation of the revenue of the State for the financial year ending 30 June 1981, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In doing so, I propose to make a few brief comments about the State's general financial position before explaining the items in the Supplementary Estimates. I will, of course, give a detailed account of the financial operations for 1980-1981 when I introduce the 1981-1982 Budget to the House later this year.

In presenting the Revenue and Loan Budgets to the House last August, I said that the Government planned for a small deficit of \$1 500 000 on the combined operations of the two accounts for 1980-1981. It was planned to finance that small deficit from the accumulated surplus held on Loan Account as at 30 June 1980, and to have the combined accounts in balance as at 30 June 1981. However, there are a number of factors, including some which have been entirely beyond the control of the State Government, which will prevent our achieving that

objective. Those matters are set out in the remainder of the second reading explanation, which I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

First, wage increases, particularly work value wage increases, have far exceeded the substantial allowance incorporated in the original Budget. These record breaking increases have required some \$17 million over and above that allowance. I will have more to say about this in just a moment.

Secondly, and also beyond the State Government's control, interest on the public debt has exceeded Budget expectations, largely because of changes by the Commonwealth Government in the timing of issue and the interest rates of stocks which it has allocated to finance borrowings by the States. Present indications are that interest payment increases due to these reasons are likely to exceed the Budget estimate by about \$11 million.

Thirdly, and again outside the State Government's control, South Australia's general revenue grants from the Commonwealth will be below the Budget estimate. As members would know, for this year only, an interim formula based on individual State C.P.I. movements between March 1980 and March 1981 has been used for the calculation of each State's general revenue grant. Members would know also that South Australia's inflation rate is now lower than the figure forecast in the last Federal Budget and, as a result, the State's grant is some \$5 million below the estimate determined by the Commonwealth Government.

Fourthly, the Government introduced a voluntary early retirement scheme in September 1980 in the Public Buildings and Engineering and Water Supply Departments, in order to bring about a more appropriate relationship between the resources of the public sector and the private sector. While this action will have significant financial benefit to the Government in subsequent years, it has had a heavy impact of \$4.3 million in the current financial year.

Finally, the Government has had to make additional funds available to meet demands in a number of areas, particularly for education, for apprenticeship training undertaken by the Department of Further Education and to overcome urgent problems which arose in the Riverland region. Those factors have added significantly to the Government's expenditures in 1980-81. Although they have been offset, in part, by an increase in receipts on Revenue Account and savings on Loan Account, present indications are that the result on the combined accounts for 1980-1981 could be a deficit of some \$10 million.

As to the Revenue Account component, the original plan was for a deficit of \$16 million to be financed by a transfer from Loan Account, thus giving a balance for the year (that is to say, neither surplus nor deficit). For receipts, recent reviews suggest that land tax is likely to be up by about \$1.5 million, stamp duties by about \$2 million succession duties by about \$1.5 million as a result of the finalisation of a number of outstanding transactions, and interest on investments by about \$2.6 million.

Fuel licensing and motor registration fees, receipts from water and sewerage charges and the recoup from the Primary Producers Assistance Fund are expected to exceed the Budget expectation by some \$4.5 million, \$1.8 million and \$8 million respectively. After allowing for a number of other variations both above and below Budget (including general revenue grants which I have mentioned already), it now seems likely that, overall, receipts could

exceed the Budget estimate by some \$20 million.

As to payments, Special Acts are expected to exceed estimate by about \$14 million, mainly as a result of a larger transfer to the Highways Fund flowing from increased fuel licensing and motor registration fees and increased interest payments on the public debt, even though some specific details to make those interest payments have yet to be received from the Commonwealth. Expenditures on departmental and miscellaneous lines are expected to exceed Budget by about \$19 million, mainly as a result of the major factors I mentioned a moment ago. The expectation for increases in salaries and wages is now \$17 million higher than the large allowance provided in the original Budget.

Members will recall that a very large round sum allowance of \$79 million was set aside in this year's Budget for increases in wage and salary rates. This budgeting amount represented an increase of 41 per cent over the allocated figure of \$56 million in the previous year. However, present indications suggest that the amount required for wage and salary increases will be closer to \$96 million for the year, an increase of \$40 million, or 71 per cent over last year's allocation, and an increase of \$17 million over the allowance provided in the 1980-1981 Budget. That record increase has resulted from:

- Indexation increases of at least 7.9 per cent, and even more if the determination of the State Industrial Commission regarding flow-on of the most recent national wage adjustment impacts on this year's accounts.
- Work value decisions for most State Government employees. So far this year, school teachers have been awarded an interim increase of 4 per cent, other occupational groups, including engineers, correctional service officers, police and legal officers, have received work-value increases ranging from 7 per cent to 11 per cent, and most other Government employees have received at least a flat 5 per cent.

In all, a large majority of the Government work force has received a work-value increase this year, which together with indexation adjustments, has resulted in pay increases ranging from almost 13 per cent up to 19 per cent. In other words, wage and salary increases in the current financial year have exceeded inflation significantly, in some cases by as much as 9 per cent. And that is not the end of it.

Teachers currently are proceeding with a claim for substantial increases in salaries before the Teachers Salaries Board and, if granted in full, that claim could cost the Government up to \$28 million in a full year. It is worth bearing in mind that, at present, 90 per cent of the education budget goes in salaries, and, consequently, that this increase would add further to budgetary pressures without in any way improving the quality of education for our children in this State.

As I have said before, and it bears repeating, pay increases of this magnitude limit the Government's ability to outlay funds on new or expanded services, they impact considerably on the availability of funds for other purposes, and they lead to an inevitable reduction in employment opportunities. Well over half of the additional expenditure has been due solely to factors beyond the Government's control, for example, \$17 million for salary and wage increases, \$11 million for higher interest payments and \$1.3 million for additional pumping costs. A number of further items of expenditure have been made necessary as the long-term effects of initiatives and projects of previous Governments have become apparent.

In summary then, a planned deficit of \$16 million, increased payments of some \$50 million and an

improvement in receipts of perhaps as much as \$20 million could see an overall deficit of some \$46 million on the Revenue Account component for the year. Regarding the Loan Account component, the original plan was for a surplus of \$14.5 million before providing for a transfer to Revenue Account of \$16 million. The plan was to fund the small deficit of \$1.5 million from the accumulated surplus held on Loan Account as at 30 June 1980 and to leave the Loan Account in balance as at 30 June 1981 (that is to say, neither in surplus nor in deficit).

For several reasons, including a steady reduction in the labour force, competitive tendering for many contracts and work not proceeding as quickly as originally anticipated, it now seems likely that savings of some \$20 million may emerge on payments from the Loan Account. The main elements of the expected savings are about \$5.5 million for waterworks and sewers, \$8 million for State Transport Authority, \$2.3 million for other Government buildings, \$2.2 million for harbor works and \$1.5 million for Woods and Forests. There will be some other minor variations, both above and below budget.

As to repayments and recoveries from departmental sources, no major departure from the Budget estimate is expected. As a result of that saving of about \$20 million, it now seems likely that a surplus of as much as \$35 million could be achieved on the 1980-1981 operations of the Loan Account (before providing for any transfer to Revenue Account). While relatively small percentage variations could change the results on both the Revenue and the Loan Account components of the Budget by several million dollars, it seems likely that the Government could face a deficit of some \$10 million on the 1980-1981 operations of its combined accounts.

While a one time deficit of that magnitude is not in itself unmanageable, there are some aspects of the present and prospective Budget situation which are disturbing and which have underlying long-term consequences. First, wage increases granted in 1980-1981 have been considerable and they will have major adverse carry-over effects into 1981-1982 and the years beyond. Secondly, the hard line taken by the Commonwealth Government at the recent Premiers' Conference will place considerable pressures on the Budgets of all States.

May I remind members that our estimated receipts from personal income tax sharing for 1981-1982 are now down by some \$30 million as compared with the position under the legislation before amendment. While some relief might be gained from increased hospital receipts, members will be aware that the whole question of Commonwealth-State hospital funding arrangements is far from resolved. Those two factors combined set a very difficult background for Budget planning for 1981-1982.

In addition, the Loan Council's attitude to general purpose capital funds and to financing under the infrastructure programme for major development projects (including the Northern Power Station) will not be known until later this month. While I expect the Loan Council to adopt a more realistic approach to funds in these areas than in recent years and trust that the importance to the building and construction industry and to employment of at least maintaining the 1980-1981 level of funds in real terms will be recognised, it has been clearly indicated that overall, and in real terms, the level of funds likely to be available in 1981-1982 will be well below the level of funds available in 1980-1981.

As a consequence, a number of difficult and, in some cases, unpopular decisions will need to be taken if we are to manage our limited resources in the most effective and responsible way. We will have no option but to continue to prune expenditures and the Government's Budget review

committee is currently making a thorough examination of all operations of the Government. Our aim is to eliminate wasteful and unnecessary expenditures, to reorder priorities, and to ensure that an effective and efficient service is maintained for those who need it.

Regrettably, we will need to look at the income side of the Budget and we have taken steps already to increase some charges to bring them more into line with current costs. I will be introducing a Bill shortly to seek an increase in the licence fee payable by wholesalers under the Business Franchise (Tobacco) Act. My Government believes those actions to be necessary and, in the case of expenditure review, long overdue. We cannot afford to continue to finance our recurrent operations from capital funds indefinitely.

To continue to do so for a long period would be detrimental to the economy, particularly to the building and construction industry and to employment. It would jeopardise major development projects envisaged for the northern part of our State—projects which will have significant benefits for South Australia and the nation as a whole. However, when the availability of revenue funds is severely limited, as at present, it is necessary to adopt this approach to enable the State to maintain normal services to its people.

We will not resile from our responsibility to take all practicable steps to assist and encourage the development of this State for the benefit of all the people of South Australia. It is particularly pleasing to note, in this respect, that employment has risen by more than 13 000 in the last eighteen months and that job vacancies are currently treble the number of one year ago.

APPROPRIATION

Turning now to the question of appropriation, members will be aware that, early in each financial year, Parliament grants the Government of the day appropriation by means of the principal Appropriation Act supported by the Estimates of Expenditure. If these allocations prove insufficient, there are three other sources of authority which provide for supplementary expenditure, namely a special section of the same Appropriation Act, the Governor's Appropriation Fund and a further Appropriation Bill supported by Supplementary Estimates.

APPROPRIATION ACT—SPECIAL SECTION 3 (2) AND (3)

The main Appropriation Act contains a provision which gives additional authority to meet increased costs resulting from wage awards. This special authority is being called upon this year to cover most of the cost to the revenue Budget of a number of salary and wage determinations, with a small amount being met from within the original appropriations. However, it is available only to cover increases in salary and wage rates which are formally handed down by a recognised wage fixing authority and which are payable in the current financial year.

The main Appropriation Act also contains a provision which gives additional authority to meet increased electricity charges for pumping water. The consumption of water this financial year has exceeded the quantity collected naturally in catchment areas by a greater amount than was expected and it has been necessary to supplement natural collections by increasing the quantity pumped from the Murray River. The expected call on special appropriation is \$1.3 million.

GOVERNOR'S APPROPRIATION FUND

Another source of appropriation authority is the Governor's Appropriation Fund which, in terms of the

Public Finance Act, may be used to cover additional expenditure. The operation of this fund has been explained to the House on a number of occasions. The appropriation available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund is being used this year to cover a number of individual excesses above departmental allocations and this is the reason why many of the smaller departments do not appear on Supplementary Estimates, even though their expenditure levels may be affected by the same factors as those departments which do appear.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

Where payments additional to the Budget estimates cannot be met from the special section of the Appropriation Act, or excesses are too large to be met from the Governor's Appropriation Fund, Supplementary Estimates must be presented. Further, although two block figures were included in the Budget as general allowances for increases in salary and wage rates and in prices, they were not included in the schedule to the main Appropriation Act. To cover the cost of higher prices or of wage increases not falling within the scope of section 3 (2) of the Appropriation Act, the House is being asked now to appropriate moneys specifically for some part of these general allowances. I point out to members that, as usual, release of funds provided on Supplementary Estimates will be subject to my specific approval.

DETAILS OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

The details of the Supplementary Estimates are as follows:

TREASURY: An additional \$1 million is sought by Treasury Department. Of that amount, some \$250 000 is required for salaries costs of staff seconded from other areas of the service on the development of programme performance budgeting, delays in the redeployment of some surplus staff from State Taxation Office and increased requirements in regard to exemption of land tax on the principal place of residence. Related contingent costs have increased by \$100 000.

An amount of \$210 000 is required to meet payments in relation to the development of programme performance budgeting. An additional \$440 000 is required to provide for refunds and remissions of tax. Late last year, the Government decided to meet payments of pay-roll tax outstanding (\$396 000) in respect of Horwood Bagshaw's Mannum operations for the period July 1976 to December 1979, to honour an undertaking given by a previous Administration.

The remaining \$44 000 is represented by refunds of a general nature, including an amount of \$40 000 in respect of the licence fee payable by the S.A. Gas Co. in relation to sales at Whyalla and Mount Gambier. The arrangement is that a refund will be made where Sagasco can show that its operations at those centres have incurred losses.

TREASURER, MISCELLANEOUS: The Government is seeking to increase the provision for Treasurer, Miscellaneous in three areas. First, due chiefly to increases in oil prices, an additional contribution of \$140 000 is required for electricity subsidies in country areas. Secondly, it is likely that the State's borrowing programme this year will be financed from proceeds of Commonwealth Government bonds which have been issued at a discount. The cost of writing up to face value the proceeds of bonds allocated to South Australia is ultimately charged to revenue account. Thirdly, the Victoria Square (International Hotel) Act, 1980 provided for a payment to the Corporation of the City of Adelaide of \$500 000.

MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL AFFAIRS, MISCELLANEOUS: Additional appropriation of \$1.6 million is sought to

provide assistance to unsecured creditors of the Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative Limited and growers associated with the co-operative. \$350 000 has been included to provide for new apprenticeship training initiatives adopted by the Government this financial year. PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Additional appropriation of \$3.5 million is sought for this department to cover the cost of employees redeployed from capital works to special projects, increased cost of providing power and telephones to Government agencies and the effect of price increases in re-negotiating leases.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS, MISCELLANEOUS: Appropriation of \$1.4 million is required for the cost of bonus payments to employees in the Public Buildings Department under the Government's voluntary early retirement scheme.

EDUCATION: The Supplementary Estimates provide for an additional sum of \$7.7 million for this department. During the year, the Government approved such initiatives as: extension of the policy of replacement of classroom teachers on long service leave; appointment of additional staff for migrant education programmes; replacement of ancillary staff to cover absences on long service or other extended leave; and an increase in primary text book allowances. In addition, specific appropriation is now being provided for the cost of flow-ons from national wage increases which do not qualify for automatic increases in appropriation and for increases in charges incurred by schools, particularly in respect to fuel and power.

This additional sum, when coupled with funds made available to the Education Department from the round sum allowances to cover national wage and other wage increases handed down by the Industrial Commission in 1980-1981, will bring the total allocation of funds to the department in 1980-1981 to \$403.7 million. After making allowance for an additional pay period falling due in 1980-1981, this allocation represents a 12.3 per cent increase over the actual expenditure of the department in 1979-1980, and accordingly makes a nonsense of the current campaign of denigration of the Government for its alleged 'cuts' in education.

FURTHER EDUCATION: Additional appropriation of \$1.2 million is sought for Further Education. During the year, the Government has substantially increased the provision of trade training to accommodate industry demand for skilled tradesmen, particularly in the metal trades and building industries. The additional amount also covers extension of the adult migrant education programme which will have no net impact on the Budget because the cost is subject to reimbursement by the Commonwealth. However, appropriation authority is required for the expenditure.

POLICE: An additional \$1.25 million is required for this department. Of this amount, \$800 000 is required for increased salary costs and \$450 000 to cover additional contingency charges.

Terminal leave payments are likely to be \$435 000 above the original budget. This, together with other factors, including the continuing need to fund incremental wage increases, account for the additional salary requirements. The effect of price increases, particularly fuel costs, will result in additional contingency payments.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINISTER OF FORESTS, MISCELLANEOUS: To enable the full effect of the financial restructuring of the South Australian Meat Corporation to be reflected for the current financial year, appropriation of \$2.3 million is sought to provide for an adjustment payment to the corporation.

HIGHWAYS: An additional provision of \$1.75 million is sought for the Highways Department. Of that amount,

\$800 000 is required to cover the cost of preliminary investigations and work associated with the construction of the Stuart Highway.

The remaining \$950 000 is attributable to increased terminal leave payments, significant wage increases which have resulted in additional overhead costs and the effect of price increases. The additional provision has no Budget impact as it will be offset by a corresponding reduction in the amount transferred to the Highways Fund under special Acts.

ENGINEERING AND WATER SUPPLY: I have mentioned that it will be necessary to exercise the special authority granted under the Appropriation Act to meet increased electricity charges for pumping water. In addition, the Engineering and Water Supply Department requires a further \$2.7 million this year. The provision covers increased terminal leave payments, additional chlorination costs associated with increased water usage, significant wage increases which have resulted in additional overhead costs and the effect of price increases.

MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES AND MINISTER OF IRRIGATION, MISCELLANEOUS: Appropriation of \$2.9 million is required for the cost of bonus payments to employees in the Engineering and Water Supply Department under the Government's voluntary early retirement scheme.

In addition, appropriation of \$900 000 is sought to write off the additional cost of preliminary surveys and investigations on schemes which will not proceed.

Mr BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1), 1981

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the Government of South Australia during the financial year ending 30 June 1982.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to apply out of the general revenue the sum of \$260 million for the Public Service for the financial year ending 30 June 1982.

Read a first time.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill provides for the appropriation of \$260 million to enable the Public Service of the State to be carried on during the early part of next financial year. In the absence of special arrangements in the form of the Supply Acts, there would be no Parliamentary authority for appropriations required between the commencement of the new financial year and the date, usually in October, on which assent is given to the main Appropriation Bill. It is customary for the Government to present two Supply Bills each year, the first covering estimated expenditure during July and August and the second covering the remainder of the period prior to the Appropriation Bill becoming law.

Members will notice that this Bill provides for an amount greater than that provided by the first Supply Act last year. The increase of \$40 million is needed, partly to provide for the higher levels of costs faced by the Government, and partly to cater for the consolidation of Revenue and Loan Accounts into a single account which I explained fully to members when introducing a Bill to amend the Public Finance Act in December last. I believe this Bill should suffice until the latter part of August, when

it will be necessary to introduce a second Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 provides for the issue and application of up to \$260 million. Clause 4 imposes limitations on the issue and application of this amount. Clauses 5 and 6 provide borrowing powers.

Mr BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

OFFENDERS PROBATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 5 March. Page 3585.)

Mr KENEALLY (Stuart): The Opposition, in the main, supports the amendments to the Offenders Probation Act, as we should, because largely the Bill before us results from the work done by the previous Government in producing amendments to the original Act.

I notice that in his second reading explanation the Chief Secretary could not resist the opportunity to have a shot at the present Opposition by saying that it was surprising that it took the then Government so long to introduce the Bill. That is fair enough criticism, but on the other hand the Chief Secretary had a Bill ready to introduce in this House when the Government changed in September 1979 and here we are, twenty-two months later, now just debating the measure. I suppose the Government and Opposition in this respect may well be equal, but I do not wish to criticise the Chief Secretary on that score. It is his measure, he has introduced it to the House, and it would be churlish for me to say otherwise.

I expect when, in the immediate future, the Chief Secretary receives his knighthood and retires to his farm in the South-East he will be able to say that his time in Parliament was not wasted because he will have on the Statute Book legislation that is of value to South Australia and he can be pleased that he was the Minister who introduced it.

In explaining to the House why the Opposition supports the Bill I think I can do the Minister no greater courtesy than to read the opening of the second reading explanation which I think says what needs to be said about the purpose of this Bill. His opening paragraph was of great merit and expressed sentiments with which I agree, except in the conclusion, and I will deal with that later. The Minister said:

The principal object of this Bill is to implement a scheme whereby adult offenders may be put on a bond under which they are required to perform community service, as an alternative to a fine or imprisonment. Fines are often inappropriate as sentences both for persons who are impoverished and therefore simply unable to pay a fine, and for those for whom a fine of a couple of hundred dollars does not constitute a particularly serious penalty. Imprisonment is, in some cases involving offences of a less serious nature, also an inappropriate sentence in that the disruption caused to an offender's family as a result of loss of employment is counter-productive from every point of view. The community service scheme will offer an offender an opportunity to repay his debt to the community in a tangible manner and outside a prison environment.

Those sentiments are so well written and expressed that I cannot for the life of me believe that they have not been stolen, in a sense, from the previous Chief Secretary, the Hon. D. W. Simmons, who was about to introduce this legislation. The Minister and the Government completed the opening paragraph as follows:

The consequent reduction in the prison population will lead to obvious savings in money and resources, but of equal

importance is the hoped for rehabilitative effect community service may have on some offenders.

I would briefly like to comment on the attitudes expressed in that sentence, that the primary purpose of this legislation is to save Government money, and it is hoped that it will also have a rehabilitative effect. The Opposition believes that the primary purpose of this legislation is its rehabilitative effect upon the offenders, and the hope for savings in State finances is a by-product of that very worthy ideal. I think the Minister or whoever wrote the speech for him has his priorities wrong.

When the Labor Party in Government was considering this measure it was also considering the possibility of introducing legislation to further expand the sentencing options of the court, and it is in our policy that the court shall have available to it the provision of periodic detention. Whilst this is not a subject of this debate, it most certainly will be the subject of future debates in this House. I took the opportunity, as did the Minister and his departmental officers, to visit Tasmania and speak with Mr Miller, Mr Green, Mr Duncan, Mr Lonergan and other people in the Tasmanian Department of Justice who implemented this scheme. Incidentally, that scheme is acting as a tourist attraction for Tasmania. Every week someone from some State Government department or State Parliament is in Tasmania having a look at the community works order scheme, and so they should be, because this has been a most successful scheme in Tasmania and is certain to be, given the right encouragement and support, an equally successful scheme in South Australia.

The courts ought to have available to them the widest possible sentencing options, and I believe currently that this is denied them in South Australia. Where a magistrate has available to him or her the option of sending a person to gaol, imposing a fine, or providing a suspended sentence or a bond as the only options, it does make it a difficult choice. In cases of minor offences or offences that a magistrate does not believe warrant gaol sentences, the magistrate sometimes imposes a suspended sentence, and we know that a lot of offenders do not take such sentences as seriously as they might. I am not complaining about the suspended sentence; it is an option that should be available to the court, and I have faith in the magistrates to implement the sentences that they see fit. However, the community service order is an option that will overcome the current difficulty in which the sentencing magistrates are placed.

We should look at how the system works. Unfortunately, when the Chief Secretary introduced the Bill he gave only a brief precis of the matters contained in it. I believe that the Parliament is the appropriate place for the system to be explained. We saw the Minister's explanation in a full-page article in one of the local newspapers. Parliamentarians ought not to have to wait to see the system explained in the press; they ought to have available to them as part of the second reading explanation a full explanation of what it is that Parliament is debating and seeking to implement, and so I have a criticism in that respect of the Minister's second reading explanation.

In brief, if this Bill is passed and becomes part of the Offenders Probation Act, the court will be able to sentence offenders to do community service orders. In short, this means that the offenders will be allocated community activities in relation to either senior citizens groups, local government groups or Government department work that otherwise would not be done because funds are not available.

In Tasmania, the work allocated to the offenders has been summarised in a report called 'Evaluation of the

work order scheme'. I wish to quote from that report because it gives a resume of the work that is likely to be allocated, although that resume is not exhaustive and the authorities can determine any number of appropriate types of work for the offenders. The report states:

In looking at areas for projects several came readily to mind:

- (a) non-government institutions for the aged, infirm, handicapped, and children;
- (b) institutions receiving some State support, e.g.: sheltered workshops;
- (c) State institutions lacking regular maintenance staff, e.g.: Welfare Department Children's Homes.

Certain civic projects also commended themselves:

- (a) Parks, gardens and grounds of historic buildings not normally maintained by paid staff;
- (b) clearing or making bush-walking tracks and removal of bush-fire hazards;
- (c) improving or making picnic areas and children's playgrounds.
- (d) assistance to civic groups to develop local amenities for the benefit of the public.

I said that that list was not exhaustive, but I imagine that I was shown in Hobart similar work to that which the Minister saw. I visited a mentally retarded children's home where some significant service had been provided under this scheme, work that would otherwise not have been done because funds were not available. I visited pensioner homes where the pensioners spoke in the most glowing terms of work that had been done for them by an offender. I was told of an instance where a relationship developed between a young offender and a pensioner. When the sentence was completed the offender returned to the pensioner, continued to mow the lawn, chop wood and took an interest in the person, which benefited the young offender and the elderly person who had lost touch with younger people in the community.

Groups of offenders work at pensioner-type villages, constructing and maintaining gardens, work that would otherwise not have been done. One project was cleaning up the foreshore, a similar programme to the tidy towns project in South Australia. In South Australia work would normally be done by local council workers, members of the Australian Workers Union. One would not anticipate that work being done under the scheme here, except if the union in an area were agreeable, and if that work would not be done because funds were unavailable. The union would have to be absolutely satisfied that if the offenders under a community service order did the work it would not affect an existing job or prevent creating an additional job. Where that agreement was reached, there would be no problem. The examples I was shown were most encouraging.

Another advantage of the scheme is that courts can penalise people living in remote areas. I was assured in Tasmania that nowhere in that State would be as remote as some of the areas here in the Districts of Eyre and Mallee. No matter where you are there is always community work available. One could clean up an old cemetery or work on an historic building, maybe an old church in one of the rural council areas. That might not otherwise be done.

People living in remote areas who have been sentenced may have to report to a town, a place like Port Augusta or Port Lincoln, and serve their prison sentence. This scheme allows them to stay within the community, continue their employment and develop a community responsibility through the work they are doing. One thing that impressed me in Tasmania was that if the scheme is to be successful the Government must ensure that more than adequate funding is available. It is absolutely no good trying to

implement this scheme without funds, or depending completely on voluntary labour. The scheme must be an outstanding success; otherwise the confidence of those groups in the community whose support is necessary will be lost. Primarily, the support of the courts is needed. If the courts believe that it will not be successful, they will not use it as a sentencing option. If there is any possibility that it will not be successful through inadequate funding, the Government will be responsible for the court's lack of confidence.

The community at large needs to have confidence in this scheme. I will read an extract from the evaluation of the Tasmanian work order scheme that expresses the need for community support. Initially, the community's response will be that they will be concerned to have in their midst people who they see as offenders. The community is always concerned about offenders mixing with it. It is only when people become aware of the good that this does to the offender, and that the courts will not sentence offenders to this system unless they have confidence in their ability to conform with the requirements of this scheme, that we will get this support.

The third group whose support is needed for this scheme to be successful is the Trades and Labor Council. If there is any suspicion that this scheme will deny work opportunities to unemployed people in South Australia one can be absolutely certain that that, in itself, will help to bring the scheme down. I know that there are provisions in the Bill, to which I will speak later, to enable the Trades and Labor Council to be fully involved in the work allocated. It will also be given the opportunity to veto any work it believes is not suitable.

However, the Minister, in his second reading speech, said that the representative from the Trades and Labor Council will be able to veto work that the community service order committee might wish to allocate to this particular scheme, but he has not written that veto into legislation. It is a matter that we will canvass later. That has been written into the legislation in Tasmania to ensure that the veto does not depend on the word of the existing Minister. Of course, the words 'existing Minister' do not necessarily bind further Ministers. The Opposition would like to see that veto written into the legislation. I quote from page 17 of the Tasmanian report on the need to provide adequate funds:

As originally devised, the scheme was to some extent planned as an economic measure. It envisaged the use of existing probation and parole staff without addition and with the minimum of expenditure on equipment. These restrictions imposed problems of some magnitude on the service, but had the advantage of compelling the administrators to be innovative and inventive. Lack of funds and shortage of staff, however, are a quite severe hindrance to administrators and in this case successfully impeded the smooth development of the scheme. Programmes of this kind can operate economically and offer substantial cost-benefits to a community. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that they should be given adequate staff and funded accordingly.

The Tasmanian scheme came dangerously close to foundering on several occasions. It was due entirely to the heroic efforts of a few dedicated professional officers and support staff, with the assistance of a small group of citizen volunteers, who were convinced of the merits of the scheme, that it managed to survive and become a major force in the criminal justice system of the State.

I hope the South Australian Government learns from the Tasmanian experience and that it makes adequate provision to ensure that, when this system is introduced, it works effectively. It would be absolutely criminal for us to

find, six months after this scheme has been implemented, that it has foundered through lack of financial and physical support from the Government. I further quote from the Tasmanian report:

Another factor which posed something of a problem was the not unnatural suspicions of people and organisations that desperate criminals were to be foisted upon them, notwithstanding the generally favourable response at the time of the feasibility study. However, as time passed and the value of the scheme became more apparent community acceptance markedly improved and ultimately reached the stage when the Probation Service was being approached with requests for work to be undertaken throughout the State. I am sure that initial reaction will be the same in South Australia, but at least we have the experience of our colleagues in Tasmania to show the public that this will be a beneficial scheme, both for the offenders' rehabilitation and the community.

Another aspect of this legislation that we should consider concerns rehabilitation. While it is difficult to determine whether recidivism is less under this scheme than it would be if the offender was sentenced to prison or fined, nevertheless, there are some lessons to be learnt from Tasmania. Unfortunately, some of the information that I have here is some years old, but I believe it is relevant. The report further states:

The work order scheme was developed and introduced into the Tasmanian criminal justice system in 1972 as an optional alternative to short terms of imprisonment. It allows an offender to be sentenced to a maximum of twenty-five work order days which he must work one day per week on community projects. An operational analysis over twenty-six weeks showed a 63 per cent attendance, 25 per cent absence with permission, and 12 per cent absence without leave.

I point out that those figures have improved somewhat; I have quoted 1975 figures. The system is now much more efficient in terms of absence without leave, because some of those offenders who wanted to absent themselves without leave have been treated fairly severely by the courts, so offenders are now most anxious to comply with the requirements placed upon them by the community works officer or the probation officer. The report continues:

Poor conduct reports averaged 3 per cent, highly commended reports 6 per cent. A comparison of recidivism rates between the 1974 work order and short-term imprisonment groups showed that 47 per cent of the work order group committed further offences and 19 per cent subsequently went to prison, compared to 62 per cent and 40 per cent respectively for the short-term imprisonment group. However, as the prison group had a more extensive criminal record, it could not properly be compared with the work order group.

Of course, that is correct. It is unfortunate that it is difficult to determine exactly the extent of recidivism among those people as compared to other offenders. I am sure the department will keep its own records which, it is hoped, will show the rehabilitative effect on offenders in South Australia.

I further quote from the Tasmanian report, which gives an indication of the cost savings to Tasmania. These are in 1975 terms. It states:

The cost of operating the work order scheme, \$4.50 per man per week, is considerably less than the cost of imprisonment, \$117.11 per man per week, an estimated saving to the State of \$1 175 000 for 1975.

Those figures expressed in current day terms show a much higher saving. It is also of interest to note that in 1973 the Tasmanian Government was contemplating the construction of a new prison, but as a result of this system that

prison is no longer required. So, the system has had that advantage to that State. I suspect that would be a significant advantage to South Australia, where the prison system is put under extreme pressure by the limited number of available cells, and unfortunately the cells that are available are outdated. I am not in any way suggesting that that is the fault of the present Government, because it has not been in office long enough to be blamed for that, and I am not about to blame the previous Government either. Unfortunately, the facilities available to Departments for Correctional Services in all States of Australia, and, I suspect, in most countries in the world, have fallen behind the needs that the service has.

I have briefly outlined some of the aspects of this scheme, and I want to go into more detail during the Committee debate. There are one or two notable exceptions to the type of legislation that the Labor Party in Government would have introduced. Those exceptions exist in the Tasmanian legislation and are also included in the Bill before the Victorian Parliament.

The most significant is whether or not an offender participating in a community service order scheme is covered by compensation. It appears from this Bill that the Government in South Australia does not anticipate that that will be the case. If it was intended to be the case, it should have been included in the legislation. It is certainly written into the legislation of some other States. I do not know whether that is the case for all other States, but it is certainly contemplated to be written into the Victorian legislation. The member for Glenelg appears to be confused, so I will explain it to him. A person who is in regular employment and who has been allocated a certain number of hours to work under a community service order and who works, say, on a Saturday under the supervision of a community service officer or a probation officer, may be involved in an accident that prevents that person from going to his normal work for the next three or four weeks. What the Opposition is saying is that such a person ought to be adequately covered by the workers compensation scheme, because otherwise there is a double penalty; he is penalised as a result of his offence and because of an accident that occurred in fulfilling a court order. That could be a most disastrous situation if it was a serious accident. I foreshadow that the Opposition will be taking some action on this in the Committee stage.

When the Minister replies to the second reading debate, I want him to explain exactly how he proposes to implement this scheme following the requirement under new section 3a, subsection (5) which states:

The Minister shall promote the use of volunteers in the administration of this Act to such extent as he thinks appropriate.

It occurs to me that the Government might want to do this work on the cheap. In the other legislation I have studied, there is a provision that enables the Minister to pay supervisors of community works order personnel. That is not in our legislation, but the Minister may be able to point to a provision to the effect that he would be able to pay these part-time weekend supervisors, because there is no doubt that that would be required. If the Minister is to use volunteer labour, it is possible that a volunteer supervisor of twenty-six or thirty-six offenders on a Saturday might decide, on the Friday night, that, because he has no financial responsibility, he will go somewhere else and not do the supervision. The member for Glenelg—

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg is out of order. The honourable member for Stuart does not, I think, require his assistance.

Mr KENEALLY: The member for Glenelg disputes that this will happen. I refer any honourable member who thinks that this is not likely to occur to the situation in Tasmania, the only experience we can rely on. That is what happened there. The scheme there started off relying almost completely on voluntary labour. Now, the system is that all the supervisors who will supervise the large numbers of people involved are paid. There is still a one-to-one situation of an offender working with a pensioner, and the pensioner voluntarily supervising the offender, and there is still a situation of a group of offenders working in a pensioner-type village, where one or two pensioners will work with the offenders and act as supervisors. However, if we want responsible supervision of people on community service orders we will need to pay for that supervision, and there is no provision in the Bill to allow the Minister to do that. I ask him, when he replies to explain how the Government intends to implement this scheme.

I am not happy with two of the powers given to the Minister and the Director, and I cannot understand why the Director or the Minister would seek them. The first is that the Director will be given power to provide an extra 24 hours community work for an offender if the Director feels that the offender has not been conforming to the requirements laid down by the court or the probation officer. I believe that this is novel legislation. I know of no other instance in State legislation of a public servant having power to add to a penalty imposed by a court. There may be some examples, and perhaps the Minister can point them out to me, but I know of no case where a departmental officer or Minister of the Crown can increase the penalty allocated to an offender by the court. That is normally the jurisdiction of the relevant court.

The Minister and the Director are seeking this power so that the Director can impose a penalty in addition to that already imposed by the court, and I believe there are some dangers in that. I appreciate that an offender may prefer, if he or she is not conforming to the requirements of the recognizance, to be dealt with by the Director rather than go back to the court. The offender could take that point of view, and that is a matter that we will take up in Committee.

Secondly, the Minister is seeking power to change the recognizance in relation to supervision of an offender. The court will impose a certain penalty, and the Minister is required to supervise the offender. The Minister is seeking the authority to determine, without reference to the court, that the offender no longer requires supervision. Here we have a two-pronged effect: a Minister who is seeking to add to a court's penalty of his own volition, and a Minister who is seeking to reduce the recognizance of the offender, also of the Minister's own volition. I can see problems in a politician having that power, and a Minister of the Crown is a politician.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

Mr KENEALLY: I believe that it is the prerogative of the court to change the sentence; it is not the prerogative of a Minister of the Crown or a public servant. I hope the Minister will comment on that.

Mr Mathwin: Come back to reality.

Mr KENEALLY: I am speaking about reality. It is a judicial function, and this is novel legislation. If he wishes to dispute what I am saying, the member who interjected will need to point to an example in State legislation where this provision applies. If he cannot do that, his argument falls flat. If he can point to other examples, I am prepared to listen to him when he contributes to this debate.

In clause 7, new section 5c contains a provision by which the Minister intends to select from a panel of three names

provided to him by the Trades and Labor Council the person whom he will appoint to the Community Services Advisory Committee. We believe that the Trades and Labor Council should provide a nominee to the Minister, as is done in other States, and that the Minister should accept that nominee. This matter, too, we will deal with in Committee. I wonder whether I am talking to the Chief Secretary, the Minister in charge of the Bill, or to the chap behind him who resembles a river—nothing up top and big in the mouth. If he lets me—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the honourable member for Stuart that, although his remarks might not be strictly unparliamentary—

An honourable member: But truthful.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! His remarks are not in the best traditions of the House.

Mr KENEALLY: I appreciate that, Sir, but I was sorely provoked by the member for Glenelg, in case anyone who reads *Hansard* wants to know to whom the description referred. I would like the Minister's assurance that, within the system of committees to be set up to determine the type of work appropriate for these offenders, a woman will be included. In addition to the person nominated by the Director and the person nominated by the United Trades and Labor Council, I should like to be assured that there will be a woman on the committee and that, if it is possible, there should be also a representative from the Aboriginal community, which makes up a significant proportion of the people in our prisons, and certainly a significant proportion of the people before our courts.

Community service committees will be established around the State, and representation on each of those should include a Trades and Labor Council representative in addition to the magistrate, who will chair the committees, and in areas such as those you represent, Mr Deputy Speaker, and those I represent, at Port Augusta, where 75 per cent of the court's time is taken up in dealing with alleged and proven Aboriginal offenders, an Aboriginal member of the community should be part of the committee. I ask the Minister, when he replies, to give those assurances. If he is not prepared to do so, at least he should tell us why that is not the case.

I am concerned about several other matters. For example, clause 8 inserts new section 7, which states in part:

A probation officer to whom a probationer has been assigned for supervision may give reasonable directions to the probationer in relation to the following matters:

It is important that my colleagues and I be informed who is to determine what is reasonable and whether the offender has the right to appeal against what he considers to be unreasonable directions given to him. In addition, a person on a works order scheme may be complying completely with the instructions and directions given to him or her by a probation officer and those instructions may be entirely unreasonable. There should be a very close check on what takes place in determining the definition of 'reasonable'. I ask the Minister to consider the points I have made.

I have mentioned the Minister's seeking power to reduce a recognizance by not requiring an offender to be subject to supervision. All of those criticisms of the Bill are mechanical and the Government would be able to agree to them: they would not lessen the value of the scheme. The points I have raised would improve the scheme and make it much more acceptable to those people in the community whose support the scheme will need. We are very much in favour of the sentencing option; we believe it will have a rehabilitative effect on offenders. We are concerned at the current situation in which minor

offenders and civil offenders are sometimes placed in gaol with serious offenders because of the limitations upon the availability within the gaol system of appropriate segregation areas to cope with the different types of offenders who find their way there. We support this scheme for that reason.

We all know that the Chief Secretary is a genuine, humane man, and I ask him to consider the points I am making, because they will add to the merit of the Bill. I have deliberately foreshadowed the matters that the Opposition will discuss in the Committee stage, because I expect none of our amendments have been circulated to the Minister. I know that other members who have had the opportunity to listen to me will be able to consult the Minister. We support the measure and will move amendments at the appropriate time.

Mr CRAFTER (Norwood): I support the remarks made by the member for Stuart and welcome the introduction of this Bill. It is an important new initiative in the range of sentences available to the courts and in the ability of the sentencing process to rehabilitate offenders. The tragedy is that we do not have the information that should be available to the House. The Bill is of minor consequence: it is how it is to be administered that is of great importance. I suggest that the public has shown a great deal of concern in recent years in matters relating to law and order, activated by the present Government. The Minister stated on television that his Government is a law and order Government, that he had come to office on such a policy and that he intended to implement it. I would have thought this Bill would be very fully explained to the community so that there would be some understanding of it, particularly by those who are being asked to enforce or interpret this law (and I will talk about this matter a little later).

The Bill is simple and, apart from the amendments that the member for Stuart has mentioned, it is not controversial, but I guess that once the scheme begins to operate it will raise a great deal of controversy in the community and there will be much misunderstanding of its intentions. For that reason, I believe it is important that a full and frank disclosure of how and where the scheme will operate and who will be involved in its operation is quite vital. Further, we must know what sort of support will be received, what back-up services there will be from the various departments involved, what training will be given and what equipment and other facilities will be available. As I have said, this is an important new initiative in the ability of the sentencing process to rehabilitate offenders, and perhaps one should reflect briefly on the basic principles of the sentencing process as it is exercised in our courts.

It has been my understanding that there are four basic principles which the person sentencing an offender applies: first, to punish the offender, and that is probably well known and accepted in the community and is often emphasised particularly by those who are recipients of offences or who are harmed in some way. The first and obvious reaction is that the offender should be punished for what he has done. Perhaps less understood is the requirement that the sentence provide some reparation to those who have been harmed and to the community that has had its fabric weakened by the committing of an offence. We see this manifested in the introduction of schemes such as under the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, by which some monetary compensation is provided for a person who is injured as a result of criminal activity. The courts have direct power to ensure that the offender, if he has the means or ability or if he is earning

money, repays in monetary terms for the damage he has caused.

The third basic principle is the deterrent factor, and this is one upon which the community places great importance. This is reflected in announcements such as that made today by the Government, whereby it is believed that increasing sentences or the maximum term of sentences that can be provided by the courts is the most effective deterrent to the offender or others likely to offend. If there was capital punishment for expiation of a parking meter offence, it is said that no-one would let his meter expire.

Mr Mathwin: That is a silly example. Surely you would not deny that heavier penalties would be a deterrent.

Mr CRAFTER: The honourable member would know that many offences are committed without thought of the consequences, and this is one of the worrying factors in the sentencing process. One knows, for example, that capital offences, particularly murder, are committed in the heat of the moment. Most murderers—

Mr Mathwin: We wouldn't be letting murderers out on the community service orders, would we?

Mr CRAFTER: I am talking about the sentencing process. Many other factors must be considered other than placing an ultimate predominance on the effect of the deterrent value of the sentence. It is a trap into which many people in the community fall. I have tried to explain these aspects of the sentencing process to constituents who come to me in regard to the need for greater deterrent factors, particularly in regard to heavier or minimum sentences and the like.

Mr CRAFTER: Before the dinner adjournment, I was referring to the four elements that comprise the sentencing process. I had referred to the deterrent factor in sentencing and said that this often pervaded the discussions in the sentencing process and that, if it did loom as the largest factor in the sentencing process, one then had a poor administration of justice indeed.

The final point to which I refer is the rehabilitative factor in sentencing. This is, of course, probably the most vital factor. If the sentencing process does not provide for adequate rehabilitation of offenders, we will not have offenders returning normally to the community. There is always, then, the risk that they will further offend or be embittered and anti-social in their behaviour, and that, even if they do not offend again, they will not be responsible members of the community.

Of the various factors involved, the rehabilitative factor is the most important. That is why the Opposition welcomes this Bill. It provides for a more appropriate sentencing factor that will assist in the rehabilitation of offenders. As I said, there is, however, much to be learned about this scheme and how it will operate in this State. It is all very well to look at the schemes operating in other States and for the Minister to say that this has worked in the other States. However, we need to know how it will adapt to conditions in this State and the precise details of its application here.

As I have said, the community has clearly voiced its concern over law and order issues, and there is no doubt that the community is very disappointed indeed that this Government has reigned over a period of increasing criminality in our community, particularly in the area of violent crime, and that its policies have been shown to be lacking in the security that the Government promised to our communities. One hopes that programmes such as this will bring a new aspect to the sentencing process and that perhaps some new attitudes in relation to offenders will form in the community and in those involved in the criminal justice system.

The lack of detail is of great concern. The Minister said in his second reading explanation that this will relieve some of the cost burdens in our prison system. However, I suggest that that is indeed a simplistic attitude to take, as I should have thought that an increasing number of persons would be ordered to comply with these community service orders as a result of their introduction. Indeed, this would seem to be placing some burdens on the existing services to which the Minister referred in his second reading explanation as being responsible, namely, the local correctional services offices.

I should like to know what costing has been done and what assistance will be given to local correctional service offices and officers so that they can perform these extra duties effectively. For example, what facilities will be provided for transporting these persons to where they will work? What happens when the work program breaks down? For example, what happens if they are working in a rural area and, because it rains, those involved must return to their base? What special training will be given to staff working in this area?

This is a new responsibility and direction for correctional services. What materials and storage facilities therefor will exist? What provisions are made for maintenance of such simple facilities as lawnmowers, paint, and so on? How will these practical things be dealt with?

These are the sort of things about which we can be told and about which the community should know. Presumably, these are not cost burdens that will be transferred to the recipients of these programmes in the community or to local government. I am perhaps more concerned about the classes to which the Minister has referred, namely, the two-hour class periods which will be held each week and which will be part of the community service order. What curriculum will be provided for these classes?

One can also ask who will establish the classes. What standards will be maintained? What discipline will be maintained in the classes? Why are they being held? What is their aim? Who will be the teachers or instructors? How will they be conducted? Will there be more than one class? Will they be in small groups, or will they be large classes? Where will they be conducted? Will it be a burden and a difficulty for people to attend the classes when they conflict with their employment? I refer, for example, to shift workers, women with responsibilities to children, and so on. I have already asked where and why the classes will be conducted.

We have not been told these things. Undoubtedly, they can be of great value if conducted sensibly and thought out. Although we do not know the Minister's or the department's plans, we are being asked to approve this Bill. We know that previously some traffic offenders have been required to attend lectures. Is that the sort of concept contemplated by the Minister? If it is, one would have grave doubts about its effectiveness and value, particularly in the rehabilitative process.

The aspect of reallocation of staff to provide for the scheme is also vital. If there is to be a reduction in numbers of inmates in our prisons as a result of community service orders, does it mean a reallocation of excess staff from the prison service into the correctional services to supervise and maintain certain standards of the community service order programme? If that is so, will those staff be trained in a certain way? How will they be chosen, or will new staff be chosen?

There is a great difference between custodial sentences and these forms of non-custodial sentence, and the sort of people who administer them and their abilities to bring out of offenders what is aimed for in the whole program.

Then, we have not been told about the problems that could occur. Where we have a non-custodial sentencing system, the human factor is involved, and many things can go wrong. What happens when a person is ill and does not turn up? What about the situation where an employer sends someone off to the country at short notice and the person's job is at risk, and when that person goes and cannot attend on those orders? A sole parent could have responsibilities for children, and institutional care is not available for children on the weekends.

These are all practical problems. Who will care for such people and follow up these sorts of problem so that these orders can work properly? These are many of the unanswered questions that should be answered. The community should know how this programme will operate. It is an innovative programme that depends very much on the way in which the community accepts it. There is every chance that the program will succeed and that the community will accept it well. However, part of it is an education process and that has not yet begun.

I hope that some of the information that the Minister will impart to the House tonight will allay those fears and will begin the educational process, which is so important, so that offenders who are embarking on this sort of programme will not be seen by the community and those with whom they are working closely as criminals and people who are to be treated indifferently and negatively, but rather that they will be treated as people who are serving out their sentences and paying their debts to the community in a certain way.

In fact, they want to return to the community like other people surrounding them and to live a normal responsible life. As I have said, this legislation is the facilitating factor in this matter. What I want to know is how the programme will be administered, how much it will cost, and how the various human factors that will determine its effectiveness will be worked out.

Mr ABBOTT (Spence): I support the Bill, and I also support the remarks that have been made by the members for Stuart and Norwood. My interest in this Bill relates to the performance of community service as an alternative to a fine or imprisonment. As this is the principal object of this Bill, I want to speak briefly to it. I have compared the amendments to the Offenders Probation Act contemplated for South Australia with the Probation of Offenders Act in Tasmania, especially in relation to the work order or community service sections of both Acts. From this comparison and from reading the Minister's second reading explanation, several issues have emerged which should be brought to the Minister's attention.

The first point is in relation to the selection of Trades Hall members. New section 5c(1) (a) of the South Australian Bill requires the nomination of a panel of three members by the United Trades and Labor Council. One of whom will be appointed by the Minister to the Community Service Advisory Committee. Yet section 5c(1)(b) of the Bill allows the Director of Correctional Services to nominate one person. This seems to me to discriminate against the U.T.L.C. and treats it as being in some way less responsible to nominate an appropriate candidate than is the Director of Correctional Services. Why could not the U.T.L.C. nominate one member? In this context, it is worth noting that in Tasmania the Trades and Labor Council nominates a single member as per section 16 (2)(a). I believe that one member should be nominated by the Trades and Labor Council, with perhaps a provision to allow for a proxy delegate. The member for Stuart has already mentioned that he will be moving an amendment in relation to this provision. I will certainly be supporting

that amendment.

The second issue involves the alleged veto on committee guidelines by the U.T.L.C. member. The main function of the Community Service Advisory Committee as stated in the Bill is the establishment of guidelines for the approval of tasks and projects to be carried out by probationers. This provision is important because of the danger of destroying work opportunities for the unemployed by the use of unpaid probationary labour. In his second reading explanation the Minister appears to remove union fears on this issue by stating:

The committee member appointed from the panel nominated by the Trades and Labor Council will have the power to veto any particular guidelines proposed by the committee.

However, this provision, as has been pointed out by the member for Stuart, does not appear in the Bill at all. Such a provision is included in the Tasmanian legislation. Section 16 (2) (b) states that a committee appointed under the Act shall not decide upon a form of work or activity for the purposes of the Act without the concurrence of the member so nominated. It seems quite clear to me that it is possible to write such a provision into this Bill.

My third comment is in relation to the two-tier committee system. In South Australia the Community Service Advisory Committee is established to formulate guidelines for the approval of projects and tasks. Other committees (community service committees) have the function of approving, within the guidelines, projects and tasks. These committees will therefore interpret the guidelines established by the advisory committee, and it is noticeable that they need not contain union membership. This could be important if the guidelines are interpreted in a way not approved by the U.T.L.C. member on the advisory committee. Of course, it may not be possible to have union representation on all community service committees. The number to be established is left indeterminate by the Bill and there may eventually be too many for union representation on all to be practicable. In Tasmania, there is a single committee which decides on actual work projects and is subject to a Trades and Labor Council veto.

One of the advantages of the South Australian Bill is that it specifies the type of work to be undertaken by probationers. The Bill states that projects must not be undertaken if they would replace people in paid employment. That work must be carried out for non-profit organisations, or government bodies. It is also stated that work should benefit disadvantaged groups within those organisations. To some extent these provisions modify some of the reservations I expressed earlier. However, in practice there might be problems in defining projects which could not be done by an employed person or a person seeking employment. For example, would painting a pensioner's cottage or performing various gardening tasks cost an unemployed person some temporary employment? I think this provision should be watched very closely.

It is interesting to note at this point that the Government seems to place some emphasis on the importance of the community service to be undertaken by the probationers. It thus admits that there are many areas in which the disadvantaged in the community could benefit by such work, but is prepared to act only to the extent of requiring a small number of unpaid probationers to fill the gap. In South Australia, probationers, as well as being required to work on Saturdays or Sundays, are required to attend community service centres (set up for the purpose of the Act) for two hours in the evening for one day per week. At these centres they will be required to participate

in courses of instruction. These courses are not defined in the Act, and the Minister might like to explain what the Government has in mind, as there is no provision to attend such centres in the Tasmanian Act.

I am in possession of a Tasmanian report on the first year of the probation and parole service of the Tasmanian scheme. The report for 1972-1973 contains some very interesting statistics on probation (conditional discharge); fine and probation; prison and probation; the number of Saturday work orders made in various districts; an analysis of work orders showing age and offences; and Saturday work statistics showing work projects and man hours in the Hobart, Launceston, Devonport and Burnie divisions. I seek leave to have those tables included in *Hansard* without my reading them.

The SPEAKER: Do I have the honourable member's assurance that those tables are purely statistical?

Mr ABBOTT: Yes, Mr Speaker.

Leave granted.

TABLE E

Statistics for the Year 1972-1973—Probation (Conditional Discharge)

	Male	Female
Number under supervision as at 1 July 1972	463	96
Number assigned during year	380	80
	843	176
Less completions	256	70
	587	106
Less breakdowns	6	—
Number under supervision at 30 June 1973	581	106

TABLE F

Statistics for the Year 1972-1973—Fine and Probation

	Male	Female
Number under supervision as at 1 July 1972	361	20
Number assigned during year	182	11
	543	31
Less completions	215	12
	328	19
Less breakdowns	2	—
Number under supervision at 30 June 1973	326	19

TABLE G

Statistics for the Year 1972-1973—Prison and Probation

	Male	Female
Number under supervision as at 1 July 1972	217	10
Number assigned during year	93	4
	310	14
Less completions	106	4
	204	10
Less breakdowns	4	—
Number under supervision at 30 June 1973	200	10

TABLE H
Number of Saturdays Work Orders Made (In Districts) Year 1972-1973

	Hobart	Launceston	Devonport	Burnie	Females	Totals
Number on work orders current at 1 July 1972	38	19	7	12	—	76
Assigned during year	181	44	43	62	9	339
Sub-total	219	63	50	74	9	415
Less Successful completions	96	24	25	27	4	176
Sub total	123	39	25	47	5	239
Less Breakdowns	2	—	3	4	—	9
Sub-total	121	39	22	43	5	230
Transfers in	9	2	7	11	—	—
Transfers out	3	8	8	10	—	—
Number of work orders at 30 June 1973	127	33	21	44	5	230

TABLE 1
Analysis of Work Orders Showing Age and Offences—Year 1972-1973

	Age						Also on Supervision	Steal	Break and Stealing	Enter	Unlawful Use	Assault Police	Assault Offences	Driving Offences	Damage to Property	Dependants	
	16-17	18-20	21-24	25-30	31-40	Over 40										Wife	Children
Males:																	
Hobart	49	66	38	17	7	4	117	35	20	33	28	—	36	10	19	54	92
Launceston	9	26	3	5	1	—	19	10	4	10	6	1	6	2	5	4	10
Devonport	12	13	10	6	—	2	27	7	3	6	6	—	12	2	7	11	20
Burnie	20	19	16	4	1	2	34	8	9	10	6	1	14	5	9	10	16
Sub-total	90	124	67	32	9	8	197	60	36	59	46	2	68	19	40	79	138
	TOTAL=330							TOTAL=330									
Females	1	3	1	2	—	2	4	6	—	—	1	—	—	—	2	5	7
	TOTAL=330							TOTAL=330									

TABLE J
Saturday Work Statistics Showing Work Projects and Man-hours
HOBART DIVISION

Organisation or Project	Man-hours Worked		
	As at 1.7.72	During Year 1972-1973	Total as at 30.6.73
Lillian Martin Home for Aged ...	192	1 576	1 768
Elim Salvation Army Home ...	80	144	224
Tasmanian Youth Theatre ...	96	160	256
Strathaven Lodge ...	180	352	532
Lady Clark Geriatric Centre ...	384	2 175	2 559
Presbyterian Home for Aged— Sorell ...	88	176	264
Maylands Salvation Army Home	96	352	448
Corumbene Home for the Aged ...	48	184	232
Hobart City Council—Domain ...	64	2 694	2 758
Elderly Persons Units ...	32	248	280
Dover Cemetery ...	8	24	32
St Ann's Hospital ...	32	312	344
Triabunna Cemetery ...	—	96	96
Freemasons' Homes ...	—	216	216
Canine Defence League ...	—	276	276
Richmond Cemetery ...	—	152	152
Pensioner—Risdon Vale ...	—	184	184
Rosny Progress Association ...	—	240	240
Lambert Park ...	—	2 554	2 554
Lauderdale Progress Association	—	1 160	1 160
Kettering Cemetery ...	—	432	432
Glenview Home for Aged ...	—	48	48
Remembrance Homes—Huon- ville ...	—	64	64
Esperance Cemeteries ...	—	16	16
Belle Vue Chapel ...	—	352	352
Pensioners—Hobart ...	—	104	104
Cultural Centre—Kingston Beach	—	80	80
Lenah Valley Kindergartens ...	—	104	104
Granton Reserve ...	—	336	336
The Priory—Rokeby ...	—	40	40
Pensioners—Geeveston ...	—	36	36
Poimena Reserve ...	—	168	168
Nubeena Cemetery ...	—	8	8
Total ...	1 300	15 063	16 363

TABLE K
Saturday Work Statistics Showing Work Projects and Man-hours
LAUNCESTON DIVISION

Organisation or Project	Man-hours Worked		
	As at 1.7.72	During Year 1972-1973	Total as at 30.6.73
Coinda ...	288	452	740
Eskleigh ...	72	44	116
St Giles ...	80	112	192
Aldersgate ...	16	44	60
Orana ...	32	340	372
St Marys Hospital ...	—	24	24
Toosey Hospital—Longford ...	—	160	160
Scottsdale Hospital ...	—	32	32
Beresford House ...	—	440	440
Ainslie House—George Town ...	—	288	288
St Vincent's Hospital—Launces- ton ...	—	40	40
Branxholm Medical Centre ...	—	128	128

Organisation or Project	Man-hours Worked		
	As at 1.7.72	During Year 1972-1973	Total as at 30.6.73
Pensioner—Launceston ...	—	84	84
Eventide Homes—Launceston ...	—	192	192
Mowbray Swimming Pool ...	—	28	28
St Oswalds Church ...	—	380	380
Canine Defence ...	—	56	56
Total ...	488	2 844	3 332

TABLE L
Saturday Work Statistics Showing Work Projects and Man-hours
DEVONPORT DIVISION

Organisation or Project	Man-hours Worked		
	As at 1.7.72	During Year 1972-73	Total as at 30.6.73
Roland Boys Home ...	256	—	256
Elderly Citizens—Latrobe ...	72	92	164
Mount St Vincents Nursing Home	40	96	136
Meercoff ...	48	636	684
St Vincent de Paul ...	72	1 364	1 436
Leo Project (Pensioners) ...	48	104	152
Henley-on-Mersey Project ...	32	120	152
Castra Road Children's Play- ground ...	—	40	40
Devonport Apex Project ...	—	72	72
Recreation Ground—Railton ...	—	156	156
Anzac Park—Ulverstone ...	—	200	200
Don Reserve Clearing ...	—	508	508
Lions Park—Railton ...	—	148	148
St Patrick's Convent ...	—	16	16
Total ...	568	3 552	4 120

TABLE M
Saturday Work Statistics Showing Work Projects and Man-hours
BURNIE DIVISION

Organisation or Project	Man-hours Worked		
	As at 1.7.72	During Year 1972-73	Total as at 30.6.73
Smithton Boys Club ...	40	48	88
Spencer Old Folks—Wynyard ...	24	—	24
Anzac Memorial Park ...	16	476	492
Renison Bell Recreation Facilities	40	144	184
Blythe Heads Improvements ...	64	72	136
Mawbanna Hall ...	—	56	56
Stoney Creek ...	—	1 489	1 489
Rosebery Apex ...	—	88	88
Pensioners—Burnie ...	—	136	136
Irishtown Hall ...	—	192	192
Flowerdale Cemetery ...	—	80	80
Wynyard Convent ...	—	112	112
Stella Maris School ...	—	104	104
Catholic School—Rosebery ...	—	48	48
Queenstown Convent ...	—	128	128
Elderly Citizens—Burnie ...	—	104	104
Pensioners—Wynyard ...	—	360	360
Savage River Stables ...	—	64	64
Rural Fires Board—Queenstown	—	96	96
Emmerton Park ...	—	232	232
Civil Defence—Burnie ...	—	112	112
Marist College—Burnie ...	—	120	120
Preolenna Pre-school ...	—	64	64
Umina Park ...	—	124	124
Luina Community Golf Course ...	—	72	72
Pensioners—Ridgley ...	—	72	72
Somerset Jaycees Project ...	—	32	32
Riana Area School ...	—	112	112
Acton Primary School ...	—	32	32
Smithton High School ...	—	48	48
Total ...	184	4 817	5 001

Mr ABBOTT: Two further matters worthy of comment relate to the maximum period of work orders and workers compensation. In South Australia, there is a minimum of 40 hours and a maximum of 240 hours a year for which work orders can be issued. An extra 24 hours can be ordered for breach of the work order in addition to the 240, if necessary.

In Tasmania no minimum period is specified. The maximum is 25 days per year, but no specified number of hours per day is mentioned. However, for offences against the Act, the number of days worked can be increased by a further 25. There is a vast difference in respect of this particular provision, and the Tasmanian provision seems to me to be much more flexible than the proposition in this Bill.

In relation to workmen's compensation, in Tasmania honorary probation officers and persons employed under the Act are deemed to be Crown employees for the purposes of the Workmen's Compensation Act. They are deemed to be paid at a rate of equal to the basic rate defined in the Workmen's Compensation Act, or at their average weekly earnings, but there is no similar provision in the South Australian Bill. When the Minister replies to this debate, he may care to explain the status of probationers and honorary supervisors if they are injured in the course of their duties. I hope that the Minister will take the opportunity to explain that and the other matters I have raised. I support the Bill.

Mr MATHWIN (Glennelg): I support this Bill. In fact, I think it is a very good Bill and it is one that particularly interests me. As the Minister said in his opening remarks, the Dunstan Government did quite a bit of research on this matter, but that Government failed to grasp the nettle and bring the Bill into this place. The member for Stuart said earlier that his Party should be given some recognition for the Bill. Let me remind him that it took his Party eight long, weary years before it decided that it might even bring it into the House, but even then it failed to do so. I do not know what credit the member for Stuart expects to get for his Party being so responsible for bringing this matter before the House.

This Bill applies to adult offenders. It will provide an alternative sentence to fines and imprisonment and will perhaps give offenders some satisfaction of doing something worthwhile in the community and it will provide some recompense to the victims of crime. I hope that my Government will bring in together with this community service order a retribution provision whereby the victim can get some recompense for damage caused to him or her by an offender. In fact, retribution orders could well work very well with this scheme. An amount could be allotted by the court for damage done to the victim, and the offender would be obliged to work that amount off at a set charge in order to repay the victim for the damage inflicted.

The member for Stuart made a great deal of what the Minister had said. Indeed, he suggested that the Minister emphasised the fact that the Bill would help relieve overcrowding of prisons in this State. Let me remind him of what the Minister actually said (*Hansard*, page 3583):

The community service scheme will offer an offender an opportunity to repay his debt to the community in a tangible manner and outside a prison environment. The consequent reduction in the prison population will lead to obvious savings in money and resources, but of equal importance—and let me stress these words to the member for Stuart, who did not mention this part—

is the hoped for rehabilitative effect community service may have on some offenders.

The Minister said that that was of equal importance, and he did not say what the member for Stuart attributed to him, that the main emphasis was placed on reducing overcrowding in prisons.

Mr Keneally: It ought to be on rehabilitation.

Mr MATHWIN: That is exactly what the Minister said. The member was probably not here when the Minister said it, but at least he should read the second reading explanation and then he would realise that the Minister put those two matters as of equal importance. As the member for Stuart would know there will indeed be advantages in rehabilitation in this sort of scheme; there is no doubt about that. I am sure that the honourable member would realise that there are some benefits that will go to the offender. Equally, though, benefits should go to the victim, too. In my estimation that is of equal importance. Of course, the offender has the advantage of keeping out of prison, and he or she gets the advantage of working within the community and doing some good for those in the community.

The maximum number of hours to be worked under this type of scheme is 240. This time will be worked on Saturdays in general. I agree with that entirely. Some people have said to me that it could apply on any day of the week. I do not believe that is the best idea. If these people are to be given the advantage of not going to prison, then at least they should be disadvantaged to the extent that at least it will take away some of their leisure time if they are obliged to work at week-ends, particularly on Saturdays, when I suppose that most would normally go to sporting events.

In addition, they will be required to attend evening classes, which will last about two hours, within the city in which they live. We must remember that we are dealing in another area of parole, and one gets familiar with the situation of parole. However, I believe that we should never forget that parole is a privilege and not a right. It is not a prisoner's right to get it, but a privilege he is given. Prisoners should remember that and, if they do not, they should be reminded of that situation very frequently. Emphasis should be taken away from the offender and more emphasis should be given to the victims of crimes. The member for Stuart misquoted the Chief Secretary on a number of occasions. I hope that the honourable member has now seen the Chief Secretary's remarks as reported in *Hansard*.

The member for Stuart is worried about what type of work offenders will be doing and about how the system operates in other Australian States. I understand that this situation prevails in a number of countries throughout the world. We are not leading the world in this matter although, if we had proceeded eight years ago when the member for Stuart's Party was in power, we might have led the world in some aspects of this scheme. Of course the honourable member's Government was too afraid to grasp the nettle and take the initiative in this matter, because it had some worries about the situation.

Had the Labor Government done that eight years ago when the report was produced, perhaps the honourable member could have claimed some credit. I have found that the scheme has been operating in several countries. In Munich, which I recently visited, community service orders have been working successfully for three years in relation to young people. From the information I gleaned on my visit to Munich, I understand that it also operates successfully in conjunction with adult courts.

In Munich, the system operates with a number of volunteers. One method used to obtain volunteers in Germany is to approach people who are studying law in the universities—and we have a few of them in this

House—and to suggest they should take an interest in this matter and become volunteers in the scheme. It will be an advantage to them in their daily avocation when they complete their studies to have some knowledge in this field. Such people are coaxed to take an interest in the scheme and to become volunteers.

I point out to the member for Stuart that the scheme works well in West Germany, especially in Munich. The member for Stuart said he was worried about the situation regarding the financing of the scheme, and I agree with him entirely (rarely do the member for Stuart and I agree, but this is one area where I agree with him) that they should never run out financially on it. The Munich authorities found financial difficulties while I was there, but they were immediately granted another 2 000 000 Deutschmarks to carry on the programme until the end of the financial year. As two marks amount to about \$1 that is a fair amount of money. West Germany is in a far better situation to raise money because of the large population—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: It is about \$1 000 000.

Mr MATHWIN: I am glad the member for Mitchell is able to prompt me in regards to the actual cost.

Mr Abbott: He is always helpful.

Mr MATHWIN: He is. The member for Stuart has challenged me to indicate in what areas this scheme is working and how they were proceeding with community service orders and the like. Therefore, I can tell the honourable member that the scheme is operating well and has been operating well for some time in America, in Massachusetts, in California, and in Detroit. It works well indeed in a number of Canadian provinces. In those areas there are many volunteers from different community organisations. I refer particularly to the communities of Windsor, Winnipeg and Vancouver.

I was surprised that the member for Stuart expressed concern about new clause 5c, which relates to the membership of the board. I would like to put the honourable member's mind to rest about the situation. This new section provides for a nominee of the United Trades and Labor Council. The honourable member said that one member should be a woman and that one should be an Aboriginal.

Mr Lewis: Why should it be an Aboriginal?

Mr MATHWIN: He said it was because we have many Aborigines in gaol, and that there are more Aboriginal offenders. I suppose that is correct, particularly in the juvenile areas. I can see the merit in the honourable member's argument, but I still believe the situation rests with the people who are to be nominated from the United Trades and Labour Council.

Has the Labor Party a trade union secretary or a union organiser who is an Aboriginal? I doubt that it has, because the Liberal Party is the only Party with an Aboriginal in Parliament. That is something that the Labor Party cannot claim. We represent the whole of the State, and in Canberra we have an Aboriginal Senator—Senator Bonner—which is more than the socialist Party can claim. It has not even one Aboriginal representative, and I doubt whether it has any Aboriginal members of its Party.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to come back to the clauses of the Bill.

Mr MATHWIN: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your protection.

The SPEAKER: It was a direction.

Mr MATHWIN: Yes, Mr Speaker. The member for Stuart suggested that we ought to have an Aboriginal on the board, but we have here a provision for an appointee from persons nominated by the United Trades and Labor Council, and it will be open to the council to nominate any

person that it believes is fit and proper to be on the board. Therefore, I suggest to the member for Stuart that he forage amongst his union secretaries, treasurers and organisers to find an Aboriginal, if the Labor Party has one, which I doubt, because it is not represented by such people and that Party does not work in the same way that we do. The Labor Party does not allow such people to climb so high.

If the Labor Party has such a person, I suggest to the member for Stuart that that person, be it a man or a woman, be nominated, and I am sure that the Chief Secretary would be delighted to consider that nomination. The situation is clearly in the hands of the member for Stuart and his colleagues at Trades Hall. New section 5c (1) provides the opportunity for the honourable member and his colleagues to nominate a lady or an Aboriginal. That resolves the problem, and it should set to rest the mind of the member for Stuart. The new section provides that one person shall be nominated by the Director.

Mr Keneally: Why should that person not be a female or an Aboriginal?

Mr MATHWIN: Why not? However, as it is the concern of the member for Stuart and his colleagues, the member for Stuart or his Party should nominate such a person or persons. If the member for Stuart can produce a trades union secretary who is an Aboriginal and a woman, perhaps we will take her up.

Mr Millhouse: Don't forget that the Labor Party is a sexist Party. Barbara Wiese said that today in the *Canberra Times*.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MATHWIN: That is precisely the point I am making. I am indebted to the member for Mitcham for bringing it forward.

Mr Millhouse: It is a sexist Party. She said so. It is in the paper, and I brought it with me for you to look at.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is the honourable member for Glenelg who has the call.

Mr MATHWIN: The member for Mitcham took the words out of my mouth: I was thinking along those lines.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I wish someone would put some in there.

Mr MATHWIN: Every time the Deputy Leader opens his mouth he puts his foot in it. However, on a serious note, we are talking about methods of parole. Parole should be regarded by the Government, the prison authorities, and the prisoners as a privilege, and not a right. Let me quote from some comments by the *Listener* in June 1979.

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: The Deputy Leader had a fair run this afternoon without an interjection from me.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: That's unusual.

Mr MATHWIN: I let him have a good run, and I think it is only fair that he should give me a fair run tonight.

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader has had too much to say.

Mr MATHWIN: In June 1979, speaking of people going up for review and parole, the *Listener* said that good behaviour in prisons did not guarantee parole, and that the committee's first consideration was public safety. I could not agree more: the first responsibility of the Parole Board is public safety.

The member for Stuart expressed concern about suspended sentences, and I share his concern. I read in the paper recently of an incident that occurred in the district of the member for Rocky River. A young man told his girl friend to get out of his car and, when she did so, he ran her down and killed her.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw to the honourable member's attention that this matter is presently *sub judice* as a result of an action taken by the Attorney-General.

Mr MATHWIN: I thought that the matter had been concluded. I realise that there has been an appeal, and I apologise for raising it. Suspended sentences generally, in my opinion, leave much to be desired. I believe that the courts, especially over the past two years, have been more than lenient in many cases, and I would be the first to criticise them for the way in which they have handled some cases, with suspended sentences for people who should have had far more severe sentences. I shall say no more on that, but I am concerned about the way in which the courts are handling the situation. Certainly, they are not taking the responsibilities they are given, and they are not using the power and the teeth which they have to impose the sentences which I believe some offenders deserve.

The member for Norwood was concerned about the area in which people were more concerned with punishment and retribution. Let it be known that my concern is more for the victim than for the offender. It is a drastic situation that matters are coming before the courts in which the victim is the worst sufferer, while the offender appears to get off too lightly.

I support the Bill, and I hope members of the Opposition will do likewise. It was their Government, eight years ago, that brought down a report on this matter, and the legislation is long overdue, so I hope they will support the Bill.

Mr McRAE (Playford): I support the Bill, and I begin by congratulating my colleague, the member for Stuart, on his first contribution as the shadow Minister in this area. It will not be his last, and it will pre-figure his appearance on the Government benches in the not so distant future when the real problem of law and order in this State will be tackled. I was surprised by part of the speech of the member for Glenelg. He has a capacity to surprise me every now and again, although I have grown hardened to that over the years. However, I was amazed that he should talk about compensation for victims of crime when his Party is currently gagging my motion in this House to see that victims of crime are compensated in a logical and sensible way.

Mr Mathwin: Why didn't you start it five years ago?

Mr McRAE: The honourable member is not playing his cards fairly, and in fact tonight is playing somewhat to the gallery. I turn now to the remarks of the Minister. I hope that this debate will not be marred by the same sort of tactics as those adopted by the Government when last we dealt with the area of penal reform. Honourable members will recall that in March we had serious matters to consider concerning remissions of sentence and parole, and the Opposition had numerous amendments to move. Having lost the first amendment, I put a question to the Chief Secretary. This is all recorded in *Hansard*. I asked whether he would accept any amendment, no matter how logical or how sensible, and the answer was, 'No.' Then I put to his colleague, the Deputy Premier, who happened to be seated by him, the question, 'Is that so?' The reply was, 'You're damn right.' I hope that tonight we will not see a repetition of that quite lamentable performance.

Mr Max Brown: He gave a good performance this afternoon.

Mr McRAE: I am talking not about this afternoon but in relation to a serious area, and I hope we will not see a repetition of that lamentable performance. We all know that, in the 1979 election, the Liberal Party had two thrusts in its positive election campaign, if it could be called that.

The first was the elimination of certain taxes, for which we are now paying the price; the poorer we are, the higher the price we pay. The second was to make our streets safe, and in earnest of that the Liberal Party machine spent considerable sums of money in very large, very garish, untasteful, distasteful, and downright vulgar advertisements, and some of its minions in industries paid very large sums towards the Murdoch press, who I note have been rewarded over recent months by various contracts with this Government for advertisements that would prop up that campaign. But, not overburdened by attacks like that, which branded the Labor Party in such an unsatisfactory light, we have been prepared over the last 18 months to say, 'Let us have a bi-partisan approach to this question.'

Every time we have attempted to have a bi-partisan approach, the Deputy Premier has left the Chamber, as he is leaving now, or, alternatively, we have been refused representation on committees, as, for instance, when the Attorney-General had a committee inquiring into this very question and the Opposition sought representation on reasonable terms but was denied it. Even putting all those things aside and starting afresh tonight, the first thing I should like to ask the Minister, if he could prise himself away from the member for Glenelg, is whether he is now prepared to adopt a bi-partisan approach towards problems of law and order in the community, in which it would be agreed that neither Party would be involved in a political point-scoring exercise, or not.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: How could you guarantee that?

Mr McRAE: I think the Labor Party could very clearly guarantee it, and the Minister could hedge his bet, because I am interested to get that reply. It implies that, if there was a guarantee, he might be interested. Let him mull that over. Assuming that the Labor Party guaranteed by public announcement through the Leader of the Opposition, for example, in the press that we did want a bi-partisan approach, would the Chief Secretary and his Government be interested in it? I say that for a very good reason, because the honourable gentleman knows well what has been going on in New South Wales for the past 10 years. We have discussed that privately and publicly.

We all know that what has been going on in New South Wales is that, depending on who is in Government or out of it, the Party that seeks to advantage itself accuses the other of involvement with the Mafia and other criminal elements and of being either sincere or insincere in the matter of penal reform. Tonight is a very important occasion. If the Minister listens (and he appears to have been), there is the gauntlet thrown down to him. Given sufficient guarantees, which he could nominate, does he sincerely want a bi-partisan approach? If he does, I believe the Labor Party will give it to him.

We all know that many of the provisions in the Bill have been canvassed not only in the Mitchell Report but also in the Nagle Royal Commission in New South Wales in 1976 and in numerous learned publications. We are all aware that the whole of our penal system to date has hinged around the idea of a prison being at the centre and everything else being on the periphery, which I must say is rather odd in one sense but perfectly clear in another.

I say it is odd because any historian would have to acknowledge that the primary function of prisons until very recent times in history has simply been to harbour people or keep them in custody prior to being executed, transported, or mutilated, or prior to their paying their debts, whatever the cost may be. When I say 'debts', I mean not debts to society at large but paying debts of monetary sums due. It was only after the abolition of the concept of execution and the other things to which I have

referred that prisons became places that performed another function.

I am not so much of an idealist as to discount the notion that prisons will be, in the foreseeable future, a necessary evil in our society, because quite clearly there is a significant percentage of people in the prison community who do not intend to redeem themselves or to make a significant effort to do so. Therefore, in relation to those people, it seems to me that we are left only with the alternative of warehousing, but, in terms of prisons rehabilitating people, I think all the evidence is to the contrary. I must confess that early in my career I had a kind of visionary ideal that you could actually rehabilitate people. I will repeat that because there is a lot of audible conversation.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Playford.

Mr McRAE: I was saying that early in my career I had a visionary ideal that we could rehabilitate people through prisons. I have come to distrust that ideal very much, and that is why I strongly support the measure before us, granted that there are appropriate precautions. I must support a number of the remarks made, first, by the shadow Minister in this area and then by other colleagues. It is imperative that, upon the Bill becoming law, there be an education program. By that, I do not just include members of the public at large. I also include lawyers, young lawyers in particular. I also include the Judiciary and, in particular, the magistracy and, above all, the magistracy in country areas.

Let me explain why I say that. This will be a very humanitarian piece of legislation and something that must be administered practically. Therefore, it would be quite wrong if young lawyers, in particular, or magistrates, over-enthusiased by the idea and not knowing what the limitations of the system were, clutched at the idea of a sentence of this sort as an alternative to fine or imprisonment and thus overloaded the system to a point of breaking it, without knowing what the practical involvement of the system was. I stress, first, that there should be that education system.

Next, I will reinforce what my colleagues from Stuart and Spence have said, namely, that there is a gratuitous insult to the Trades and Labor Council in this Bill. There is no way in which this measure will work without the co-operation of the Trades and Labor Council. There is no way in which the Minister should expect that council to co-operate with a Bill as patronising as this is. It is quite unfortunate that new section 5c refers to a panel of persons. What the honourable gentleman is doing is attempting to drive a wedge into the Trades and Labor Council. In other words, the Government is saying, 'We, as a Government, do not trust your capacity to present a nominee who will be a responsible person: we want you to give us a variety so that we can choose.'

That is not done in the majority of pieces of legislation. It will immediately arouse suspicion, and the Trades and Labor Council will not co-operate. It would be foolish to co-operate and, if the co-operation of any single body is needed, it is the co-operation of that council. I hope that the Minister will be sensitive to the remarks that have been made to him honourably.

Next, may I draw attention to the need for workers compensation provisions. There has been a great deal of unnecessary concern about this matter. I have been shown by my colleague the member for Stuart the Victorian and Tasmanian legislation, which quite simply and adequately provides for necessary workers compensation provisions for persons pursuing work orders. Why should that not be? These people are not in the custodial system. We are dealing with something different from a work system

inside prisons. Even then I would say it would be wise for any Government to protect itself in such a way, but here, as the member for Stuart has adequately pointed out, we are placing people in double jeopardy. They should not be so placed: it is quite wrong.

Finally let me draw the Minister's attention to the worst provision of the Bill. Clause 13 provides that an officer can commit murder with impunity—

No liability shall attach to a probation officer or community service officer for any act or omission by him in good faith and in the exercise of his powers, or discharge of his duties, under this Act.

That is in the same words as a clause that was provided in a State emergency or disaster Bill (I cannot remember the measure's correct name). I drew attention to this matter at that time and I was told by one of the many patronising Ministers on the front bench that I was wrong. Subsequently, I understand that the Judiciary brought the Ministers to heel and the clause was corrected in the other place. I believe it would be a good idea if one of the Parliamentary Counsel corrected this error now to ensure that the criminal potentialities are removed immediately. Under the Bill I mentioned involving a State emergency or disaster, a model clause is being prepared that will assist, and I believe that is all the Minister needs to consider.

I applaud the Government for proceeding with this measure and for doing so expeditiously. However, no member in this House and no Government over the past 40 years could afford to have any pride, let alone conceit, in regard to the criminal justice system in this State. The system has been run down so badly in the past 40 years that it is nothing short of a disgrace. It is not a question of my saying that the Liberals are bad and the Labor Party is good: both Parties are equally bad and derelict in their duties, and it is none too soon that measures such as this are brought before us. However, if such measures are to be brought before us, I would like to see them brought forward with an attitude of goodwill and with a bi-partisan and reasonable approach to the matters I have raised, which are quite self-evident and which should involve basic amendments.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): I thank members who have made a contribution to the debate. The last speaker raised the question of a bi-partisan approach to these matters, which is something with which the Leaders of each Party in this place would probably agree. I give the member for Playford full marks for trying: he is very persistent. He does me great honour if he thinks that, in this situation, I can commit the Government to his suggestion.

The member for Norwood, along with the shadow Minister, said that he did not know what was contained in the Bill or how it would operate. The Bill will operate from district probation offices and will be introduced over a three-year period. In the first year, it will operate from the Noarlunga Centre, Norwood (and I hope that does the honourable member's heart good) and Port Adelaide offices. It is proposed that the scheme will accommodate up to 120 persons, 40 in each district, in the first year.

Mr Langley: You should know that without reading from a piece of paper.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Perhaps I am cast in the same mould as the member for Unley.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Russack): Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The maximum order can be 240 hours, which involves about six months. This can be spread over twelve months if a person on a community service order becomes sick or is unable to complete his

community service within the six months. The scheme will provide an alternative to a fine, imprisonment or other form of penalty imposed by the court and will allow the offender to repay his debt to society outside the prison environment. I am sure that members of both sides will approve of that. The scheme will provide other sentencing options for the courts and may be linked to a suspended sentence or awarded as a separate penalty on its own. It will not jeopardise employment opportunities in the community, involving jobs that should not otherwise be done.

A community service committee will be established to formulate guidelines for the approval of projects suitable for community service, and one person on the committee will be nominated by the Trades and Labor Council. Much play has been made of this. I have had discussions with Mr Gregory, who supports the concept of community service orders. We paid the courtesy today of telephoning his office but we found that he is overseas. However, a message was left for Mr Gregory to make him aware of what the Government is doing. I would not like anyone to gain the impression that we do not appreciate the organisation represented by Mr Gregory.

There will be a community service committee for each community service centre. This committee will determine specific projects to be undertaken in the districts concerned, and one of the persons on that committee will be a magistrate. To allay any fears, I indicate that we shall be having discussions with Mr Gregory or his appointee in that regard. As a disciplinary measure, the Director of Correctional Services may, in lieu of commencing proceedings for a breach of recognizance, require the probationer to perform up to a maximum of twenty four additional hours of community service in the event of a probationer not fulfilling his order properly. This would be equivalent to three extra working days.

As well as working on a Saturday, the probationer will be required to attend an evening class each week. Provision is also made for the probationer to attend two evening classes instead of one if he does not co-operate as much as he should. The other main provisions of the Bill include defining more clearly the duties and responsibilities of probation officers and outlining more clearly the responsibility of the probationer so that he understands what is required of him. This will enable breaches to be more clear cut, because at present there are some grey areas in regard to whether a probationer is in breach of his bond. The Bill gives the Minister power to cancel the supervision clause of a person's recognizance, and provision is also made for probation hostels sometime in the future, increasing the discretion available to the courts when dealing with breaches of a suspended sentence or a recognizance, and including orders for compensation as a condition of the recognizance.

The shadow Minister queried the matter of paid supervisors. There is provision in the departmental planning for supervisors to be paid, and this involves persons undertaking community service and carrying out the work assigned to required standards. Volunteers may work in a supervisory capacity but their performance will be checked by the paid supervisors in all cases. In other words, the professional person will be in charge.

Mr Keneally: Will this be a departmental officer or a paid part-time supervisor?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: There will be paid supervisors, and they are proposed to be departmental officers. The extra 24 hours penalty to be issued by the Director was the subject of some query by the Opposition. This is to be used as a disciplinary tool to deal with minor breaches of discipline. If this provision is not employed

every breach would result in a court appearance and the offender would have his community service order revoked, and this may result in his having to serve a term of imprisonment. It gives flexibility and is quite common. Indeed, I saw this operating in New Zealand a few weeks ago. The Director can act in the interests of the parolee without the matter going to court. It will work as I know it works in other areas.

The removal of supervision does not apply to community service orders at all. It only refers to deleting the supervision requirement attached to probation orders when the offender has proved that supervision is no longer necessary. There are many instances where this will be indeed most valuable. New South Wales uses this procedure. The panel of three was not acceptable to Mr Keneally. He wants the T.L.C. to nominate its own person. This situation has been discussed by the Government, exists in other areas, and we see nothing wrong with it.

Mr Keneally: Are you seeking the co-operation of the Trades and Labor Council?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: We have had discussions with Mr Gregory. We see nothing wrong with the proposed panel.

Mr Whitten: What did he think?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: We do not expect any problem in this area. My colleague points out to me that it was a procedure in industrial training legislation.

Mr Langley: Why didn't you know that?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The member for Unley is being exceptionally verbose. If he went and studied his racing form for next Saturday we would be better off. The practice of nominating one person on a panel of three is common and applies in different kinds of legislation. The question of a woman or an Aboriginal being appointed is something that the Opposition wants spelt out in the Bill, but the Government wishes to keep its options open. However, we are not sexist. We believe that all members could be women if they were satisfactory. We are interested in persons and we do not want to put a sexist brand on it.

Mr Keneally interjecting:

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Members opposite are seeking a specific appointment. It may well be that an Aboriginal will be appointed in the honourable member's area once this scheme takes on in the country. The honourable member also referred to the power of veto. Without putting it in the Bill, I can assure the House that we are looking for co-operation, and we would not want to be responsible for taking work from those people who are paid in the community. We would be looking for the expertise of the Trades and Labor Council in those areas. I give the shadow Minister my assurance in that regard.

The question of workers' compensation has been raised, but this matter is not in the Government's character. A person injured when carrying out work under a community service order has a right to seek common law compensation. I understand that in Tasmania offenders are considered by the Crown to be covered for workers' compensation when under the Community Service Order scheme, and it is written into the legislation. In Queensland offenders are covered by the Workers' Compensation Act.

Mr Keneally: Why shouldn't we do the same here?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The Government does not propose to accept the proposal put up by the honourable member. The member for Norwood queried where these classes would be held and what courses would be set up for people involved with community service orders. Where appropriate it will involve attendance at existing D.F.E.

locations or places where similar courses are held. Where this is not suitable, special courses will be set up to deal with specific needs. For example, courses dealing with alcoholics and alcoholics' dependants and courses in basic literacy and budgeting will involve using existing Government facilities or hired community halls. Provision for payment of tutors has been made in the Budget.

It may interest the House to know that presently in the prisons system there are some 146 people in institutions who are d.u.i. offenders. They are people who could be put out under the community service order scheme. It was said that we should be thinking not about punishment but rather about rehabilitation, and I was chided for talking about saving money. I am sure that the Labor Party when in Government was as interested as this Government is in saving money and provides rehabilitation for those people who have offended against society, albeit driving under the influence.

It is innovative legislation, as the member for Norwood described it. It is a Bill that breaks new ground in this State. I accept that a measure was being drafted when we came into Government. We have picked up the matter and had a look at the system in New South Wales, Tasmania and New Zealand, where it works very well.

Mr Keneally: It doesn't work in New Zealand—You're getting the two systems mixed up.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: New Zealand has several other schemes that could operate here if we could take them on, although perhaps we do not have the facilities that New Zealand has. New Zealand has approached the matter effectively, and I saw the scheme working in Dunedin a few weeks ago. I thank members for their comments on the Bill and commend it to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

Mr KENEALLY: Because of the limitations placed on me in Committee, I will be required initially at least to seek information on three matters while I am on my feet for the first time. The first matter relates to paragraph (c), in which the Minister seeks to strike out the definition of 'Minister'. I should like to know why that definition is being struck out.

The Opposition would also like to ask the Minister why in paragraph (d) he is excluding the offences of murder and treason, thereby separating those offences from other serious offences such as aggravated assault and rape in relation to which, one would imagine, offenders would not be participating in the scheme. The Opposition would like to see all offences excluded rather than the Government's selecting two offences, thereby making the community wonder why those offences are being excluded whereas the other serious crimes, which, in the normal course of events, would attract the maximum penalty of life imprisonment, are not being excluded.

My other query relates to paragraph (h), which strikes out the definition of 'this Act' and inserts a definition of 'working day'. Will the Minister say what relationship exists between the striking out of 'this Act' and the inserting of the definition of 'working day'?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I am advised that the definitions are covered by the Acts Interpretation Act.

Mr Keneally: That's the definition of 'Minister'?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: That is so, as well as the others that are referred to.

Mr Keneally: Is that the Minister's answer to the question regarding his intention to strike out the definition of 'Minister'?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I am advised that there is no

relationship between the repealed definition of 'this Act' and the definition of 'working day'. This Act is defined in the Acts Interpretation Act, and probation and parole deal only with imprisonment.

Mr KENEALLY: Is the Minister telling the Committee that the words 'other than murder or treason' referred to in paragraph (d) are being excluded because they are the only two offences for which offenders cannot receive parole or probation? If that is the Minister's explanation, I should be pleased to hear it.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I will have to seek advice.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I rise on a point of order. Is the Chairman keeping a note of the intervals between this debate so that we know how long the Minister in charge of the Bill is away from his place getting instructions? I suggest that the Chair ought to make a note of the time that is being spent in this way, because it has been at least five minutes now.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair is certainly not going to take any notes. If the honourable member wants to do that, he is quite entitled to do so.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I inform the honourable member that murder and treason were never part of the Offenders Probation Act.

Mr KENEALLY: I thank the Minister for that information, which confirms the information that has been presented to me. However, I wanted to check it out with the Minister. Is the Government likely to agree, if the Opposition was to move accordingly in another place, that other more serious types of crime ought to be added to the offences of murder and treason so that some of the very worst cases of rape, aggravated assault, robbery with violence, and so on, may be considered? I ask this merely to ascertain the Government's feeling on this issue. It is not necessarily an indication that the Opposition will take this course of action.

There is obviously a whole series of very serious crimes for which this scheme is not appropriate. Does the Government consider that it would be too restrictive on the courts (as may well be the case) to write such a provision into the legislation, or does it consider it a useful exercise to examine whether other serious crimes should be added to the exclusions that already provide for treason and murder?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: No.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—'Provisions relating to administration.'

Mr KENEALLY: In his reply to the second reading debate, the Minister canvassed some of the issues raised by the member for Norwood and me in relation to how the community service orders would operate. It is appropriate to raise this matter under this clause. Could the Minister be more specific in relation to volunteers? Is it initially proposed under the scheme that the centres at Port Adelaide and Norwood and the other one will use volunteer supervisors, as the Minister is encouraged to do under this clause, or will the centres be initially set up using paid departmental officers working either an additional shift on Saturday or under some other arrangement, and I imagine that they would be working overtime, to ensure that the scheme started and worked effectively. I have discussed this matter with the Tasmanian Government and the officers concerned. In fact, I was very impressed with a supervisor, Mr Lonagan, who started off as a volunteer supervisor and was very soon employed by the department because of his extreme competence in this area. Can the Minister be more specific about how he intends to start this scheme? Will it be commenced using volunteers or paid supervisors from the department who will supervise a group of volunteer

supervisors who in turn will supervise the offenders? Will it in fact be a three-tier system?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Initially, it will be started off using departmental officers and paid part-time supervisors, although the volunteer can be used. It goes without saying that a system like this cannot be run with volunteers. The volunteer has a place, but it is proposed that paid professional officers will start the scheme off.

Mr KENEALLY: I agree with what the Minister has just said. There is certainly a place in the scheme for volunteers, and I am sure that the department will use them progressively as the system develops. It was my fear that the Government would start off the scheme using volunteers. One thing that was impressed upon me more than anything else in Tasmania was the need to ensure that once the system is started it is effective, so that all areas of the community, particularly the court, have confidence in it and can sentence offenders to participate in it. Nevertheless, despite the assurances of the Minister, I would have preferred to see a provision written into this Bill similar to the Tasmanian and Victorian legislation which specifically provides for the payment of officers working under this scheme.

Of course, if the Government intends that all paid supervisors will be departmental officers, that provision will not be required. Does the Government propose that, after the system is set up by departmental officers, it will employ part-time supervisors who are not members of the Correctional Services Department or probation or parole officers, and will they be paid?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Whilst the work will take place on a Saturday it does not have to be exclusively on that day but can be by arrangement. A person could be unemployed, and some work could be done on another day. The work must be done, and it can be an ongoing thing through the week. Night classes will also be conducted. In the first year there will be a senior probation parole officer, one project officer, three community service officers, four clerks, and six part-time supervisors.

Mr KENEALLY: Will the part-time supervisors be departmental officers or persons recruited from the community?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: They will be experienced people.

Mr KENEALLY: Paid or unpaid?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: They will be paid a certain amount for their time if they work on a Saturday.

Mr KENEALLY: Do you believe that provision should be made for that in the Bill?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: No.

Clause passed.

Clause 5—'Power of courts to permit conditional discharge of offenders etc., and to suspend sentence of imprisonment.'

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

Page 2, after line 45 insert paragraph as follows:
and

(c) by inserting in subsection (4) after the passage 'Any order under subsection (3) hereof may' the passage '(unless a condition requiring compliance with the order has been included in a recognizance entered into by the probationer)'.

Mr KENEALLY: Why is this amendment necessary?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: It removes the duplication. This covers the situation where a person may have a further order to serve.

Mr MATHWIN: Section 4 of the principal Act is amended—

Mr KENEALLY: I rise on a point of order. I understand that the matter before the Chair and the matter that the

Minister is in the process of answering is a question in relation to the amendment moved by the Minister and that we are not debating the principal Act. The subject before the Committee at the moment is the amendment and not the original clause.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot uphold the point of order. The honourable member for Glenelg has not yet explained the particular matter that he wishes to raise. The honourable member was probably going to link up his remarks.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: This is a bit tricky in that it is consequential to the amendment foreshadowed to clause 6 where an order is made for compensation to be paid. If the member for Stuart and I were lawyers we could slide through this very easily, but unfortunately we are not lawyers.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 6—'Probation orders and conditions of recognizance.'

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

Page 3, after line 26 insert paragraph as follows:

(fa) a condition requiring the probationer to comply with an order made by the court under section 4(3);

Mr KENEALLY: On a point of order, I am seeking a ruling as to whether we should debate the clause now and move the amendment after the debate, or should we move the amendment to the clause first and then debate the clause? I think it has been a practice of the Committee previously to debate the clause first and then when that debate is completed to seek the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN: What the honourable member for Stuart has said has been basically the practice of the Committee. However, the Chief Secretary can still move his amendment and when it is dealt with the member for Stuart can then refer to the clause if he desires.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The amendment to clause 6 is consequential upon the preceding amendment and makes it clear that, if the court does not make the compliance with such an order a condition of a bond, then the order may be enforced in the usual manner.

Amendment carried.

Mr KENEALLY: I want to raise a number of matters in regard to clause 6. I will canvass all of these items so that I am not caught by the requirement of not speaking more than three times. I raised in my second reading speech, to which I am not allowed to refer, of course, that the figure of 240 hours seems to be a figure selected by the South Australian Government which is different from that selected by other Governments. I would like the Minister to tell the Committee why that figure has been selected.

I understand that the offender has a choice of accepting gaol or a fine or a community service order. It is interesting that this should be the case, because it has been explained to me that the response of people who are employed varies significantly from the response of those who are unemployed. The unemployed person who faces the prospect of something like 200 hours under the works order scheme will quite often prefer to take three weeks gaol rather than look forward to every Saturday for the next six months being taken up the community service order scheme. Therefore, such persons opt for a gaol sentence, whereas a person who is employed and upon whose employment his family depends will take the community service scheme rather than gaol. I think the Minister clarified this point during the second reading debate. However, new subsection (1a) of section 5 provides that:

A court shall not include in the same recognizance conditions both under subsection (1)(a) and under subsection (1)(e).

Subsection (1)(a) requires that a probationer be under the supervision of a probation officer and subsection (1)(e) requires that a probationer undertake a specified number of hours of community service under the control and supervision of a community service officer. I have been able to find out that in Tasmania the community service officers are not probation officers, and they ought not to be. However, persons who are on a bond and who are doing community service work will treat their community service officers as probation officers. They will seek advice from them as to budgeting and advice on a whole range of questions which a probation officer is more competent to reply to. So, what has happened in Tasmania is that community service officers or works order officers are finding themselves being placed in the situation of a probation officer for which they have no training. If one makes the provisions of subsection (1)(a) and subsection (1)(e) mutually exclusive then one most certainly will be placing community service officers into the role of probation officers. All I can report to the Committee is that the one Government which has had the experience of that is very much opposed to it. They say that on all occasions people who are on community service orders ought to remain on probation and ought to have a probation officer to refer to. Can the Minister explain to the Committee why the Tasmanian experience is not appropriate for South Australian legislation?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The member for Stuart first asked me about why there should be 240 hours?

Mr KENEALLY: Yes, and I think Victoria is selecting 400 hours.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I think that is right; they will have 12 months. We are opting for 240 hours, which, if worked at the rate of 10 hours a week, amounts to approximately six months for an order to be completed.

Mr Keneally: That is 8 hours on Saturday and two hours during the week.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Yes. With regard to new subsections (1)(a) and (1)(e), in South Australia we cannot give two penalties. Officers with probation officers qualifications will be recruited.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is—

Mr ABBOTT: Am I in order in asking a further question in relation to clause 6?

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is somewhat late. I will be tolerant and allow a question to be asked.

Mr ABBOTT: I waited for the stipulated amendments to be debated before asking my question. I refer to new subsection (1)(b) of section 5 which provides:

A recognizance under section 4 may include such of the following conditions as the court thinks appropriate—

a condition requiring the probationer to reside with a specified person, or in a specified probation hostel or other specified place;

How many probation hostels are likely to be declared? What type of premises will be used? Clause 3 provides that a probation hostel 'means any premises declared as a probation hostel under this Act'.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: As I stated in the second reading reply, when I referred to hostels, that is something for the future. We do not propose to have hostels at the onset of this scheme. It will involve people working from their homes. This is something for the future, and the Bill is drawn with an eye to the future.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 7—'Insertion of new sections 5a, 5b and 5c'.

Mr KENEALLY: All my amendments on file are to this clause. Before moving my amendments, I want to tell the Committee that the Opposition is much in favour of the

concept of two hours attendance at an education facility or like facility for offenders so that they can be tutored in literacy and a whole range of socially desirable skills that unfortunately in most cases offenders do not seem to be well provided with. This is not so in all cases, as some offenders are bright people indeed; they are too clever by half, which is why they find themselves at odds with the law.

New section 5b (4) gives me much concern. As I said in the second reading debate, I do not know why the Minister or the Director is seeking the power to add a further penalty to that imposed by the court. Perhaps the Minister can tell me where in South Australian legislation there already exists the power for a public servant or a Minister to add to a penalty imposed by a court. The Minister has not been able to provide that information for me. This is novel legislation indeed. I may be wrong about this, and I would be pleased if the Minister can point that out to me.

I am concerned about the power of a public servant or a Minister to add to the penalty given by the court. It seems to be taking from the court powers that rightfully belong to the court. I appreciate the argument that the Minister has advanced, that giving the Director the power to impose an additional 24-hour community work order on an offender is a better deterrent for that offender or person involved in a work order scheme than sending him back to the court, where a penalty of greater magnitude may be imposed on that person. I am not convinced.

I refer to the situation in Tasmania where, if someone working in a work order scheme offends and does not turn up for work or arrives intoxicated or consumes intoxicating liquor while doing eight hours of work on the weekend, which is probably considered to be the worst offence, the supervisor in charge of the group of workers would take that worker aside at the first opportunity and impress upon the worker that that would be the only occasion on which the supervisor would allow the worker to depart from the requirements placed upon the worker and that, if the worker does offend in that way again, there is no doubt he would find himself before the court.

When the system was initially introduced in Tasmania they had considerable problems with intransigent offenders, with people who confronted authority and who had all sorts of problems with authority, people who just did not fit into the scheme at all and who took advantage of the volunteer supervisors. After a year or two, when the scheme seemed to be falling apart, the Government was lucky enough to be able to appoint a couple of good paid supervisors who brought a more disciplined approach to the scheme. This approach was brought about simply by the supervisor saying, 'You have had one chance and, if you offend again, you go back to the court, which has given you an opportunity by not sending you to gaol, by not imposing a fine on you and by involving you in a work order scheme doing socially desirable work. The court has given you an opportunity to rehabilitate yourself without having to impose more punitive penalties and, if you go back, the court will be most unhappy to see you because it has given you an opportunity. If you go before the court again, it is likely that it will deal harshly with you.'

That happened two or three times and everyone in that work order scheme in Tasmania became aware quickly of that happening, and the discipline among people involved in the work order scheme became good, because they knew that if they did not conform they would go back before the court. If the Director has the power to impose an additional twenty-four hours of work orders, I am concerned that he will not be able to convince people involved with the scheme, as much as sending them back

to the court would convince them, that they ought to comply.

That is my personal view, and I do not understand why the Director or the Minister requires this power. This should be a power of the court. Apart from my amendments to which I will speak, that is the matter in this clause that concerns me the most. What does the Minister believe will be achieved by giving that power to the Director and indirectly to himself? Why should he wish to add a penalty to the penalty already imposed by the court?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I have not much more to add to what I said in the second reading speech. The power that the Director has is not in any way altering what the court has done. The provision is there in case a difficulty arises. An inmate may have a duty to discharge but he may have been late in coming to work and, rather than sending him straight back before the court to pay the penalty, it is a flexible way of dealing with a person who is perhaps creating some minor misdemeanour. That is all we are talking about. If the matter was serious, I am certain that the Director would send him back to the court.

Mr Keneally: The court is able to determine if an offence is minor.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The provision has been included to allow discretion and flexibility.

Mr KENEALLY: An offender could be sentenced to twenty-four hours of community service work, and the Director would have the power to double the sentence. If the court were to apply a 16-hour work order to an offender, the Director would have the power to impose an additional twenty-four hours, thus placing a greater penalty on the offender than the court did. Why is it necessary for this power to be given to the Director?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: It is flexible, and all the offender is doing is making up the hours he is supposed to do. It is not in any way taking the power from the court.

Mr GLAZBROOK: I am surprised that the member for Stuart thinks as he does on this. Part of his reasoning is correct on the deterrent potential of the system used in Tasmania, which is based on words of warning after a person has committed some infringement of the conditions of his work order, but I wonder why the honourable member cannot see the other side of the coin and the reasoning. To save the time involved in the person's going back to court for the court to adjudge whether or not the offences should be penalised by some further time, the Director in his wisdom can say, equally as a deterrent, that a number of hours shall be served in excess of the time, as is proposed in the Bill. I see that as a far more important deterrent so that a person will keep within the guidelines of the work service order rather than just words of warning, saying, 'If you do it again, I will pull you up before the courts for them to adjudge you.'

If a person offended again and broke other rules appertaining to his work service order, he would automatically go before the courts again, because he would have breached the conditions of the order. He has been given one opportunity, under which the Director can adjudge the case and say, 'I believe you should serve a few more hours to make up for misdemeanours or breaches.' That would save an immense amount of time and it is quite a reasonable attitude to take that the Director, in his wisdom, can say, 'You have breached some of the conditions we have laid down, and we are giving you one more chance by bringing in a few more penalty hours, but if you do it again we will have to take you back to the courts.'

Mr KENEALLY: I accept the arguments put forward by the member for Brighton, arguments which have been canvassed within the Opposition. I appreciate that a

person who did not comply as well as he or she might would prefer to be dealt with by the Director, in most cases, rather than go back to the court. However, my concern is whether or not we are writing novel legislation, whether this might be the first occasion, perhaps anywhere in a democratic society, when a public servant and a Minister have taken over powers that rightfully belong to the court. If that is not so, I am happy for examples to be provided to me; if it is the case, I am concerned that we are doing this.

Obviously, the Opposition does not have the numbers in this Committee to change what the Government intends; on the other hand, if the Government cannot quote examples in this place it might be able to provide to the other place examples of public servants having the power to add to the penalty imposed by the court. If the court were to give six months gaol to an offender and the Director of Correctional Services felt that the prisoner was playing up and thought he would impose an additional month's gaol, one can imagine the outcry—and rightfully so. If an offender were required to pay a fine and had time to pay, and if the Director felt that it was inappropriate and that the offender was not acting as a decent citizen in the meantime and imposed an additional \$100 fine, that would cause an outcry. I know it could not happen, but I quote it as an example. I am not sure that this case is any different. It is a sentencing option that we are giving the courts in this case; we are not giving it to the Director or the Minister. If we are giving the option to the courts, surely it is for the courts to decide whether the original sentence should be varied.

I am surprised that we have before us legislation which gives an individual outside the courts the right to vary a penalty imposed by the court. It seems to smack of a Minister of the Crown interfering with areas that are the prerogative of the court. I know there are members here with greater legal knowledge than I have, but perhaps there is someone with greater knowledge of the complexities and the repercussions of this action who could explain that to the Committee. I am happy to be convinced that I am wrong and that the arguments put forward are sound in respect of not sending back to the courts an offender who has not fulfilled all the requirements of the recognisance. I can understand a reluctance to do that. An intermediate authority could protect the worker from the extra penalty that the court may impose, but it is not certain that the court would do that. It has a discretion; it can exercise mercy. It can say to the department, 'Why have you brought this person back on such a minor charge? You can resolve this within the department without unnecessarily imposing an additional penalty.' When the Director or the Minister takes a person back to the court, it is because that person has offended to such a degree that that course of action is warranted. I am tending to repeat myself.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Dicken you're not.

Mr KENEALLY: But I am making very great sense. If the Minister of Agriculture were not in the Chamber I would not have to repeat myself, because everyone else understands it the first time he is told. I have known the honourable gentleman for some years, and I know it is necessary to repeat things on a number of occasions for him to grasp them. My main objection is that a Minister of the Crown and a Director of the department should have power to take such action. I am most uneasy about it.

Mr GLAZBROOK: Taking up the point made by the member for Stuart, let me draw the opposite viewpoint. What he has suggested sounds quite reasonable, and I understand and appreciate it, but in the situation of a person on a work service order the circumstances are

totally different from the situation where a person is in gaol, as he could be if this legislation had not been introduced. If he were in gaol, he would be allowed certain privileges.

If he misbehaves within the precincts of the gaol, the Director is in a position to restrict those privileges and take them away. Where a person is on a community work service order and is not subjected to those same conditions, the Director in this sense will have some other method to use to penalise on a minor infringement. If we did not have that provision there, the only method he could use, as was suggested earlier is done in Tasmania, would be taking the person aside and whispering in his ear or giving him a talking to and saying, 'If you do not watch it, we will have to put you back in the courts,' whereas in this system at least the Director has some method to enforce that point of view on a privilege, a privilege of time. If the person was inside, he would also have that privilege of time, either his time with himself outside his normal duties or he would have those privileges taken from him. In this sense, it gives the Director that opportunity of a system of enforcing the conditions of that service order.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I had not thought of taking part in this debate but what the member for Stuart has said, in my view and contrary to that of the Minister of Agriculture, makes a lot of sense. I know that this is new legislation for our State and therefore we have to look at it without being too cautious and perhaps too conservative but this could be a quite oppressive power. I see that the Director can require the performance of a number of additional hours up to twenty-four.

That is for one breach but there is nothing to say that he cannot do it again and again and again if in his opinion the probationer has failed to obey a reasonable direction. Of course, the probationer probably would be a damn nuisance by that time and everyone would be sick of him. I should have thought that this system would not always work, in that people will not profit by it and will be more nuisance than they are worth, but this could be a very oppressive power, because it could be exercised in the case of any probationer not only once but repeatedly and if the Director, or someone on his behalf, got his knife into a probationer, the process could go on indefinitely, as far as I can see.

I may be wrong. I understand that the Labor Party does not want to push the issue too far here anyway but I should like to think about it and perhaps consult my colleague in another place, because I can certainly see some danger. That does not automatically mean that it should not be given a trial, but I am not sure that it should be given a trial in this almost open-ended form, if I have properly interpreted the various provisions that we are considering.

Mr GLAZBROOK: The member for Mitcham has suggested that the imposition of the twenty-four hours additional time may be recurrent. It can be only on the one recognizance, which is a maximum, and I think that should be pointed out. If the Director took the position of saying, 'I impose the full twenty-four hours on one infringement' he would have nothing left with which to negotiate with the person to warn him not to commit further breaches, so the Director would be taking certain procedures to allow him other hours to impose on that person if he felt that the breach of the conditions warranted it.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Yes, I see that I was wrong in that. Subsection (5) of new section 5b does limit it to twenty-four hours, so it is not as bad as I thought. It still gives wide powers but they are not as bad or as sweeping as I at first thought.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I say again that it makes for

flexibility in something in which there needs to be flexibility. These people are to a degree on their honour and it is not 'in addition to': it is 'in lieu of'.

Mr ABBOTT: New section 5a provides that the court shall also include in the recognizance a provision requiring the probationer to report to a specified place within two working days after the day on which the probation order is made. I ask the Minister where the specified places will be centred. Will these be on a regional basis, and can the Minister indicate some definite places in regard to this provision?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: This Bill is drawn for the present and the future. We did mention hostels. We have not got hostels, nor do we propose that at this stage, and I do not think I have to emphasise that very much, with the financial restraint. New section 5a provides:

Where a court includes in a recognizance a condition requiring the probationer to be under the supervision of a probation officer, or a condition requiring the probationer to undertake community service, the court shall also include in the recognizance a condition requiring the probationer to report to a specified place within two working days after the day on which the probation order is made, unless within that period the probationer receives a notice in accordance with section 6.

I take that to be quite clearly spelt out. My officers advise regarding officers in the Department of Correctional Services that there are seven in the metropolitan area and there are six in the major country centres. In the first year we propose to set up three centres. As I say, that is something for the future.

Mr KENEALLY: I move:

Page 5, after line 24—insert subsection as follows:

(8) Where a probationer performs community service work pursuant to a recognizance under this Act, the Workers Compensation Act, 1971-1979, shall apply to him in relation to that work and, for the purposes of that Act—

- (a) the probationer shall be deemed to be a worker employed by the Crown; and
- (b) his average weekly earnings shall be deemed to be an amount equivalent to his average weekly earnings in any full-time employment in which he is then engaged or, if he is not then engaged in full-time employment, an amount which the Minister administering that Act considers reasonable in the circumstances of the case.

I point out to the Minister that the wording of the amendment is a direct take from the legislation currently before the Victorian Parliament, and that the provision was moved by one of his colleagues, a Victorian Liberal Minister. That provision already exists in the Tasmanian legislation. It protects a person who has been required by a court to do community service work from injury while doing that work and from the possibility of not being able to go back to his or her normal work place.

We have this system of double jeopardy. We have the circumstance whereby a person has to do community service work and then can run the risk of losing his or her income for weeks. Worse than that, this person could lose an arm, leg, or eye, or could lose his or her life on the community work order scheme, and the Minister has told us in the second reading debate that the person has the right to take civil action. What we want the Minister to do here is to give the same protection to these people as is given in Tasmania and as is proposed in Victoria, because overwhelmingly the people on the work order scheme will be working people who depend on their weekly income to maintain their families. That weekly income is threatened by the omission from this Bill of this protection.

This is not novel legislation: it is legislation that the

Ministers colleagues in Victoria and the Liberal Party when in Government in Tasmania were happy to accept. I believe that people who are required by the court to work under this scheme are entitled to the protection of the Workers Compensation Act. There should be no doubt whatsoever as to their position. They should not be required to take civil action, which could take some years to remedy their claims.

The Chief Secretary has agreed with Opposition speakers who have said that the support of the Trades and Labor Council is vital to the success of this scheme. I can tell the Minister quite clearly that, if ordinary members of the trade unions in South Australia find themselves participating in this scheme but do not find themselves protected by the Workers Compensation Act that would cover people who normally do this work, the support of the Trades and Labor Council will be withdrawn. The council is very much in favour of this measure: Mr Gregory has examined the detail of the Bill and its intent. It has been discussed at the Trades and Labor Council and at the A.L.P. Council, and there is general approval for it, particularly when people understand what it hopes to do.

It was never considered by the Trades and Labor Council, the A.L.P. in Opposition or any other Labor Party forum that the Minister would seriously doubt the need to include this provision in the Bill. We thought it was only a matter of bringing it to the Ministers attention and he would do what his colleagues elsewhere have done, but it is to our surprise and dismay that he has not included this provision. We consider this amendment will overcome the greatest objection that we have to a Bill that we otherwise support, and we want to see the amendment written into the Bill. We want those who are sentenced to do this work to be given the protection to which they are entitled, and I ask the Minister to reconsider the advice that he has given previously and accept this amendment, which will save him a lot of trouble in trying to get this measure through Parliament and will improve the Act immeasurably.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): I move:

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

Motion carried.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I have listened to the shadow Minister's comments; he has implied that, if we do not accept the amendment, we can expect a lot of trouble. However, the Government has considered the amendment and does not accept it. If a person is injured while working on a community service order, he has the right to seek compensation under common law: he will not be left without cover. We could argue all night about this, but I can only repeat what I said previously.

Mr McRAE: The Minister is right in saying that we could speak all night and get nowhere, but I will give one example in support of our argument. Among the Minister's advisers is at least one qualified legal practitioner. A person may be sent to a place of work under an order, carry out his or her work in an appropriate fashion, and may be very seriously injured in circumstances in which it cannot be said that occupier's liability is attracted or negligence has been attracted but in circumstances in which it would be most obvious that the benefits of the Workers Compensation Act would normally follow.

By way of example, a person may be assigned the task of mowing an invalid pensioner's lawn; there may be nothing wrong with the lawn mower or the premises, so there would be no question of occupier's or manufacturer's liability, and no negligence, but, because of one false stumble, that person may fall into the path of the rotor

blades or stumble in such a fashion that his foot may be caught in the rotor blades. Normally, workers compensation would cover such an injury that would be no-one's fault in a moral or ethical sense; nonetheless, the situation would be covered. That example is not fanciful or stupid, and many other examples could be given. I can see the lynx eyes of the member for Mitcham, who is becoming interested because he loves these examples.

I can cite another example: a person in exactly the same circumstances may go about his duties using an excellent lawn mower. There would be no occupier's liability and no negligence involved. However, the rotor blades could pick up a stone and hurl it at the person's eye, knocking out one eye. What is so unreasonable about the amendment? The honourable gentleman has a colleague in Victoria who is in the same political party and who has provided for exactly that situation without destroying the fabric of Victorian society (no pun intended) or inciting anyone to undue rage. I cannot see the problem.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Sit down and I'll tell you.

Mr McRAE: The Minister of Agriculture is apparently going to tell me the problem: I hoped that his colleague would deal with it.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: It is so simple and straightforward that I feel I can answer, and I intend to do so.

Mr McRAE: I will be pleased to hear the answer.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I am not aware of the detail of this Bill to the extent to which the Chief Secretary is aware of it. However, the matter raised by the member for Playford is so simple and so straightforward that it amazes me that he and his colleagues have not come to grips with the commonsense element of this clause. First, I am sure that he and his colleagues would appreciate that the worker's compensation scheme we have in this State is nothing less than glorious compared with that which applies within our neighbouring States. In fact, when compensation is determined in Victoria in circumstances cited by the honourable member, it is my understanding that the average wage earned is the basis of the compensation paid, unlike our situation here, where the full wages plus overtime worked by an employee are payable to the employee.

Quite apart from that distinct difference, he continues in his argument to suggest that a person who is serving a penalty (that is what it amounts to) falls into a category of an employee/employer relationship and should therefore qualify for the worker's compensation that would apply ordinarily in those circumstances. However, it is not an employee/employer relationship that exists in the situation where a person is carrying on work within the ambit of this clause, nor is it an employee/employer relationship that exists in relation to a prisoner if that person were inside serving a sentence. Accordingly, the Workers Compensation Act does not apply, nor in the Government's view should it apply in these circumstances. In the case of an accident in the example given by the member for Playford, that person is adequately and appropriately protected in that under the ordinary basis of common law he can seek and obtain compensation for damages. That is what the argument has been about for a long period during this debate.

The Chief Secretary has explained it. As I indicated earlier, I have a broad understanding of the principles involved in this case. It is simple for me to understand, and I would have thought that it was about time the honourable member for Playford and his colleagues, including the shadow Chief Secretary accepted the position and what is proposed in the Bill and accepted that it does give adequate and fair protection to the person who

may be in that circumstance where he needs to be fairly protected. To try to throw a wet blanket over this clause and funerally hold up the process of this debate on the basis that that person should fall into some other category of compensation is quite unreasonable in my view.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I did not know anything about this amendment until I looked at it and listened to the speakers that we have heard. I believe that the Minister of Agriculture is under a misapprehension as to the right of a person to sue. The examples which the member of Playford gave seem to me to be perfectly feasible. As I understand the scheme, somebody could be asked or directed to mow the lawn of an institution, a pensioner or elsewhere. It is conceivable that an accident such as he mentioned could occur. His fingers might get into the rotor blades and he may lose his fingers. It has unfortunately happened many times to various people. I cannot for the life of me see, unless there is some scheme of compensation (and the Labor Party is suggesting worker's compensation), how anybody who lost a finger, for example, could possibly sue. There is no general common law liability. If the Minister or I go to mow somebody else's lawn and we are injured, we cannot sue that person unless there has been some breach of occupier's liability. There may not be, as the honourable member for Playford said, so that person in that position would be left without any redress whatsoever.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: And without fingers.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Of course. I can see, on the other hand, the point which the Minister put rather crudely, that it is not an employer/employee relationship. If a probationer is injured (and the injury may not be particularly serious), it does seem a little bizarre that he is able to seek compensation. One can imagine in certain circumstances probationers laughing up their sleeves because they can do it. On the other hand, there could be a situation such as the honourable member for Playford outlined where there was a serious injury and the person would be left without a thing. I do not believe that we should allow that to happen.

Maybe the Government would give an *ex gratia* payment in those circumstances, but there ought to be some provision to cover it, because it would be wrong. I suppose one could say that the person who lost an eye would get sickness benefits from the Commonwealth. If he were 85 per cent incapacitated, he might go on an invalid pension, but that is not a satisfactory solution. It would have to be a very serious injury. I believe that there should be some provision. As I understand what has been said by the member for Stuart and the member for Playford, there is some provision in Victoria and Tasmania. I must say on the debate that I have heard from both sides—

Mr Keneally: And in Queensland as well. Where are all the reactionaries?

Mr MILLHOUSE: It may be, but on the debate that I have heard so far I am strongly inclined to support the amendment.

Mr GLAZBROOK: I am surprised that one of the points which seems to have been missed in this argument is that those currently serving sentences in our gaols are not covered by workers compensation. Those who work in the yards and machine shops and indeed those that work in Cadell amongst the farm equipment are not covered by workers compensation. If that is the case, should we make it a lot easier for those on community work service orders by giving them compensation? If we do, is that not setting a precedent to provide workers compensation for all these people in turn? The present situation was going on during the Opposition's term in office. You did not think that you

should give prisoners workers compensation. I believe you would have shied away from it. I see no difference between the situation that exists now and that which existed when you were in Government.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I rise on a point of order. I believe that honourable members on this side are entitled to be referred to as 'the Opposition'. We are not 'you'. We do not have anything to do with sheep necessarily.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest to the member for Brighton that he refer to members opposite by their district.

Mr GLAZBROOK: I apologise, Mr Chairman. I could have sworn that I heard some bleating before. I cannot see any justifiable reason to change the *status quo*. Therefore, I cannot support the amendment.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I have listened to the debate. I can appreciate the zeal of members opposite in relation to the resolution. People who are in prison and those who will be required to attend community service centres are in that situation because they have offended against society. If they have an accident, that matter will be taken up by the Crown Law Office, and they will be compensated.

Mr PETERSON: There is one important difference in this situation. If a prisoner serving a sentence injures himself, he is provided for in the system. One's food and wherewithal will be there for the term of the sentence. A person could be doing a job in a community service centre on a Saturday and on the Monday he might have to front up to his employer. If such a person was injured, how would he turn up for his regular employment and earn his bread and butter? What possible income could such a man obtain? How would any craftsman in that situation who lost, say, his fingers earn his living and meet his commitments thereafter? That is the very important difference. Such a person would be doing eight hours work in a community centre.

Mr Mathwin: He can go to prison if he wants.

Mr PETERSON: I have just heard an interjection: perhaps that is what he should do, instead of acting under this system. If a man or woman working under this system injured themselves, through no fault of their own, they would not, the legal people have explained (they understand this matter better than do I, and, I suggest, the honourable member), have any way of obtaining compensation. This could effectively prevent a person from earning enough money to feed his family, and that is a fault in the system.

Mr McRAE: I make a final plea to the Chief Secretary. I have made my plaintive call, and my colleague, the member for Mitcham, who is one of Her Majesty's Queen's Counsel, has endorsed my comments. The Chief Secretary has available to him the excellent resources of the Parliamentary Counsel and must be able to decide whether we are wrong as a matter of law or whether he is in doubt. If the honourable gentleman is in doubt, he could seek leave to have this debate adjourned.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: We have heard you on this before.

Mr McRAE: This is a very specific matter, and that is what worries me. I do not think that the specific question which I have put and which has been reinforced by my colleague from Mitcham has even been put to the Parliamentary Counsel. No other person in this Chamber apart from the political Parties has more capacity to judge this issue on an independent basis than has the Parliamentary Counsel. The honourable gentleman has a perfect right either to seek or not seek that advice, and it is rather a poor show that he chooses not to seek it.

The Minister's colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, of all things, decided to tell us that the poor wretch who went out there and had his eye knocked out would somehow

have a right at common law. I just laugh at that, as does everyone else in the Chamber. One must demonstrate, as against the defendant that one sues, either that that person was negligent or was in some other way in breach of the statute law or the common law. In the cases that I have cited I doubt that that could be shown. It may conceivably be shown, but it is most unlikely.

I am astounded that the honourable gentleman has been only too happy to get advice on other relatively minor matters during the course of the evening but that on this important matter, which affects the personal rights of the subject, he will not do so. After all, this is a person adjudged by the courts (as the member for Semaphore rightly said) as fitting into the category of a person who is suitable for this sort of order rather than having a sentence of imprisonment or a fine, or a mixture of the two, imposed on him.

Mr Mathwin: That's his choice. He can choose whether he goes to prison or to a community service centre.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Playford has the call.

Mr McRAE: I am appalled by the abysmal ignorance of Government back-benchers in relation to the whole matter. I should have become used to it by now, but throughout my life I have always been an optimist; that has been my curse. If I cannot persuade the Minister on legal grounds to consider the matter, simply on practical, humanitarian grounds he might think it over. Precisely what the member for Semaphore said applies in this situation. Surely, if a person is doing his best to continue in the community working during the week, he should not have to suffer because of some unforeseen, chance circumstance.

I should have thought that in those circumstances the Opposition would be pleased enough if the Minister would at least consult with his advisers in order to ascertain what the law is and the facts are or may be, and then respond to us in an informed fashion, instead of giving an uninformed, off-the-cuff pre-prepared answer to a question that he never expected, anyway.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I have made quite plain to the committee that I do not intend to accept the shadow Chief Secretary's amendment.

Mr McRAE: Would the Chief Secretary tell the Committee whether we have now reached the stage as on the last occasion when matters of this kind were before this Committee, where the Government's attitude was that no amendment, no matter how logical or reasonable, would be accepted, and when the answer given by the Deputy Premier was, 'You're damned right'? Is that the situation that we have now reached because, if it is, I am sure that I would like to know.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I do not need to have the member for Playford putting words in my mouth. I have already told the Committee that I do not intend to accept the amendment. I believe, on the assurances that I have had, that these people will not be left without a feather with which to fly, if that is what Opposition members are concerned about.

Mr McRae: Who gave you that assurance?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I have assured the Committee, and I do not intend to give qualifications to the member for Playford.

Mr McRae: Who gave you that assurance?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I do not intend to reveal to the honourable member the source of my information.

Mr MILLHOUSE: The Minister is being pretty unwise in taking this attitude. He can get away with it in this place, but he may not find it so easy in the other place. It may be better for the Minister to temporise here. It may

save a bit of time if we are sitting for only six days. The real reason why the Government will not accept this amendment is that it is afraid that, if it did so, the pressure would be on for workers' compensation in gaols, and the Government does not want that. I do not think that the Government's opposition goes any further than that, and we might as well say it. At present, I understand that if a prisoner is injured in gaol the Government will, as a rule, make an *ex gratia* payment as a form of compensation, although there is no obligation on it to do so.

What the Minister said in a rather *gauche* way was, I suppose, meant to be an undertaking that, if a probationer was injured, some sort of *ex gratia* payment would be made. However, he did not get to saying it, and he certainly stopped short of giving any public undertaking on behalf of the Government that that would be done. I do not think that I would be satisfied with it, anyway, but the Minister did not even go as far as that. If we are wasting our time debating this amendment, we might as well get on with it. However, I tell the Minister that it may take a far longer time in another place, where his Party does not have the control that it has here.

Mr KENEALLY: I understand that there is within the Government a body of opinion that is not opposed to my amendment. However, some Cabinet members are violently opposed to this measure. A classic example of one of those persons is present tonight. He is a Minister who has been heavying his colleague and has been participating in a debate that has nothing to do with him. I do not know how the Minister of Agriculture can concern himself with legislation in the correctional services area. It is quite clear who is playing the bully boy in Cabinet, and unfortunately he seems to be getting away with it. We are putting this whole scheme at risk. There is no doubt at all that the scheme cannot work without the total support of the Trades and Labor Council. Every member agrees with that. The Minister himself has conceded that point, and members on this side have stressed it.

If the Trades and Labor Council representative on the advisory committee has the power to veto any work that he believes will prevent someone else from obtaining employment or for whatever reason which may not be agreeable to the Trades and Labor Council, he will veto participation in the scheme. There will then be no scheme, because the Trades and Labor Council representative will not approve of any offender undertaking any work where there is the slightest possibility that an accident will occur. There is no job at all that the Minister could imagine where there is not the slightest possibility that an accident could not occur. What representative of the Trades and Labor Council would agree to a trade unionist being sentenced by the court to a place of employment where that unionist will risk losing his income from an injury that might occur at that place of employment?

If the Minister stops and thinks about what I am saying it is quite obvious that his intransigence on this matter will put the whole scheme at risk, because it will not be supported by the Trades and Labor Council. That organisation cannot support this scheme if the Minister continues in this way. Why should people involved in this scheme be different from people in prison? In addition to the very pertinent remarks made by the member for Semaphore, it is quite clear that the court intends for a person involved in the work order scheme to continue with his or her employment. That may well be the very reason that the court decides that the rehabilitation of offenders depends upon their continued employment. The court will sentence such a person to this scheme so that he can continue with his employment. If a person was injured on the first day that he attended under the work order scheme

his whole family structure would be put at risk. That is the very structure that the court has decided should not be put at risk by sentencing offenders to the work order scheme. That is a matter for the Government to consider.

Because the Government will not provide compensation cover for the workers, it is putting at risk the decision of the court, which believes that a continued income for an offender is vital to his rehabilitation. If the court knows that that compensation cover is not available to the offender, it will impose a suspended sentence. It will not put offenders in gaol, and it will not put them on the community work scheme if their livelihood is at risk, because they are not covered for workers compensation.

I have put two issues before the Minister. First, if he continues to refuse to accept this amendment he will not receive the support of the Trades and Labor Council. If the Bill is passed, it will depend upon having a member of the Trades and Labor Council on the advisory committee. It will not work without that provision. If the Trades and Labor Council blackballed that appointment the Minister would have to come back to Parliament and ask for an amendment so that the legislation could work. The Government should be very well aware of that possibility. Secondly, the Government will be depriving people who the court has determined require a continued income for their rehabilitation so that the family of the offender is not placed in a double jeopardy situation.

This scheme will deal with offenders charged with, for instance, driving under the influence offences. That is a very serious offence, but the offender does not necessarily have a criminal nature. According to the Minister of Transport such offenders may well participate in this scheme. The court may decide that these offenders and others might best be dealt with by continuing in their employment and receiving an income. The Minister of Agriculture wants to stop that from happening. The Chief Secretary, who is responsible for this matter on behalf of the Government, is not prepared to do that because he has not received a brief to change his view.

I am absolutely certain that the Minister acknowledges the merit of what members on this side are saying. If the Minister is as intelligent as I give him credit for being, he knows that he is putting the scheme at risk by not accepting this amendment. That is not a threat but a statement of fact, and it is on this issue that the success of the community service scheme in South Australia depends. The Minister has said that he will give an undertaking that people involved in the scheme will be adequately protected. He cannot do that; it must be written into the legislation. We might be prepared to accept that this Minister will abide by his word, but his word does not bind another Minister. I suspect that the present incumbent is not likely to be Chief Secretary through to the end of this Parliament. As I said earlier, I believe that he is in for a greater promotion. Therefore, we will be dealing with another Minister who will not be bound by an undertaking given by this Minister. I have seen Ministers do that in the past. I am not prepared to accept the Minister's word; I want it written into the legislation.

What is wrong with this amendment when this Government's colleagues in Victoria are providing for it in their legislation at the moment? Their colleagues in Tasmania have provided for compensation in their Act and have not changed it. Their colleagues in Queensland have also provided for it in their legislation. Am I to believe that the right-wing reactionary policies of this Government towards social issues are worse than those of the Country Party dominated, with great respect to the member for Flinders, Government of Queensland,

because that is exactly where the South Australian Government is putting itself? I cannot believe that that is the advice that this Government is receiving from its departmental officers. In fact, the Government should be telling its departmental officers what needs to be done. The whole scheme is threatened. I believe that the Government's approach could well be in conflict with a court sentence, and it will be cutting off the options of the court to sentence offenders under this scheme if there is a conflict. We find this Government is more reactionary than its Liberal counterparts in other States of Australia. Why is it the only Government or individual Party throughout Australia which thinks this way? Does all the wisdom reside in this Government? Of course, it does not. This Government is in the minority on this issue, because it is wrong. I believe that the Government should admit to the error and accept this amendment. I repeat for about the tenth time that this scheme depends on the support of the Trades and Labor Council. The Government's stand on this matter undoubtedly threatens that support.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Of course, there is no doubt that the person responsible for the Bill in this place, speaking for the Government in this instance, is the Chief Secretary. However, I take exception to the remarks made by the member for Stuart, when he said, among other things, that I was intruding into an area that had nothing to do with me, or words to that effect.

I do not want to pursue all the allegations he made, except to say that on this issue or any other issue before the Parliament or before a committee I will speak on a subject in support of my colleagues if I desire to do so. I did so earlier this evening in this debate, because I believed that the Committee was drifting on unnecessarily and wasting a heap of time on a subject on which the Chief Secretary had made his intentions quite clear. It was explained to the member for Stuart and to other members that the precedent had been set; that the system has existed in this State for a number of years, where people in similar circumstances—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: There aren't any.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: That is, outside the direct employer/employee relationship, and indeed, in prisons, where in the event of an accident (and they have occurred) and where they are without public risk factors, but in the sort of circumstances as outlined by a couple of members earlier, where a claim was due, then the Crown Law Office has assessed that claim and made an *ex gratia* payment.

The extent to which the Chief Secretary wishes to go on this occasion is entirely up to him, but before the Chief Secretary has had a chance to indicate his intentions the member for Stuart gets up and says that he will not believe it anyway, that he will not accept the view put forward by the Government through its Chief Secretary. Therefore, what is the point in pursuing and arguing about the subject.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Sit down and listen to the Chief Secretary.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I had looked forward to listening to the Chief Secretary, but I am sick of the arguments that have been repeated continually after the Chief Secretary has given his decision. It seems incredible that members opposite should repeat an argument *ad infinitum*.

Mr KENEALLY: Am I to understand that once the Chief Secretary has made a decision all other debate is inhibited? That seems to be the opinion of the Minister of Agriculture. Obviously he does not understand the system—he understands very little. I would like the Chief Secretary to tell the Committee whether his Government is prepared to let this measure founder on this amendment

I have moved. The Chief Secretary must be aware that what I have said is factual and he must be aware that on this very point the scheme is likely to founder. Is the Chief Secretary prepared to allow it to founder? All we need from the Chief Secretary is an agreement to write into the legislation a protection for the participants of this scheme, and he has said he will give us his word that they will be protected. All the Opposition is asking is that, if the Government is prepared to go thus far in saying that these workers need to be protected (contrary to the Minister's colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, the Chief Secretary says that they ought to be protected), then the Chief Secretary should agree to write the appropriate protections into the legislation, for without them, I repeat, he is not likely to get the support of the Trades and Labor Council. Are we to understand that he will go ahead and try to implement his scheme without the support of the Trades and Labor Council? Just how does he propose to get the support of the Trades and Labor Council after he denies working people in South Australia this cover, which his colleagues everywhere else provide? Can the Chief Secretary tell me whether he believes that this system can be effective without the support of the Trades and Labor Council, and will he answer how he proposes to get the support of the Trades and Labor Council without agreeing to this amendment? I want the Chief Secretary to answer, not one of his colleagues in the background.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I have listened to the persuasive eloquence of the member for Stuart, the shadow Minister in many and varied forms. I have never heard him as eloquent and as pleading as he is at the moment. Obviously the member for Stuart was deaf when I told him a quarter of an hour ago that I was not going to accept his amendment, and I am not resiling from that statement.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Peake.

Mr PLUNKETT: I did not think I was going to get a call.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope you are not reflecting on the Chair.

Mr PLUNKETT: I do not intend to reflect on the Chair. Can the Chief Secretary give us his reason for refusing to accept this amendment, when the same type of amendment exists in Victoria, Tasmania and Queensland. I have been very surprised about some of the things that have come out of this debate. However, I was not very surprised about the Minister of Agriculture's attitude, because on many occasions he has displayed the fact that he has no feeling whatsoever for working people or people who are in gaol. He would suggest that this would be too good a treatment. Can the Chief Secretary give us an answer about why he refuses to accept this amendment when his own colleagues in Victoria have provided a worker's compensation coverage, which has also been provided in Tasmania and Queensland?

In fact, what the Government is saying is that a prisoner has no workers compensation coverage. I would suggest that the situation is completely different. The person who is in gaol is on Crown land, and also this would apply when he is on a prison farm, whereas people who are going out on to private properties are in a vastly different position. If such a person had an eye knocked out, as was pointed out by the member for Playford, when the sentence finished that person still has his eye out and receives no compensation whatsoever. Can the Chief Secretary say why he refuses to accept this amendment when it has been accepted in Victoria, Tasmania and Queensland?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The Government has the charter to govern in South Australia. This legislation has been researched and looked at by officers of the Government, and the Government stands by it. I can

recall over the past ten years when I sat on the other side of the House that we went through similar exercises which were just as futile. I can recall the Hon. G. T. Virgo stonewalling for hours. I think I have made it quite plain to the House that anybody with an action will be not left without a feather to fly with. I will not go into a lot of semantics which has come from members opposite as we would be here all night. The Government is not going to accept the amendment moved by the member for Stuart.

Mr MATHWIN: We have had threats from two quarters tonight. We have had very strong threats from the member for Stuart about what is going to happen as far as he is concerned. Obviously it is moving as a vote to the Trades Hall on South Terrace. We have had threats from the Australian Democrat in this House about what is going to happen as far as he is concerned. We have had a situation where we are faced with blackmail from the two Parties in opposition in this place.

I refer to the argument put forward by my friend the member for Peake who said that prisoners are not covered now. It amazes me that the previous Government condoned the situation in relation to prisoners not being covered by this type of provision which they now claim they need and require and which they are asking for in this legislation.

The excuse given by the members for Stuart, Mitchell and Peake is that they are working on Crown land but, for the edification of those honourable members, I indicate that people in prison in Cadell and Yatala do not always work within prison precincts all the time. A number of them go out to do work in other areas. Some of them fight fires, as far as I know, and they do not always work on Crown land. Prisoners assist the C.F.S. and in other areas.

When the previous Government was in power it was not worried about prisoners at all but now, when the Labor Party is grasping at straws, members opposite are saying that they are covered anyway. That argument is wrong. I tell the Opposition that in the ten long weary years when a Labor Government was in power, it did not see fit to make any alterations in regard to prisoners, and the Labor Party is grasping at straws in this situation. As far as I can see, it is just a filibuster in this area.

Mr Keneally: It is my amendment. You sit down—you are filibustering.

Mr MATHWIN: I am entitled to speak to the amendment. The honourable member spoke for an hour and a half, and said nothing that showed any intelligence. This is the first time I have spoken on this amendment and, if I wish to, I can speak on two other occasions on this amendment. I point out to members opposite, that is, to those who are reasonable enough to see what I am driving at, that the Labor Government did not cover prisoners. It did not see fit to do that in the ten years when it was in office, although prisoners did not always work on Crown land.

Mr PETERSON: Again, the point seems to have been missed in this debate: a prisoner in gaol is in a totally different set of circumstances than a person involved in community work. Much has been spoken in this debate but I have still not been told how a person injured while doing community work can feed and clothe a family and satisfy his debts if that person cannot get to work the next day. That is almost significant part of the amendment. The idea of community work is great and has obviously been successful in other States. I can see no reason why it cannot be successful here. It is a great idea, but the legislation is being put at risk because the Government will not protect a person involved with Saturday work. No-one has explained this aspect to me, and I would be pleased to hear an explanation. There has been much airy-fairy

comment that no-one would be left on a limb, but that does not buy any loaves of bread. If a person is injured while doing this work and cannot attend his normal work, be it a trade or a profession, or if he is permanently injured and cannot continue with his work, how will that person be paid?

I would be much happier if I could get an assurance that the person will be paid. I cannot accept these airy-fairy explanations. I would accept a firm assurance that they will not be in any worse situation than if they were injured in their normal work. If the Minister cannot give me such an assurance, then the whole exercise is a waste of time. If a person is injured, how will he feed his family and satisfy his debts?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Can the Chief Secretary say whether in law he and his officers consider that a person who is subject to a so-called work order is a person under sentence for the purpose of the law? That is important to this question, as the Minister's officers will know. Certain prisoners under sentence still do not have full civil rights, and it may be that such a person injured through the absolute negligence of either an employer or someone who was present on the site where the work was taking place would in fact act in a grossly negligent fashion and that that prisoner would have no rights whatever to claim against that person for damages. This is what the amendment of the member for Stuart is trying to deal with. I would like to know from the Chief Secretary whether or not, in law, these people who are on work orders are considered to be prisoners under sentence.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: As the honourable member knows, I am not a lawyer. If a person is required by a court to carry out a community service order, that is an order. I am not competent to say whether it is a sentence in terms of law, but what I have said to the Committee is, and the advice that I have had during the drawing of the Bill is, that their welfare is covered and protected by the Government. Members are seeking assurances. The member for Semaphore seeks an assurance, but the advice of my officers is that it is not a sentence of imprisonment but a bond to do a community service order. I am sure that the member for Elizabeth will understand that, especially with his legal training. If someone is unfortunate enough to have an accident—I would be the last one to say this could not happen—I certainly would not want to see them put in a situation where they had no compensation.

I am saying that the way the Government proposes to do this is not the way the Opposition wishes to do it. That is the prerogative of Government, and that is what I have been trying to communicate for the last hour.

Mr KENEALLY: High sentiments indeed! The Chief Secretary said he would be the last one to deprive these people of adequate cover, yet he will vote not to provide that adequate cover. The Minister has not answered the question that has been asked of him several times, that is, whether the Government is willing to have this legislation founder on this issue, because he must know that that will be its fate.

I know that he has expressed a desire and that we have expressed a desire that this legislation should be written into the Statute Books because it has enormous merit. It would be unfortunate if it was to founder on this enormous matter of principle of protection of those people in the community who are most in need of a permanent income, that is, the working people who are on the lower end of the scale and who will inevitably and unfortunately predominate as participants in this scheme.

If that is the decision of the Minister and the Government, they should know exactly what decision they are making. This is the last occasion on which I will make a

plea to the Minister to ignore completely the advice that he is getting from some of his Cabinet colleagues and to look at the issues as they have been put before him in Committee.

Mr BLACKER: I have listened to the debate for over an hour and I am trying to draw a parallel between an offender and a worker in this case. If an offender is injured by way of an accident whilst he is detained within a gaol or some other institution and then subsequently upon release has to feed and clothe his family, provisions exist under which *ex gratia* payments can be made.

In those circumstances, where the person is still working as he would be within confined spaces, although in this case he is under the care and control of the Department of Correctional Services, there is little difference in his status as of that time. He is still serving a sentence as set down by the courts.

Mr Keneally: Except that he is in work and that could be an important element in his being sentenced to a community work order.

Mr BLACKER: I can accept that to some extent, but I cannot accept that the actual position he would be in if he were injured while carrying out that work order would be any different from his position if he were injured while serving a sentence within confined spaces, still under the jurisdiction of the Department of Correctional Services. I tend to believe that the right thing in this case is that the person is still in the care and control of the department, and that therefore the normal protection afforded to the offender would be the same as if he were serving a sentence within confined spaces. I fail to see that a person would not be covered, or at least given the protection afforded any other person serving a sentence. On that basis, I must oppose the amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Messrs Abbott, L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hoggood, Keneally (teller), Langley, McRae, Millhouse, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (21)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda (teller), Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, and Wilson.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Corcoran, Hemmings, and Slater. Noes—Messrs Ashenden, Becker, and Wotton.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

Mr KENEALLY: I move:

Page 5, lines 28 and 29—Leave out 'appointed by the Minister from a panel of three persons' and insert 'a person'.

This issue was canvassed during the second reading debate. We believe that it is a gratuitous insult to the Trades and Labor Council to ask it to nominate a panel of three names from which the Minister will select the person most suitable to the Government. I do not know that anyone in the Trades and Labor Council would be willing to put himself in the embarrassing position of being one of three, and asking the Government to select which nominee was most suitable to it. That person might find it difficult to live with his colleagues. Perhaps that is a flippant remark that should not be part of the debate.

The Opposition believes that the Government should give the United Trades and Labor Council status similar to that given to other organisations, particularly in this case. One of the members of the community service advisory committee will be a person nominated by the Director. We do not argue with that, but we would like to see the Trades and Labor Council given the same right. It is a responsible

body, and no doubt it will give the Minister a very good nominee who will serve the committee very well.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: We have thought about this. Similar provisions exist in other legislation. Surely, it will be no problem for the Trades and Labor Council to nominate three people, and I cannot see what the honourable member is worried about. I have had very harmonious discussions on this issue with Mr Gregory. I am sure that, of the three people put up, any one would be satisfactory. I believe the honourable member's fears are without foundation. Because we are asking for three, that gives a choice.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I am not accepting the amendment.

Mr KENEALLY: What would be the situation if the Government asked the United Trades and Labor Council to give it a panel of three from which the Government would select a nominee and the council refused to give it any nominees? This is my third appeal to the Minister on this score. What would happen if the Government asked the Trades and Labor Council for a panel of three from which to select the council's nominee and the council, as a result of what has taken place here tonight, did not provide the Government with the nominee? Would this legislation be able to work?

Mr O'NEILL: When the Minister says he had harmonious discussions with Mr. Gregory on this subject, is the Minister indicating to this Committee that Mr. Gregory agreed with the Minister that the Trades and Labor Council would put up a panel of three people?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I do not recall that we had that discussion.

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member for Mitchell to withdraw that remark.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will certainly withdraw that. I would say that all Liberals make terminological inexactitudes the order of the day when they are speaking.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I am sorry for making that sort of explanation. I apologise to the member for Mitchell if it grated on whatever it grated. The point that the member for Stuart made has gone from me.

Mr Keneally: Do you need the co-operation of the Trades and Labor Council—

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I regard that as a hypothetical question. We will cross that bridge when we get to it, if we are going to get to it. It is not only the Trades and Labor Council that is asked to put up a panel of three. It has happened in other areas and it may be much easier to put up three people than one.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hopgood, Keneally (teller), Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (22)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, Ashenden, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Millhouse, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda (teller), Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Corcoran, Hemmings, and Slater. Noes—Messrs P. B. Arnold, Becker, and Glazbrook.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr KENEALLY: I move:

Page 5, after line 39—Insert subsection as follows:

(3a) A guideline formulated by the advisory committee

shall have no force or effect unless the member the nominee of the United Trades and Labor Council has concurred in its formulation.

This is only writing into the legislation an undertaking given by the Minister in his second reading explanation. It is simply putting into the Bill, and so into the Act, what the Minister says is the Government's intention in relation to the United Trades and Labor Council representative's right of veto. We are doing no more than that. It is in the legislation in the other Parliaments that have Trades and Labor Council participation and it ought to be in the Act in South Australia.

I am surprised that the Minister feels that the Parliament and the community in South Australia ought to be able to accept his word on a number of issues rather than have the Government write those matters into legislation. I have pointed out when dealing with other amendments that Ministers change. The Minister's word may be acceptable to us because we may agree that he is an honourable person and would not go back on his word, but there is a great deal more force if the provision is written into legislation and that is what we are asking him to do. We are trying to do is no more than put into the legislation the very pertinent point that he canvassed in his second reading explanation. He assured us that that member would have power of veto. We want that veto power written into the legislation, as his colleagues elsewhere have done.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I ask the honourable member who is running this State. What is wrong with the Government's word? We can sit down and have discussions about these matters; surely we do not have to write this into the Bill. I do not accept the amendment.

Mr KENEALLY: The Minister, in his second reading explanation, stated:

The committee member appointed from the panel nominated by the Trades and Labor Council will have the power to veto any particular guideline proposed by the committee.

That intention should be written into the Bill. This is a perfectly reasonable request and involves what the Minister said in his second reading explanation. However, the Minister responds by asking, 'Who is running this State? The Government is running this State. You will not tell us what to do.' We are not telling the Government what to do; we are merely asking the Government to write into legislation what it says it will do. The Minister would get on better if he did not respond to the various inputs from the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Industrial Affairs. I ask the Minister to ignore the ill advice he is receiving and to write into the Bill what he said in his explanation.

If the Minister is not prepared to do this, the suspicion arises that he does not propose that the Trades and Labor Council member will have the power of veto. If he is positive that that power of veto is to be given to the member of the Trades and Labor Council, he will write it into the Bill. The Minister's failure to accept this amendment casts serious doubt upon whether he is a man of his word. The simple test is here. Is the Minister a man of his word? If he is, he will accept the amendment and write it into the Bill, but if he is not he will reject the amendment, and then we will have to rely on his word as to whether the member of the Trades and Labor Council will have a veto.

Where is it stated that that representative will have the power of veto? The power is contained in the Minister's second reading explanation but nowhere else. On what can the community and the Trades and Labor Council rely other than the Minister's second reading explanation if the

provision is not included in the Bill? I ask the Minister not to resort to the 'Who is running the State?' type of argument but to tell us why he believes strongly on the one hand that the power should reside with the Trades and Labor Council representative but why he believes equally strongly on the other hand that the provision should not be written into the Bill. There is an obvious conflict, and it should be explained to the Opposition—

Mr Mathwin: You can't be told if you don't sit down.

Mr KENEALLY:— and to the honourable member who interjects why that power will not be written into the Bill.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I have told the honourable member that the answer is 'No', and I hope that message has reached him.

Mr KENEALLY: This Committee should not be held up to ridicule. We are members of Parliament, and this is a legislative House of the South Australian Parliament. It is in this place that issues should be sensibly debated and questions answered so that the facts can be placed before the Committee and the Parliament; theoretically, honourable members should be able to make a decision based on that information. When a Minister is asked a straightforward question as to why he is not prepared to write into legislation assurances that he gives in his second reading explanation, when he refuses to inform the Committee what assurances other than his explanation the Trades and Labor Council would have that its representative has power of veto, and when the Minister says, 'That is what we are going to do' and makes no further contribution, how can this Committee sensibly debate the issue if there is to be no participation in the debate by the Minister? For the Minister to refuse the Committee the information which he obviously possesses and which we do not possess that enables him to refuse the amendment and insist that the assurances can be relied upon is somewhat unfair.

I ask the Minister to inform the Committee of the information that makes him so certain that the Trades and Labor Council veto is a part of this legislation. Unless this provision is written into the Bill, it is not a part of it and the Minister cannot convince this Committee or anyone else, including the Trades and Labor Council, that that is the case. I repeat, almost *ad nauseum*, that on every issue that the Trades and Labor Council is involved in regard to this measure, the Minister has denied it the participation that other Governments have provided. The Minister says that he has had amiable discussion with the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council, but when he is challenged about specific points of that discussion he is unable to inform the Committee accordingly. The Minister has had no assurances from anyone in the Trades and Labor Council: he is not giving the council in South Australia the status that is given to it in other States. How can the Minister expect the council to respond favourably to this measure, which he says requires the council's support to be a success. He is doing everything to ensure that the Trades and Labor Council will not give that support and to torpedo his own legislation.

It is incredible when a Minister of the Crown introduces a Bill and then does what he can to ensure that that Bill is unworkable. I am not asking for anything more than the Minister says the Trades and Labor Council delegate is entitled to have. Why will the Minister not write the provision into the Bill? Are we to assume from his reluctance that his word cannot be relied upon? If his word can be relied upon, it would be simple for him to write this provision into the Bill. What are the Minister's fears? I hope that we will not receive an answer such as 'We are the Government and we will do what we like, and the rest of the Parliament and the South Australian community

can suffer that sort of arrogance.'

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: You know and I know that we are not going to put people into a job that will take away another person's job. Do not waste my time and your time by carrying on with such arrogance.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I rise on a point of order. No member on this side has any association with sheep in the sense that we are called 'you'. I ask you to correct the Minister in that regard.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order and ask the Minister to refer to honourable members opposite in regard to their district, and to address the Chair.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The member for Mitchell, the shadow Minister and I know that the Government will not put people under the community service order scheme in a situation that will cause the Trades and Labor Council to use a veto. There will be a spirit of co-operation. Surely, we do not have to write into legislation the fact that someone has a veto over a properly elected Government? Is that what members opposite want? I will not agree to it. It is as plain and simple as that, and I apologise if I upset someone by getting into the agriculture area.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Russack): I realise that during a debate there is anxiety, but I ask honourable members to stand if they wish to speak, and the Chairman will call on an honourable member before he commences speaking.

Mr KENEALLY: The Minister has let the cat out of the bag, but he is probably not aware of it. He said that the Government will not give the power of veto to an organisation over a democratically elected Government, yet in his second reading speech he said that the Trades and Labor Council representatives would have the power. As the *Hansard* report will show clearly he said that the Government is not going to give power of veto to an organisation over the democratically elected Government. There it is. He makes pious promises in his second reading speech about how he is going to give power of veto to the Trades and Labor Council. When he is challenged and flushed out he tells the committee that no way is the power of veto going to be given to anybody over the democratically elected Government of South Australia. That is why we want him to write that provision into the legislation. We know now that he was not genuine when he read the second reading speech that was written for him. Perhaps he ought to write them himself so that he will not compromise himself to this degree. The democratically elected Government in Tasmania gives the power of veto. It is not abused. The Minister has to explain to the committee just exactly what he means; whether he means, as he said in the second reading speech, that the power of veto is there. If that is the case, let us write it into the legislation. The amendment does no more than that. There is nothing insidious or complex about the amendment—it is straightforward and does what the Minister says is the Government's intention. Are we now to believe that it is the Government's intention that the power of veto in this or any other matter will not be given to responsible bodies on issues that vitally concern their interest? I would like to know from the Minister once again whether or not he believes that the support of the Trades and Labor Council is forthcoming and whether it is the firm opinion of his Government that the statement that he made in the second reading speech was incorrect and whether the statements that he recently made at the Committee stage is the policy of the Minister, that is, that the power of veto will not be given to an organisation to veto decisions made by as he says, the democratically elected Government. The issue of course is not quite that. The power of veto is to veto decisions made by the

advisory committee, which could hardly be said to be a democratically elected Government.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I rise out of courtesy to the honourable member. He is putting a lot of effort into this. The matters that will be discussed by the committee have to have agreement. I made it quite plain that the Government is concerned that we are not going to be getting into areas where the power of veto is needed. There is plenty of work in the community to do this without infringing on areas that the honourable member is asking me to agree to in this amendment.

Mr ABBOTT: I support the amendment. Obviously, fears are held by the trade union movement, the Trades and Labor Council and possibly that is why the Minister included in his second reading speech, to expel some of those fears, the statement that the Trades and Labor Council would be given veto rights in this matter. I do not think that the amendment is unreasonable. If we want to expel those union fears the amendment should be written into that legislation. If, however, this is an oversight by the Minister, or if he has made a mistake in those words used in his second reading speech he ought to be man enough to stand up here and admit it. If the Minister was prepared to do that it would be more acceptable to the Opposition than his standing up and saying that he has no intention of accepting the amendment. I believe the amendment is necessary, and I support it whole heartedly.

Mr HAMILTON: I have been in this Parliament some 18 months, and this is one of the most disgusting displays of arrogance by a Minister that I have seen. He has quite clearly dishonoured a promise. He has stated that he has given a promise to the Trades and Labor Council: that is contained in his second reading speech. He states in part:

The committee member appointed from the panel, nominated by the Trades and Labor Council, will have the power to veto any particular guidelines proposed by the committee.

If the Minister is not prepared to honour that promise, I can see quite clearly why the Trades and Labor Council and the unions in this State do not trust a Liberal Government. Quite clearly, this will be reported back to the Trades and Labor Council and the unions tomorrow. As we have seen clearly demonstrated, not only in this Parliament but also in other States where the Liberals have held power and in the Federal arena, the trade union movement does not trust a Liberal Government, and justifiably so.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: What is new about not doing that?

Mr HAMILTON: I thank the Minister for his interjection. We have heard a great deal from the Minister and his colleagues over the past eighteen months. They have said, 'We will work in co-operation with the trade union movement'. Quite clearly, the Minister is either stupid or he forgets what he and his colleagues said leading up to the last election and since they have come into office. I register my disgust at the attitude of the Minister in relation to his 'promise'.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: As far as I can recall, the Minister has been a member of the House for a few months more than I have. It is only in the last twenty-one months that he has entered Ministerial office and has been required to exercise the responsibility and integrity associated with being a Minister of the Crown. It seems that the Minister does not understand the situation at this stage in relation to the amendment and does not realise what is on the line. Much as I find it difficult to extend some clemency to a person who is politically opposed to me, I am prepared to do so to point out to the Minister what is really at stake here. The Minister said (no-one else

in this House said) what is stated in his second reading speech. It can be cursory, perfunctory or even inserted in *Hansard*, but there is a convention and a tradition that the whole place will not work unless we can rely on the word of a Minister. The Minister said:

The committee member appointed from the panel nominated by the Trades and Labor Council will have the power to veto any particular guidelines proposed by the committee.

No-one on this side said that initially. It emanated from the Minister, and the Minister alone. There have been suggestions that someone else wrote it for him, that he did not read it, or whatever. Nothing of that nature has anything to do with what we are considering now—it is rather the integrity of the Minister up front right now. I serve notice on the Minister that, if he is not going to abide by the promise given in that second reading speech, he had better not make any other statements in this House and expect me to believe them, because I will refuse to believe them, and I will be justified in doing so on the basis of what he is proposing here tonight.

No pressure was put on the Minister by Opposition members. The Minister introduced this Bill within a day or so of three months ago. In fact, according to *Hansard* he did so on 5 March. Is that how good a Liberal's word is? Is it only worth while for less than three months? This is a vital and important matter and, if the Minister meant it, let him prove it to the Committee right now by accepting the amendment. If the Minister did not mean it, let him have the guts to say, 'I only put it in there for window dressing, to make it look good, but I did not mean it.' That will show how much worth one can place on the word of a Liberal member.

A division on the amendment was called for.

While the division bells were ringing:

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I suggest that conversations going across the Chamber have gone quite far enough.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have already given a warning, and I will take the necessary action prescribed in the Standing Orders if the conversations continue.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hoggood, Keneally (teller), Langley, McRae, Millhouse, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (21)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Ashenden, Bil-lard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olson, Oswald, Randall, Rodda (teller), Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Corcoran, Hemmings, and Slater. Noes—Messrs. Allison, P. B. Arnold and Becker.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

Mr KENEALLY: I move:

Page 5, after line 44—Insert paragraph as follows:

(ab) one shall be a person nominated by the United Trades and Labor Council;

I have moved this amendment because of the situation that has applied at Port Adelaide, Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, Elizabeth and a number of other country areas which are predominantly working class and in which people's jobs will be affected by wrong decisions that may be made by the community service committees, even though guidelines will have been laid down for those committees by the advisory committee.

It seems to me that the position would be best served by the Government's agreeing to my amendment, so that a representative of the trades and labor movement, who will have an interest in such important issues, will be able to decide whether or not work has been given to the detriment of people who are already working.

The Opposition strongly believes that the best interest of the system will be served by having on these regional committees a representative from the Trades and Labor Council who is best able to determine whether or not work given to the community service system could otherwise be done by a trade unionist or worker, so that a job is not lost.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I take it that the honourable member, by his amendment, is looking to have a nominee of the Trades and Labor Council on every community regional committee.

Mr Keneally: Yes, at places like Port Pirie, Elizabeth, Whyalla, Port Augusta, and Port Adelaide.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: To be fair, the advisory committee will have an input right across the board. The honourable member is really wanting a field day when he wants the United Trades and Labor Council involved officially in this matter. I have no doubt that there will be on these committees representatives who will reflect the views that the Opposition supports. Although I do not resile from that position, I cannot agree that this amendment should apply across the board.

Mr KENEALLY: I believe that the amendment is perfectly logical and reasonable and would be an advantage in the Bill. However, as it is quite obvious that the Government will not accept any amendment that has any relevance to the Trades and Labor Council at all, I will leave my remarks at that point. It is a hopeless task trying to convince this Minister that he should include references to the Trades and Labor Council and treat that organisation as it should be treated. Obviously the Minister will not accept my amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Mr KENEALLY: I move:

Page 6, after line 24—Insert subsection as follows:

(8a) An approval given by a community service committee under subsection (8) shall have no force or effect unless the member the nominee of the United Trades and Labor Council has concurred in the giving of the approval.

This amendment is consequential to my other amendment. If the Government is not prepared to accept my amendment in relation to the advisory committee, it will certainly not be prepared to accept this amendment in relation to the community service committee.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 8—'Ministers shall assign probation officer or community service officer to each probationer.'

Mr ABBOTT: I note that the marginal note to new section 7 states that a probation officer or community service officer may give reasonable directions to probationers. What kind of direction may be given, and what does the Minister consider to be a reasonable direction?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: In my view a reasonable direction would involve a probationer having to report to his probation officer and being entitled to have explained to him the requirements of the order in a courteous manner. Everything expected of him as set out in the Bill would be explained to him. Without spelling out all the details, I believe that everyone is entitled to be treated with courtesy.

Mr ABBOTT: New section 7(2)(a) provides:

(2) A community service officer to whom a probationer

has been assigned for community service may give reasonable directions to the probationer in relation to the following matters:

(a) requiring the probationer to report to a community service centre or other place at certain times;

Has any consideration been given to the distance to be travelled to work sites? In Tasmania a probationer is not to be employed more than seven miles beyond his usual place of residence. As the Bill before us does not have a similar provision, will this be taken into account?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I believe it is self-explanatory. Obviously, we would not expect someone from Gawler to go to Port Noarlunga.

Mr Abbott: Is there a limit?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: That is why we have provided for centres at places such as Norwood, Port Noarlunga and Port Adelaide. I believe it is reasonable to expect people to travel a reasonable distance. Travelling across the city is not unreasonable. If I am expected to specify a distance, I have already been in trouble tonight for having said something that has upset some people. However, I think we all understand what a reasonable distance means, and the Bill establishes centres in various areas.

Mr PETERSON: Will the Minister explain the provisions contained in new section 7 (1) (d) and (e), which appear to be very Draconian? Paragraph (d) requires a probationer 'to reside, or not to reside, in any place or area, or with any person'. That implies that a probation officer can dictate where and with whom a probationer will live. That seems rather harsh when presumably the people who have offended and who are on probation are ordinary people living in a family environment. However, the probation officer has the power to tell these people where and with whom they will live. Paragraph (e) refers to 'requiring the probationer to take up, or not to take up, any particular employment, not to give up his employment, or to be punctual in reporting to work'. I assume that is referring to his normal employment. Those two paragraphs seem very harsh, dictating where and with whom a probationer will live and with whom he will work not work.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: A person affected by an order could be required by a probation officer to reside at a certain place, in his present or future interests. It is not the general rule, but the Bill covers special circumstances.

Mr KENEALLY: I would like to follow up the point made by the member for Spence in relation to travel to and from the place of employment. In Tasmania there is a statutory limit of eleven kilometres. If an offender is required to work at a place outside that limit, the department is responsible for providing transport. There is a statutory limit on the distance one can be made to travel to work. If the department cannot provide work within the statutory limit, the department is responsible for providing transport to a place where work can be found.

The Tasmanian Government has set up work order guidelines which cover such matters as providing work and a whole host of other matters dealing with the community service scheme. What discretion do officers have in relation to determining what is reasonable? Are guidelines going to be laid down by the Minister so that the supervisors and officers working within the scheme know what is expected of them in terms of what is and what is not reasonable? It seems to me that there are some people who would be prepared to accept any order given to them by a supervisor, even when that work order could be most unreasonable. People could be doing work under the scheme which was not intended to be done under the scheme, because the people concerned believed that work to be reasonable.

To be quite honest about this, the Minister, the Director and his officers know, as I do, that many people who will be participating in this scheme as offenders, are people whose average intelligence quotient is not as high as one would wish it to be. There will be a lot of people in this scheme with relatively low intelligence, people who are not ordinarily able to make a distinction between what is a reasonable request and what is not a reasonable request.

Mr Mathwin: Come on, Gavin!

Mr KENEALLY: There must be guidelines provided so that thugs of this world, like the member who is interjecting—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would suggest to the honourable member that he should not refer to another member in that fashion, and I suggest that he withdraw that remark.

Mr KENEALLY: I withdraw it reluctantly, Sir, because I take great offence at the general attitude illustrated by part of that interjection. People will be participating in this scheme who are of relatively low intelligence and who are unable to make a distinction between reasonable and unreasonable requests. If it is an unreasonable request they are likely to fulfil that request not knowing the difference. I believe that supervisors should have and will have guidelines provided for them. If a request by a supervisor is demonstrably unreasonable, does the offender, or the participant, or the worker, or whatever we wish to call him or her, have the right of appeal to somebody. If so, who is that somebody? Do they have to fulfil an unreasonable request and then complain about it afterwards? If legislation specifies a reasonable direction or a reasonable request, a person ought to have the right to appeal against that request or direction if it is unreasonable. Will guidelines be provided; will the individual be provided with the ability to register an appeal; and will that appeal be determined immediately, or does the offender have to fulfil the request and then complain at a later date?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: There is no provision for appeal in the Bill, but I think common sense must prevail. The scheme must be got off the ground in the first instance. The honourable member spoke about where the community centres are to be located and mentioned a figure of seven miles. Common sense would have to apply as in some areas it would be difficult to get people to a certain location, but seven miles around Norwood, for example, would not present a big difficulty. There is adequate public transport in Adelaide. I think that in Victoria people were covering greater distances than that. Most of these people had their motor cars. This is something that the department will develop as the scheme goes along.

Mr KENEALLY: The fact that reference is made to a reasonable direction presupposes that unreasonable directions could be given, and that being so, a person should have the right to appeal against them. That is a point of view I hold, but obviously I am not going to get a satisfactory reply.

Clause passed.

Clause 9 passed.

Clause 10—'Power to revoke or vary a condition of recognizance, or to discharge recognizance'.

Mr KENEALLY: I move:

Page 8, Line 15—After 'Instrument in writing,' insert 'and after obtaining in the prescribed manner the approval of a stipendiary magistrate.'

The amendment applies to the new subsection (3) of section (8) which states:

Where the Minister is satisfied that the conduct of a probationer under supervision has been such as to make it

unnecessary that he should be under supervision any longer, and that it would not be in the best interests of the probationer for him to remain under supervision, the Minister may, by instrument in writing, waive the obligation of the probationer to comply any further with the condition of his recognizance requiring him to be subject to supervision.

This is a corollary to my objection to giving the powers to the Minister and the Director to impose an added penalty. To be consistent, I am providing here that the Minister or the Director ought not to have power to vary the penalty, even if it is to reduce the requirement for supervision.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I do not see any point in the amendment.

Mr MATHWIN: In many parts of the world it is common practice, as the member for Stuart would know, for a waiver to be given in certain circumstances. It is used quite frequently in States in America and it is used in Canada. It works very successfully, and the order does not have to be given by a judge or magistrate. Once again this gets down to what is common sense and what is reasonable. A definition of that is very hard if one tries to define it as a legal term. However, if common sense prevails the waiver system works remarkably well. I have plenty of proof which indicates that it has done so in other countries. The member for Stuart mentioned this when he spoke in the second reading debate, and he said that he did not know that it was working anywhere else. Indeed, he challenged me to tell him how it was working. I am able to tell him that it is working in many States in America and in many Provinces in Canada.

Amendment negated; clause passed.

Clause 11—'Provision in case of probationer failing to observe conditions of his recognizance.'

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

Page 8, lines 37 to 40—Leave out all words in these lines and insert new subsection as follows:

(6) Where a probative court orders that a suspended sentence be carried into effect, the court—

(a) may, if it considers that there are special circumstances justifying it in so doing, reduce the term of the suspended sentence;

(b) may direct that time spent by the probationer in custody pending determination of the proceedings for breach of recognizance be counted as part of the term of the suspended sentence; or

(c) may direct that the suspended sentence be cumulative upon any other sentence, or sentences, of imprisonment then being served, or to be served, by the probationer.

This gives flexibility in these instances. The amendment is self-explanatory and I ask the Committee to accept it.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

[Midnight]

Clause 12 passed.

Clause 13—'Immunity from liability.'

Mr McRAE: This clause is totally objectionable and is well known to the Government and its advisers to be objectionable. I have now found the precedent to which I referred earlier this evening. There must be a clear limitation and restriction as to the sort of liability and, in a nutshell and at the very least, one must exclude criminal liability. The precedent for that is the State disaster legislation, which was reprinted with amendments and is Bill No. 70 now in our folders. The Minister is taking advice on that matter and will find that that Bill draws a clear distinction between criminal and civil liability. The Opposition would be satisfied if the Minister gave a

definite undertaking that in another place the appropriate distinction would be drawn.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The honourable member is concerned about criminal liability as opposed to civil liability, and I have no objection to the word 'civil' being inserted.

Mr McRAE: I take it that the Minister is now telling me that in due course in another place an appropriate amendment will be made to discriminate between civil and criminal liability in the same way as it was done in relation to the State disaster legislation?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I have no objection to the word 'civil' being inserted in the clause.

The CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member intends to move an amendment, he will have to do so in writing.

Mr McRAE: I will do so.

Mr MATHWIN: Portion of this clause provides an immunity from liability, which is the area of concern expressed by the member for Playford. I can see the point raised by the honourable member and I believe his point is worth considering.

Mr McRAE: I move:

Page 9, line 21—After 'No' insert 'civil'.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr KENEALLY (Stuart): The Bill coming from Committee with the provisions that are in it in relation to the Trades and Labor Council activity within the measure does not meet with the approval of the Opposition. I am absolutely certain that it will not meet with the approval of the very vital part of this Bill's success, with the Trades and Labor Council itself. I will not be seeking a division on the third reading, because it only holds up the House at this late stage. I wish only to express my concern about the Bill as it is now, and I forecast that there will need to be massive amendments to it in another place for the Minister to successfully pilot through this Parliament a Bill which is sorely needed and which would have been improved if it had been amended as we wished it to be.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ARCHITECTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 March. Page 3585).

Mr KENEALLY (Stuart): A Bill seeking to amend the Architects Act is no stranger to Parliament. This is the third or fourth time in the last seven or eight years that Parliament has attempted to come to grips adequately with the problem that exists with architects *vis-a-vis* building designers. In registering architects we have tried to prevent building designers from using the term 'architects', but then Parliament had to introduce a provision that exempted building designers and now we are back to square one: a committee established by the Minister and chaired by the member for Fisher has recommended that the system existing before 1975 ought to be re-established.

I checked with the Architects Board and the Building Designers Association on whether they were in total agreement. They confirmed that they were. I did not make the effort to discuss the Bill with the Institute of Draftsmen, the Master Builders Association or the Housing Industry Association, because I was assured that they were equally in support of the measure.

What happens now with building designers is that we have a group of people, quite often with architectural qualifications, who are unable to be registered because there are not enough architectural firms in South Australia to provide the necessary two years of acceptable work to those graduates so that they can be registered as architects. They quite often set themselves up as building designers. Such a person can advertise himself as 'Building designer, Joe Blow', with the appropriate letters after his name, although he cannot advertise himself as an architect. The Architects Board is quite happy with this, and the Opposition has no objection to it. Along with the present Government, our Government has tried to resolve this problem over many years.

The second part of the Bill deals with problems that have arisen in relation to one-director companies registered as architects. One-director companies are no longer allowed under the Companies Act; there must be two directors. One-director architectural companies find themselves in conflict with either the Companies Act or the Architects Act. So, a request was relayed to the Minister seeking amendment to the Architects Act to allow companies to be established with the one professional person, the architect, but with the second director being able to be an employee, an accountant, a solicitor, or a relative. A relative is defined as a spouse, parent, child, or grandchild. The Opposition has some reservations about this provision, although it is realised that this is not novel legislation. We have some concern about members of the family being able to be co-directors. We have no objection if a solicitor, an accountant, or a worker within the company is a co-director, but we have some concern about the relative, because there are some aspects of the matter which, whilst not unsavoury, smack perhaps of tax evasion, and so on. It is not the role of this Parliament to provide a facility for people to evade tax.

To overcome the problem with existing one-director architectural firms is a difficult matter, and we understand the problem the Government has faced if in fact it has shared the concern felt by members on this side. On balance, the Opposition decided to agree that clause 3 should be allowed to go through, that we should not oppose it. I do not know whether not opposing a measure suggests that we support it. I am sure that historically that will be seen to be the case, although in fact it is not. However, we are not so strongly committed to our objections that we will vote against clause 3. We are unhappy about having relatives as co-directors, but we accept the reality of the situation.

That is as much as I am prepared to contribute at this late stage. Hopefully, Parliament now will not be required to look again at the Architects Act to provide for the needs of our building designers. I am sure that, if no-one else agrees, the member for Fisher will. Of all members of Parliament, he has been that one who has most notably contributed each time a similar measure has been before the House. The other contributors have been many and varied, but the member for Fisher has been consistent in his concern. The Opposition will not oppose this measure.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I have appreciated the opportunity to attempt to resolve the problem, with recommendations from other people. The committee looked at all aspects of the matter, including another board, and whether there were other ways around it by another Act, and so on. In the main, the architects themselves would prefer not to have other groups referred to in their Act, because they believe it is an Architects Act. That is one of the problems we were endeavouring to solve. I appreciate the co-operation I received from the people involved, and

particularly from a member of the Minister's staff.

The point raised by the member for Stuart regarding relatives is a just one. Unfortunately, other companies that have only two members do not have the restrictions that apply in this case. In the Architects Act the problem existed, and so what we are doing in relation to relatives is no different from the situation applying with other companies. I can understand the honourable member's concern about tax evasion, but the committee had to consider that there are some very genuine cases where a member of the family carries out work within the company—clerical work, talking to customers, and so on. If we had tried to eliminate the provision for relatives we would have eliminated those with a genuine reason.

I am sure the Government appreciates the point made by the member for Stuart. It is a problem area that is difficult to legislate around. It is giving these people no greater benefit than many other small companies enjoy. I thank all who have helped me through the twelve-month period to get to this point, and I am pleased that the Opposition has accepted the Bill in its present form.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): I appreciate the comments of the member for Stuart. I know from the papers I have looked at that the previous Government had

its problems with this matter. I would like to place on record my appreciation and that of the Government of the work done by the member for Fisher in chairing this committee, which had many meetings and which were not easy. He was assisted by Miss Graham, now Mrs Stevens, and they came up with resolutions, after which we had discussions with the Architects Board. It was not an easy task, but they came to a resolution and we commend them on that.

I thank the member for Fisher because, with Miss Graham, he was successful in coming up with a solution that would enable these people to go about their lawful business. The matter contained in clause 3 has been resolved, I hope satisfactorily. I think that our building institutions can look forward to some harmony in their industry, and I thank the member for Stuart and the member for Fisher for their work on this matter.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.21 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 3 June at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 2 June 1981

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

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

1. What requests, if any, did the Minister have from:
 - (a) principals;
 - (b) parents and staff;
 - (c) The S.A. Institute of Teachers; and
 - (d) the S.A. Association of State Schools Organisations,

regarding the conditions under which corporal punishment in schools might be imposed, when did he receive them, and were they oral or in writing (and which)?

2. When were guidelines pursuant to the regulations on this matter published in the *Education Gazette*?

3. What alterations, if any, did such guidelines make to the conditions under which corporal punishment might be imposed and, if none, why were such guidelines issued?

4. Did the Minister write on 16 October to the staff of the Hillcrest Primary School (and to the staff of any other, and what, schools) saying that he had been led to believe that there had already been discussions about these guidelines with teachers and parents and, if so, who and what led him to believe that discussions with teachers and parents had already happened?

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

1. The Minister was assured by Education Department senior officers that consultation processes by the department had been impeccable and that the South Australian Institute of Teachers had been involved as early as April-May 1980 in discussing the guidelines and their implications. No opposition was expressed by that organisation, but only mild reservations on two of the guidelines.

2. Promulgated *Education Gazette* 3.10.80 (and withdrawn 16.10.80).

3. No guidelines had ever before been promulgated. Corporal punishment was most certainly retained as a deterrent to misdemeanour, but provision was made for parents with strong conscientious opposition to corporal punishment to request an alternative. It was also considered that guidelines now afforded protection to staff members whose responsibilities had not before been clearly defined.

4. Yes, acting upon the advice of departmental officers. The matter is now dormant. Government policy supports the retention of corporal punishment.

APPRENTICES

875. Mr PETERSON (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. For each month of 1980:
 - (a) how many apprentices had their indentures suspended;
 - (b) what were their individual trades;
 - (c) what year of their apprenticeship and what trade were they in at the time of suspension;
 - (d) how many, and in which trades, were re-employed as apprentices and what year of apprenticeship were they; and

(e) what were the reasons for the suspension and how many were in each category of suspension?

2. Will suspended apprentices be given any preference in the Government's 'Apprentice Hotline' telephone service and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: There are over 11 000 apprentices in South Australia and in 1980, 404 of these had their indentures suspended for some period. The procedures adopted for suspensions of indentures are as follows:

When all parties to an indenture of apprenticeship formally ask for the indenture to be suspended for a specified reason and from a particular date, this is generally accepted by the Apprenticeship Commission and the decision made to suspend the indenture. In most cases, there is prior contact with an apprentice supervisor. Where there is disagreement between the parties whether an indenture should be suspended, the party requiring the suspension must convince the commission that the circumstances of the apprentice are such as to warrant that decision. This must be formally set out in writing to the commission. An apprentice supervisor would inquire and advise all parties as the situation required and formally report to the commission. Usually a letter from the other party or parties to the contract telling them their position will also be sought. When the assessment of the situation is difficult or the circumstances complex, a Committee of Inquiry is called where the parties and their representatives discuss the issues before the Chairman of the Apprenticeship Commission. The findings of such a committee assist the commission with its deliberations. Occasionally, parties in a dispute situation may be asked to discuss their differences with the Apprenticeship Commission.

Apprentices suspended from trades for financial reasons are normally re-employed within a short space of time and although the Commonwealth Employment Service has the major responsibility for placement in employment, apprentice supervisory staff of the Training Branch of the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment also endeavour to find suitable vacancies.

Part I

The attached sheets set out month-by-month the answers to (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) of this Part. The reasons for suspension have been divided into two categories: Financial reasons—where an employer has sold his business or has been unable to provide work or training due to financial difficulties, and other—reasons such as loss of interest, change of residence incapacity and misconduct.

The subsequent position or employment situation of the apprentices has been divided into four categories: T (Transfer) where an apprentice has been transferred to another employer; R (Resumed) where an apprentice has resumed with the previous employer; S (Suspended) where an apprentice is still under suspension; C (Cancelled) cancellation of the apprentice.

Part II

The purpose of the Apprentice Hotline campaign was to encourage employers to recruit additional first year apprentices in a number of key metals and electrical trade areas. Accordingly, the question of priority for suspended apprentices is not relevant.

APPRENTICES SUSPENDED IN 1980
JANUARY

Trade	Total Number Suspended	Number of Apprentices	Year of Apprenticeship	Reason for Suspension	Subsequent Position
Ladies hairdresser	7	2	First year	Other	C C
		1	Second year	Other	T
		2	Third year	Other	T R
		2	Fourth year	Other	S T
Motor mechanic	6	2	First year	Other	C T
		2	Second year	Financial	C T
		2	Fourth year	Financial	T T
Fitter and turner	3	1	Second year	Other	T
		2	Third year	Other	T T
Electrical mechanic	3	1	First year	Other	T
		1	Second year	Other	S
		1	Second year	Financial	T
Cook	2	1	Second year	Other	T
		1	Third year	Other	T
Carpenter	1	1	Third year	Other	S
Cabinet maker	1	1	Fourth year	Financial	S
Bricklayer	1	1	Third year	Other	C
Plumber	1	1	Fourth year	Financial	R
Panel beater	1	1	Second year	Other	C
Painter and decorator	1	1	Third year	Financial	C
Refrigeration mechanic	1	1	First year	Financial	C
Structural steel tradesman	1	1	Second year	Other	C
Butcher	1	1	Fourth year	Other	T
Total	30				

FEBRUARY

Ladies hairdresser	6	1	First year	Financial	T
		2	Second year	Financial	C C
		2	Third year	Other	S C
		1	Fourth year	Financial	T
Motor mechanic	6	1	Second year	Financial	C
		2	Third year	Financial	S C
		1	Third year	Other	C
		2	Fourth year	Financial	T T
Electrical mechanic	1	1	Fourth year	Other	S
Cook	1	1	Second year	Other	S
Cabinet maker	3	1	First year	Financial	C
		2	Third year	Financial	S T
Bricklayer	1	1	Third year	Financial	C
Plumber	3	3	Fourth year	Financial	R R S
Painter and decorator	1	1	Third year	Other	C
Joiner	1	1	Fourth year	Financial	T
Upholsterer	1	1	First year	Other	C
Sheetmetal worker	1	1	First year	Other	C
Optical mechanic	1	1	Third year	Other	R
Wood machinist	1	1	Fourth year	Other	C
Total	27				

MARCH

Ladies hairdresser	4	1	First year	Other	C
		1	Second year	Other	C
		1	Third year	Other	S
		1	Fourth year	Financial	C
Motor mechanic	4	1	First year	Other	S
		2	Second year	Financial	T T
		1	Fourth year	Financial	T
Fitter and turner	3	1	Second year	Other	S
		1	Third year	Other	T
		1	Fourth year	Other	S

APPRENTICES SUSPENDED IN 1980—*continued*
JANUARY—*continued*

Trade	Total Number Suspended	Number of Apprentices	Year of Apprenticeship	Reason for Suspension	Subsequent Position
Electrical mechanic	4	3	Second year	Financial	T T T
		1	Third year	Other	T
Cook	2	2	Third year	Other	S S
Carpenter	2	2	Third year	Financial	T S
Cabinetmaker	1	1	Second year	Financial	T
Bricklayer	1	1	Fourth year	Financial	C
Plumber	4	1	Second year	Financial	C
		1	Third year	Financial	T
		1	Third year	Other	S
		1	Fourth year	Financial	R
Structural steel tradesman	1	1	First year	Financial	S
Butcher	4	1	First year	Other	C
		1	Second year	Financial	S
		2	Fourth year	Financial	S S
Motor painter	1	1	Second year	Financial	C
Auto electrician	1	1	Second year	Financial	C
Machinst 1st class	1	1	First year	Financial	C
Panel beater	3	1	First year	Financial	S
		1	Second year	Financial	T
		1	Third year	Other	C
Total	36				
APRIL					
Ladies hairdresser	5	1	Second year	Financial	C
		1	Second year	Other	C
		1	Third year	Other	T
		2	Fourth year	Financial	S T
Motor mechanic	4	1	First year	Financial	T
		2	Second year	Financial	C S
		1	Third year	Other	C
Fitter and turner	1	1	Fourth year	Other	T
Electrical mechanic	1	1	Second year	Financial	T
Cook	1	1	Fourth year	Other	R
Carpenter and joiner	7	1	First year	Financial	T
		1	First year	Other	R
		5	Fourth year	Financial	S T S T S
Cabinet maker	1	1	Second year	Financial	T
Bricklayer	1	1	First year	Financial	S
Plumber	3	1	Second year	Financial	T
		1	Third year	Financial	S
		1	Fourth year	Financial	T
Panel beater	4	1	Second year	Other	C
		1	Second year	Financial	C
		1	Third year	Other	C
		1	Fourth year	Financial	S
Butcher	2	1	Second year	Financial	S
		1	Fourth year	Financial	S
Motor painter	4	2	Second year	Financial	S S
		1	Third year	Financial	T
		1	Fourth year	Other	C
Boilermaker	1	1	First year	Other	C
Electrical fitter	1	1	Fourth year	Other	T
Sheetmetal worker	1	1	Third year	Other	C
Total	37				
MAY					
Ladies hairdresser	9	1	First year	Other	C
		1	Second year	Other	C
		1	Third year	Financial	S
		3	Third year	Other	T S T
		1	Fourth year	Other	T
		2	Fourth year	Financial	T C

APPRENTICES SUSPENDED IN 1980—*continued*
 JANUARY—*continued*

Trade	Total Number Suspended	Number of Apprentices	Year of Apprenticeship	Reason for Suspension	Subsequent Position
Motor mechanic	6	2	First year	Financial	S R
		1	Second year	Other	S
		1	Second year	Financial	S
		1	Third year	Financial	C
		1	Fourth year	Financial	T
Fitter and turner	1	1	Fourth year	Other	R
Electrical mechanic	4	1	First year	Other	C
		2	Second year	Financial	T S
		1	Fourth year	Financial	T
Cook	1	1	Second year	Other	C
Carpenter and joiner	1	1	Second year	Financial	T
Cabinet maker	2	2	First year	Other	C S
Bricklayer	2	1	Third year	Financial	C
		1	Fourth year	Financial	C
Panel beater	2	2	Second year	Financial	T C
Painter and decorator	2	1	Third year	Financial	S
		1	Fourth year	Financial	T
Refrigeration mechanic	2	1	Second year	Financial	T
		1	Fourth year	Financial	C
Motor painter	2	2	Third year	Financial	C R
Upholsterer	2	2	Second year	Financial	R T
Wood machinist	1	1	Fourth year	Other	T
Auto electrician	1	1	Fourth year	Other	C
Electrical fitter	1	1	Fourth year	Other	R
Fibrous plasterer	1	1	Second year	Financial	C
Joiner	1	1	Fourth year	Financial	T
Jeweller	1	1	Fourth year	Financial	C
Dental mechanic	1	1	Third year	Financial	T
Total	43				
JUNE					
Ladies hairdresser	3	2	Second year	Other	C R
		1	Third year	Other	S
Motor mechanic	12	4	First year	Financial	S S C T
		2	Second year	Financial	S T
		2	Second year	Other	S S
		2	Third year	Financial	C S
		2	Fourth year	Other	S S
Electrical mechanic	1	1	First year	Other	C
Cook	2	1	First year	Other	C
		1	Fourth year	Financial	T
Carpenter and joiner	2	1	Second year	Financial	C
		1	Fourth year	Other	C
Cabinet maker	1	1	First year	Financial	C
Bricklayer	1	1	First year	Financial	T
Panel beater	1	1	Second year	Other	C
Plumber	3	1	Second year	Financial	S
		1	Third year	Financial	T
		1	Fourth year	Other	S
Motor cycle mechanic	1	1	Second year	Other	C
Motor trimmer	1	1	Second year	Other	C
Floor and wall tiler	1	1	Second year	Financial	C
Auto electrician	1	1	Third year	Financial	C
Motor painter	1	1	Fourth year	Financial	C
Electrical fitter	1	1	Second year	Other	R
Total	32				
JULY					
Ladies hairdresser	9	2	First year	Other	R S
		2	Second year	Other	R S
		2	Second year	Financial	S T
		3	Fourth year	Financial	T T C

APPRENTICES SUSPENDED IN 1980—*continued*
JANUARY—*continued*

Trade	Total Number Suspended	Number of Apprentices	Year of Apprenticeship	Reason for Suspension	Subsequent Position
Motor mechanic	5	1	First year	Financial	T
			First year	Other	S
			Second year	Financial	T T
			Fourth year	Financial	T
Fitter and turner	1	1	Third year	Other	S
Cook	3	1	First year	Financial	S
			Second year	Other	T C
Carpenter and joiner	3	1	First year	Other	T
			Third year	Financial	S
			Fourth year	Other	R
Bricklayer	3	1	First year	Financial	R
			Third year	Financial	T
			Fourth year	Financial	S
Plumber	4	1	Second year	Financial	S
			Fourth year	Financial	C T
			Fourth year	Other	T
Panel beater	1	1	Second year	Financial	S
Painter and decorator	1	1	Fourth year	Financial	S
Sheetmetal worker	1	1	Fourth year	Other	T
Wood machinist	1	1	First year	Other	S
Boilermaker welder	1	1	Second year	Other	T
Upholsterer	1	1	Second year	Other	T
Motor trimmer	1	1	Second year	Financial	T
Motor cycle mechanic	1	1	Fourth year	Other	S
Plasterer	1	1	First year	Other	S
Total	37				
AUGUST					
Ladies hairdresser	9	1	First year	Other	S
			Second year	Other	S C
			Second year	Financial	T S
			Fourth year	Other	S C T
Motor mechanic	7	1	Fourth year	Financial	T
			First year	Financial	T
			First year	Other	S
			Second year	Financial	S
Electrical mechanic	1	1	Third year	Financial	S S
			Fourth year	Other	T R
			Fourth year	Financial	T R
Cook	3	1	First year	Other	S
			Second year	Other	C S
Bricklayer	1	1	Second year	Other	S
Plumber	5	1	First year	Other	C
			First year	Financial	T
			Fourth year	Financial	S
Panel beater	1	1	Fourth year	Other	S R
			Fourth year	Other	S
			Fourth year	Other	S
Fitter and turner	1	1	Second year	Other	S
			Second year	Other	S
Painter and decorator	2	1	First year	Other	S
			Third year	Other	R
Carpenter and joiner	3	1	Second year	Other	T
			Third year	Financial	T
			Fourth year	Other	C
Butcher	2	2	Third year	Financial	S S
Cabinet maker	1	1	Fourth year	Financial	S
Sheetmetal worker	1	1	Second year	Other	S
Boilermaker	1	1	Second year	Other	R
Welder	1	1	Third year	Other	T
Radio tradesman	1	1	First year	Other	C
Pastry cook	1	1	First year	Other	T
Total	41				

APPRENTICES SUSPENDED IN 1980—continued
JANUARY—continued

Trade	Total Number Suspended	Number of Apprentices	Year of Apprenticeship	Reason for Suspension	Subsequent Position
SEPTEMBER					
Ladies hairdresser	9	1	First year	Other	C
		1	Second year	Other	S
		1	Second year	Financial	T
		2	Third year	Other	S R
		1	Third year	Financial	S
		1	Fourth year	Financial	S
		2	Fourth year	Other	T S
Motor mechanic	3	2	Second year	Other	S C
		1	Third year	Other	S
Fitter and turner	2	1	Second year	Other	R
		1	Fourth year	Financial	S
Electrical mechanic	1	1	Third year	Other	T
Cook	1	1	Third year	Other	T
Cabinet maker	2	2	Second year	Financial	S R
Boilermaker	2	1	First year	Other	S
		1	Fourth year	Other	S
Bricklayer	1	1	Second year	Financial	S
Painter and decorator	1	1	Fourth year	Financial	S
Panel beater	3	2	Second year	Other	S S
		1	Fourth year	Other	S
Motor painter	1	1	Fourth year	Other	S
Pastry cook	1	1	Fourth year	Other	S
Sheetmetal worker	1	1	Second year	Other	S
Moulder coremaker	1	1	Third year	Other	S
Total	29				

OCTOBER					
Ladies hairdresser	9	3	First year	Other	T S C
		1	Second year	Financial	S
		3	Third year	Other	S T T
		1	Fourth year	Other	T
		1	Fourth year	Financial	S
Motor mechanic	6	3	First year	Financial	T S S
		1	Second year	Other	S
		2	Fourth year	Other	S R
Cook	7	2	First year	Other	C S
		1	First year	Financial	T
		3	Second year	Other	T S S
		1	Third year	Other	S
Carpenter and joiner	5	2	Third year	Financial	R R S
		2	Fourth year	Financial	C S
		1	Fourth year	Other	R
Cabinet maker	4	2	First year	Financial	T C
		1	Second year	Other	S
		1	Fourth year	Other	S
Plumber	2	2	Fourth year	Financial	S T
Painter and decorator	2	2	Fourth year	Other	S S
Electrical mechanic	1	1	Second year	Other	T
Panel beater	1	1	Fourth year	Financial	C
Bricklayer	1	1	Fourth year	Other	R
Butcher	1	1	First year	Other	S
Bread maker	1	1	Second year	Other	S
Upholsterer	1	1	Second year	Financial	S
Moulder coremaker	1	1	Fourth year	Other	S
Electroplater	1	1	First year	Other	S
Total	43				

APPRENTICES SUSPENDED IN 1980—*continued*
JANUARY—*continued*

Trade	Total Number Suspended	Number of Apprentices	Year of Apprenticeship	Reason for Suspension	Subsequent Position
NOVEMBER					
Ladies hairdresser	10	2	First year	Other	C T
		3	Second year	Other	T T T
		2	Second year	Financial	S S
		1	Third year	Other	T
		1	Third year	Financial	S
		1	Fourth year	Other	S
Motor mechanic	7	2	Second year	Financial	T S
		3	Third year	Financial	S T S
		1	Third year	Other	S
		1	Fourth year	Financial	S
Cook	2	1	Second year	Financial	S
		1	Third year	Financial	T
Cabinet maker	2	2	First year	Other	S S
Plumber	2	1	First year	Financial	S
		1	Second year	Other	S
Bricklayer	2	1	First year	Financial	S
		1	Fourth year	Other	R
Panel beater	2	1	First year	Other	S
		1	Second year	Financial	S
Auto electrician	1	1	Second year	Other	S
Upholsterer	1	1	Second year	Other	C
Jeweller	1	1	First year	Other	S
Total	30				
DECEMBER					
Ladies hairdresser	1	1	Second year	Other	T
Motor mechanic	4	1	First year	Other	S
		2	Third year	Other	S S
		1	Fourth year	Other	S
Electrical mechanic	1	1	Second year	Other	S
Cook	5	2	First year	Other	S S
		1	First year	Financial	T
		1	Third year	Financial	T
		1	Fourth year	Other	S
Carpenter and joiner	1	1	Third year	Financial	S
Plumber	2	2	Second year	Financial	S
Painter and decorator	1	1	Third year	Financial	T
Panel beater	1	1	Fourth year	Other	S
Motor painter	1	1	Third year	Financial	S
Electrical fitter	1	1	First year	Financial	R
Structural steel tradesman	1	1	Second year	Other	R
Total	19				

STATE LIBRARY

890. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Have tenders been called for the installation of an 'on line' computer at the Adelaide State Library and, if so:

- (a) when did tenders close;
- (b) have contracts been let for part of the installation and, if so, to whom and at what cost;
- (c) what is the cost and type of computer to be installed;
- (d) how many terminals will be involved; and
- (e) what will be the functions of the computer (e.g. book registrations, etc.)?

2. How many additional temporary staff will be employed during and/or after installation of the computer and for what length of time?

3. For what period of time will the library operate on a dual system and why?

4. Is this new computer system a packaged system and, if so, what does the packaged system involve?

5. How many librarians and other staff are employed at the State Library and what are their classifications?

6. How many librarian and other staff positions will be affected by the installation of the computer and in what manner?

7. How many positions will be made redundant, over what period of time and what are the classifications involved?

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

1. (a) 2 February 1981.
- (b) No. A decision has not been made. The tender evaluation process takes two months and a selection is not likely to be made until the end of March/early April 1981.
- (c) Not yet determined.
- (d) Twenty-four.
- (e) Functions will be:
 - (i) Circulation control for the State and Public Libraries;
 - (ii) Recording of book loans, including extension of loan period;
 - (iii) Reserving books sought;
 - (iv) Statistical reporting on the various aspects of library functions;
 - (v) Inquiries on borrowers (e.g. fines owed) and book information.

2. The number is far from definite, but anticipated at ranging between twelve and twenty. Staff will probably work between two to three months before, and approximately the same time after installation, which may take approximately two months. To occur generally between April and October 1981.

3. The Library is not expected to operate on the dual system—in computer terminology—run in parallel—for more than one month. The time is considered necessary to disclose system and program bugs, which then may be rectified.

4. It is presumed that it will be. However, section 1 (c). The most appropriate equipment appears to be a minicomputer based system.

5. Staff of the State Library comprises:

Title	Classification/ Other Information	No. of Staff
State Librarian	EO3	1
Senior Librarian Grade 2	Archivist	1
Senior Librarians Grade 1	Branch Heads	6
Librarians Grade 2	Deputy Branch/ Section Heads	12
Library Supervisors		16
Librarians in Charge of Departmental Libraries		22
Librarians—Base Grade		92
Administrative Officer	CO6	1
Senior Clerk	CO3	1
Budget Officer	CO3	1
General duty staff— Base range		80
Manuscript Repairer	CO1 (approx.)	1
Bookbinder (Subordinate—Bookbinders and Sewers)		50
Photographer (Subordinate)	PV3	1
—Photographic Assistant		1
—Darkroom Assistants		6
Typists in Charge Grade 1		2
Typists in Charge Grade 2		2
Steno-Secretary Grade 2		1
Senior Attendant		1
Couriers, Drivers, Door Attendants—all at 'Attendant' level.		27
		326

6. It is expected that approximately fifty-sixty people will be involved, approximately twenty-five of whom are Librarians.

7. No positions will be made redundant. The purpose of the system is to provide a more efficient service than the one presently available.

LOTTERIES

895. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Premier:
1. How much profit was made by the Lotteries Commission during 1980?

2. What were the profits received from:

- (a) Instant Money Game;
- (b) Cross Lotto; and
- (c) normal lotteries with ticket values of—
 - (i) \$1;
 - (ii) \$5;
 - (iii) \$10; and
 - (iv) \$20?

3. How was that money distributed by the Government to the hospitals, etc. and what were the respective amounts?

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

1. The total surplus from the commission's operations for the financial year ended 30 June 1980 was \$16 021 267.

2. It is not possible to strike a profit figure for each individual lottery as all operating expenses are grouped together.

3. Transfers of Lotteries Commission surpluses are made to the Hospitals Fund at Treasury one month in arrears, and during 1979-1980 transfers, which included funds from other sources, amounted to \$16 371 000.

Section 7 of the Appropriation Act provides for transfers to Revenue Account from the Hospitals Fund and \$27 000 000 was transferred during 1979-1980. This supported appropriations from Revenue to hospitals totalling \$182 589 000. No attempt is made to itemise the initial sources of final allocations to hospitals.

SPORTS GRANTS

896. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What is the allocation of State and Federal grants for all the respective categories of sports played in South Australia for 1980-81 and what are the forward commitments, if any, for 1981-82 and 1982-83?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: State grants are allocated through various assistance programs administered by the Recreation and Sport Division and are made on application from individual State sporting associations and clubs during a financial year. I am unable to supply details of Commonwealth Government grants made directly to South Australian State sporting bodies. In general, there are no forward commitments in respect of grants to sporting bodies from the Recreation and Sport Division. The exceptions are largely in the capital assistance program where it sometimes becomes necessary to make commitments for ensuing years.

SPORTING GOODS

897. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is the Minister aware of the hostility of sporting goods retailers to the Federal Government's sales tax and if so:

- (a) does the Minister support the 'Life. Be in it.' program; and

- (b) will the Minister support the lifting of sales tax on sporting equipment to encourage more people to become involved in 'Life. Be in it.' programs and assist in the promotion and sale of more sporting equipment and, if not, why not?

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

- (a) Yes.
 (b) This matter has been raised with the Commonwealth Government on many occasions and has been the subject of discussion at meetings of the Recreation Ministers' Council.

2. What defects were issued involving:

- (a) smooth or oversized tyres;
 (b) defective brakes;
 (c) defective steering;
 (d) noisy mufflers;
 (e) faulty lights; and
 (f) other major mechanical defects?

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

1. This information is not maintained by the Police Department.
 2. Statistics relating to various types of defects are not recorded.

TRAFFIC SIGNALS

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

1. What was the total cost of maintenance of traffic signal equipment in all country towns in 1980?

2. Who carried out that maintenance at each country town?

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

1. In 1980 the Highways Department incurred a cost of \$17 000 in maintaining traffic signals on roads under its control in rural areas. The Department does not have information on traffic signal maintenance cost incurred by local government authorities on roads under their control.

2. Maintenance of traffic signals in rural areas is carried out by local contractors under the supervision of the Highways Department, except at Murray Bridge, Mount Barker, Gawler and Angaston where maintenance is carried out by Highways Department personnel.

BUS FUEL CONSUMPTION

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

1. How does 4/81 engine oil additive referred to in the STA advertisement of 17 January 1981 'reduce bus fuel consumption' and what is the reduction for each type of bus used by the authority?

2. What is the cost of this additive and what is the estimated fuel saving to the bus division per year?

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

1. The STA tender No. 4/81 invited offers from manufacturers for the supply of engine oil additives for trial purposes to enable the authority to assess their effectiveness. The various additives available are designed to reduce friction and lower fuel consumption. The manufacturers claim a fuel saving of approximately 5 per cent could be achieved.

2. The cost of the additives ranges between \$5 and \$8 a litre. This would amount to a cost of approximately \$40 000 a year if introduced to the authority's fleet of public transport vehicles. A 5 per cent reduction in fuel consumption would result in a saving of approximately \$140 000 a year.

DEFECTIVE VEHICLES

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

1. How many defect notices were issued on motor vehicles, motor cycles and buses, respectively, each year between 1970 and 1980, inclusive?

ACCIDENT RATE

902. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What is the vehicle accident rate per 100 vehicles in this State and how do these figures compare with all other States?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: In 1979 the vehicle accident rate per 100 vehicles in South Australia was 7.04 accidents per 100 motor vehicles. This accident rate cannot be compared to other States because of the variation in accident reporting requirements between States.

A commonly accepted comparison with other States is based on the number of fatalities per 10 000 motor vehicles. The information for 1979 is set out hereunder:

State	Fatalities/10 000 Vehicles
New South Wales	5.35
Victoria	4.28
Queensland	5.15
Western Australia	3.88
Tasmania	4.12
Australian Capital Territory	2.25
South Australia	4.48
	—
Average for Australia	4.76

LPG

903. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Are concessional registration fees available to owners of motor vehicles using lpg in South Australia, and, if so when were these concessions introduced, how do they compare with concessions in other States and how many have been granted and if no concessions are available, when will they be introduced?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No. The equipment necessary for the conversion of a motor vehicle to operate on lpg is currently exempt from sales tax. Further, the Federal Government pricing policy on lpg represents a substantial concession to the owners of lpg powered vehicles. In the circumstances, the Government does not propose to introduce further concessions in the form of reduced registration fees for lpg powered vehicles.

RAIL CARS

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

1. What engine, mechanical and air-brake problems have been encountered since the 2 000 class rail-cars were introduced by STA and what replacements were necessary?

2. What are the leasing arrangements for these new rail-cars and what costs are involved?

3. How many acts of vandalism have occasioned damage to 2 000 class rail cars, what damage was caused and what costs were involved?

4. Is it a fact that these cars are not used after 8 p.m. due to vandalism?

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

1. Two engines have each had a burnt out exhaust valve. The exhaust valves have been replaced. Difficulty in selecting gears—electropneumatic valves and broken air pipe changed. Air brakes have not released—awaiting a replacement improved type of feed valve. Air brake slack adjusters—returned to supplier for reworking. Exhaust pipes burnt out—exhaust pipes modified and replaced by supplier.

2. These railcars are not subject to lease arrangements.

3. Fourteen (14) acts of vandalism have occurred to the 2 000 class rail cars. Two seat cushions have been slashed; nine tinted side windows have been broken by stones thrown at cars; on three occasions, graffiti has been removed from the interior of the cars. Cost records are not maintained for damage by vandalism.

4. No.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS

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

1. What departments are responsible for the replacement of traffic light globes?

2. Are traffic light globes replaced on a regular basis and, if so, what is that basis and, if not, why not?

3. How many employees are involved in globe replacements and what inspections occur daily or weekly?

4. Was it the practice under the former Government to replace globes on a regular basis and, if so, what was that practice and, if has been changed, why?

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

1. The Highways Department is responsible for the replacement of traffic signal globes on roads under its control.

2. All globes are replaced on a regular basis, viz at traffic signal installations every three months, at pedestrian crossing installations every two months.

3. Six Highways Department officers make regular inspections of installations as part of their normal duties associated with maintenance. The Highways Department also relies heavily on the Police Department, State Transport Authority, Royal Automobile Association and the general public for the reporting of traffic signal faults.

4. No alteration has been made to procedure in regard to the replacement of globes.

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

1. How many sets of traffic lights have been installed in the Adelaide metropolitan area and non-urban areas and what has been the annual installation rate and cost for each area?

2. What is the program of installation for 1981-1982 and 1982-1983 in the Adelaide metropolitan area and non-urban areas and:

(a) where will these traffic lights be installed; and

(b) what is the estimated cost of installation?

3. What Government department services these traffic lights and how many employees are so engaged?

4. Has there been any planned reduction in the servicing of and maintenance of traffic lights in both country and city areas in 1980-1981 and, if so, by how much and under whose direction?

5. How many complaints have the Minister or his departments received in 1980 concerning traffic lights not working?

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

1. To date, the number of traffic signals installed by the Highways Department is as follows:

	Urban	Rural	Total
Traffic signals	234	12	246
Pedestrian actuated signals	134	4	138
School crossing signals	128	32	160
Zebra crossing signals	2	—	2

The cost of installation of these traffic signals is not readily available and would require much research and cost to provide.

The installation rate for the past five years is as follows:

1975-1976	26
1976-1977	39
1977-1978	45
1978-1979	62
1979-1980	52

2. The detailed program of traffic signal installation for 1981-1982 and 1982-1983 has not been finalised.

3. The Highways Department has fifteen men engaged full-time on traffic signal maintenance and six men who are engaged part-time on this activity.

4. No.

5. The Highways Department received a total of 5 830 reports indicating faults in traffic signals during 1980.

BUS SHELTERS

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

1. How many bus shelters have been provided each year by the STA since 1975?

2. How many were erected each year in the Albert Park Electorate since 1975 and how many will be erected in 1981?

3. How are priorities set for the erection of bus shelters and by whom?

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

1. The authority has maintained a program to erect 120 shelters at STA bus stops each year.

2. Since the 1974-1975 financial year thirty-two STA shelters were erected in the Albert Park electorate as follows:

1974-75	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80
3	6	7	8	4	4

It is proposed to erect another four shelters this financial year.

3. The provision for bus shelters is the joint responsibility of the authority and local council concerned. Priorities are given to bus stops that are heavily patronised and in exposed positions.

STA EMPLOYEES

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

1. How many STA bus and tramway employees have been assaulted, whilst on duty, from 1 January 1975 and what are the circumstances in each instance?

2. How many STA rail employees have been assaulted whilst on duty from 1 January 1975 and what were the circumstances in each instance?

3. What compensation and sickness benefits were paid to each employee so attacked and what was the period of leave in each instance?

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

1. Thirty-four employees engaged on bus and tram operations were assaulted during the period from 1 January 1975. The circumstances are as follows:

Twenty-four bus operators were assaulted by male passengers.

Five bus operators were assaulted by motorists.

Two bus operators were assaulted by pedestrians.

Two tram motormen were assaulted by passengers.

One conductor was assaulted by several tram passengers.

2. This information is not available from STA records prior to 1 March 1978. From 1 March 1978 up to the present time, seven rail employees were assaulted whilst on duty and these employees lost time due to injuries resulting from assaults by passengers or intending passengers.

3. This information is not readily available and would involve considerable expense to research.

(c) Traffic Flow on Tapleys Hill Road at West Lakes Boulevard:

7.00 a.m.-8.00 a.m.	850	620
8.00 a.m.-9.00 a.m.	760	600
9.00-10.00 a.m.	470	520
10.00 a.m.-4.30 p.m.	3 490	5 020
4.30 p.m.-5.00 p.m.	340	680
5.00 p.m.-5.30 p.m.	290	610
5.30 p.m.-6.00 p.m.	250	440

(d) Traffic Flow on Tapleys Hill Road at Old Port Road:

7.00 a.m.-8.00 a.m.	550	350
8.00 a.m.-9.00 a.m.	540	370
9.00-10.00 a.m.	390	330
10.00 a.m.-4.30 p.m.	2 770	3 450
4.30 p.m.-5.00 p.m.	240	450
5.00 p.m.-5.30 p.m.	230	420
5.30 p.m.-6.00 p.m.	180	280

VEHICULAR ACCIDENTS

915. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: How many motor vehicle accidents, injuries and deaths have occurred in each year since 1970 at the intersections of:

(a) Tapleys Hill Road and Trimmer Parade, Seaton;

(b) Trimmer Parade and Frederick Road, Seaton; and

(c) Frederick Road, Webb Street and Old Port Road, Royal Park?

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

(a) Tapleys Hill Road-Trimmer Parade intersection:

Year	Motor		
	Vehicle Accidents	Personal Injuries	Death
1970	18	3	2
1971	10	2	0
1972	19	6	0
1973	29	6	0
1974	36	9	0
1975	46	17	0
1976	30	6	0
1977	26	3	0
1978	30	12	0
1979	33	7	0

(b) Trimmer Parade-Frederick Road intersection:

1970	2	0	0
1971	2	0	0
1972	9	3	0
1973	7	1	0
1974	9	2	0
1975	7	0	0
1976	10	2	0
1977	20	2	0
1978	10	2	0
1979	16	7	0

(c) Frederick Road-Webb Street-Old Port intersection:

1970	4	2	0
1971	4	2	0
1972	5	1	0
1973	15	9	0
1974	10	4	0
1975	10	4	0
1976	16	4	0
1977	13	5	0
1978	19	2	0
1979	30	12	0

TAPLEYS HILL ROAD

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

1. What are the latest traffic flow statistics for Tapleys Hill Road in each direction?

2. What is the present traffic flow on Tapleys Hill Road in each direction, in the periods 7 to 8 a.m., 8 to 9 a.m., 9 to 10 a.m., 10 a.m. to 4.30 p.m., 4.30 to 5 p.m., 5 to 5.30 p.m. and 5.30 to 6 p.m. at the following intersections:

(a) Trimmer Parade, Seaton-Tapleys Hill Road, Seaton;

(b) Tapleys Hill Road, Seaton-Clarke Terrace, Seaton;

(c) Tapleys Hill Road, Seaton-West Lakes Boulevard; and

(d) Tapleys Hill Road, Royal Park-Old Port Road, Royal Park?

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

1. The traffic flow on Tapleys Hill Road in each direction varies from 8 300 vehicles per day to 12 500 vehicles per day depending upon the location of the traffic counter.

2. (a) Traffic Flow on Tapleys Hill Road at Trimmer Parade:

Hours	North bound	South bound
	Vehicles	Vehicles
7.00 a.m.-8.00 a.m.	1 230	490
8.00 a.m.-9.00 a.m.	1 110	430
9.00-10.00 a.m.	420	420
10.00 a.m.-4.30 p.m.	3 320	3 950
4.30 p.m.-5.00 p.m.	330	780
5.00 p.m.-5.30 p.m.	310	740
5.30 p.m.-6.00 p.m.	340	470

(b) Traffic flow on Tapleys Hill Road at Clarke Terrace:

7.00 a.m.-8.00 a.m.	590	280
8.00 a.m.-9.00 a.m.	630	410
9.00-10.00 a.m.	400	270
10.00 a.m.-4.30 p.m.	2 410	2 870
4.30 p.m.-5.00 p.m.	240	370
5.00 p.m.-5.30 p.m.	180	370
5.30 p.m.-6.00 p.m.	130	260

SEAT BELTS

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

1. How many persons have been prosecuted for not wearing seat belts since that legislation was introduced and:

- (a) what were the respective age brackets of men and women involved in such prosecutions; and
- (b) what was the average fine imposed per prosecution?

2. How many children not wearing seat belts, and below the minimum age, were either killed or injured in accidents since seat belt legislation was introduced?

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

1. 1971-1972	18 (½ year only)
1972-1973	53
1973-1974	42
1974-1975	449
1975-1976	1 711
1976-1977	6 959
1977-1978	2 005
1978-1979	5 627
1979-1980	7 247

Ages of offender of both sexes and the fines imposed are not recorded.

2. This information is not recorded in the Police Department.

STA DIESEL VEHICLES

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

1. How many diesel powered motor vehicles, other than buses, are owned by the STA, where are they used and for what purposes?

2. Does the STA intend purchasing diesel powered sedans and utilities in lieu of the present petrol driven fleet of vehicles and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

3. What research or assessment has the STA carried out in relation to the comparative benefits of diesel powered as against petrol sedans and what did those investigations reveal in relation to cost savings and if none has been carried out, why not?

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

1. Twelve diesel powered motor vehicles are used by the STA in the metropolitan area of Adelaide for rail track maintenance, fuel supplies, bus recovery and general maintenance.

2. The STA purchases sedans and utilities through the State Supply Department. No diesel powered sedans are listed on the Government schedule. Diesel powered utilities have only been included on the schedule since 1 December 1980. Consideration will be given to diesel powered units as utilities become due for replacement.

3. None. Other Government departments have carried out tests or assessments between diesel and petrol powered sedans. The results of these tests are monitored by STA personnel.

MOUNT GAMBIER AIRPORT

919. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Will the Minister request his Federal counterpart to upgrade the present conditions at the airport building at Mount Gambier so as to overcome crowding of passengers in that building where incoming

and outgoing flights from and to Melbourne and Adelaide coincide and to arrange for better directional signs both within and outside the airport for motorists?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I have referred this matter to the Commonwealth Minister of Transport.

OCEAN BOULEVARD

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

1. Are road tankers banned from using the steep Ocean Boulevard at Seacliff Park and, if so, for what specific reasons?

2. Are semi-trailers and other heavy vehicles, excluding tankers, permitted to use Ocean Boulevard and, if so, why and, if not, why not?

3. What were the objections lodged by residents in that area, how many objections were received and what is the Government's intention concerning these objections?

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

1. Regulation 3.09 under the Road Traffic Act prohibits the driving of 'fuel carrying vehicles' from a section of Ocean Boulevard, Seacliff. The regulation was introduced due to the number of vehicles involved, the flammable nature of the load and the steep descent to be negotiated by these vehicles.

2. Other heavy vehicles, including semi-trailers, are permitted to use this road as it is a major arterial road. It was not considered necessary to extend the prohibition to goods other than fuel.

3. No objections have been received from residents regarding the prohibition of 'fuel carrying vehicles'.

SEMI-TRAILERS

922. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: How many semi-trailers have overturned in the Adelaide Hills each year since 1970 and:

- (a) where did these accidents occur;
- (b) what were the major causes;
- (c) what investigations were carried out into each accident;
- (d) what recommendations, if any, were made by the investigating authority to overcome similar accidents; and
- (e) where can such information be obtained and, if it is not available, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: As far as Highways Department recorded accident data is concerned, the number of semi-trailers that have overturned in the Adelaide Hills is as follows:

1970	14	1975	17
1971	9	1976	16
1972	7	1977	20
1973	14	1978	8
1974	12	1979	6

(a) *Mount Barker Road*

Mount Osmond	7
Devil's Elbow	8
Near Devil's Elbow	5
Near Eagle on the Hill	5
Near Lookout	1
Stirling	2
Aldgate-Bridgewater	1
Bridgewater	2
Bridgewater-Verdun	1
Hahndorf-Littlehampton	7
Littlehampton	1

Littlehampton-Nairne	6
Nairne-Callington	41
<i>South-Eastern Freeway</i>	
Crafers Interchange	2
Bridgewater Interchange	1
Verdun Interchange	2
Mount Barker Interchange	4
Whitehill Interchange	1
Car Park: near Mount Barker Road	1
Sturt Highway: near Truro	2
Sturt Highway: near Rowland Flat	1
Sturt Highway: Tanunda-Nuriootpa	2
Adelaide-Goolwa Road, near Clarendon ..	1
Eden Valley-Angaston Road	1
Gawler-Morgan Road, near Greenock	2
Adelaide-Mannum Road, Inglewood-Chain of Ponds	1
Mount Pleasant-Keyneton Road, near Mount Pleasant	1
Mount Barker-Wellington Road Wistow- Rochester	2
Sandy Creek-Williamstown Road near Sandy Creek	1
Lyndoch-Chain of Ponds Road Lyndoch- Williamstown	1
Aldgate-Langhorne's Creek Road Echunga- Strathalbyn	1
Meadows-Macclesfield Road, Meadows	1
District Road, Macclesfield	2
District Road, near Nuriootpa	1
District Road, near Gumeracha	1
District Road, near Tanunda	1
District Road, near Murray Bridge	1
Torrens Gorge Road, Athelstone-Chain of Ponds	1
District Road, Hundred of Onkaparinga ...	1
(b) Inattention	41
Vehicle Fault	25
Excessive Speed	36
Insecure Load	13
Misjudgement	1
Brake Failure	3
Driving under Influence	2
No Error	2

(e) The information on accident numbers and location is available at the Highways Department. Enquiries on availability of investigation material should be directed to the Police Department.

TRICYCLE RICKSHAWS

923. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Will tricycle rickshaws be subjected to registration and registration cost and, if so:

- (a) where will such cycles be registered and by what authority;
- (b) what are the anticipated registration costs per unit; and
- (c) will there be restrictions on the number of such units that can be used in metropolitan Adelaide and, if so, to what number and why?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: With the exception of tricycle rickshaws used within the area of the corporation of the city of Adelaide, tricycle rickshaws are not subject to registration and registration cost.

On 12 March 1981, city of Adelaide by-law No. 40 was enacted to provide for the registration of trishaws and the

licensing of trishaw drivers plying for hire or hired for the purpose of conveying passengers within the Adelaide city council area.

- (a) Adelaide Town Hall; town clerk, corporation of the city of Adelaide.
- (b) Trishaw licence \$5 per year.
- (c) The Adelaide city council has not placed any restriction on number at this stage but will monitor their effect on traffic conditions.

EXPRESS BUSES

926. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What is the number of express bus services operated by the STA for residents in the north-western suburbs, between what locations do these services run express and what are the departure and arrival times in each instance?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The State Transport Authority runs the following express bus services to the north-western suburbs:

Route 28K, Port Adelaide-Adelaide (via Royal Park, Military Road, Henley Beach Road).

Route 28J, Port Adelaide-Adelaide (via Semaphore Park, Sportsmans Drive, Henley Beach Road).

Route 28G, Adelaide-West Lakes (via Sportsmans Drive).

Route 28, Grange Station-Adelaide (via Henley Beach Road).

Express running exists from stop 20 and stop 14 Henley Beach Road and West Terrace on routes 28, 28K, 28J at the following times:

Route 28K, express stop 20 approximately 7.57 a.m. arriving city 8.14 a.m.

Route 28, express stop 14, approximately 8.03 a.m. arriving city 8.19 a.m.

Route 28J, express stop 20, approximately 8.07 a.m. arriving 8.24 a.m.

Route 28K, express stop 14 approximately 8.18 a.m. arriving city 8.34 a.m.

Route 28J, express stop 20, approximately 8.26 a.m. arriving city 8.43 a.m.

P.M.

Route 28K, express West Terrace and stop 20. Departs West Terrace approximately 5.09 p.m.

Route 28J, express West Terrace and stop 14. Departs West Terrace approximately 5.16 p.m.

Route 28K, express West Terrace and stop 20. Departs West Terrace approximately 5.25 p.m.

Route 28G, express West Terrace and stop 14. Departs West Terrace approximately 5.36 p.m.

Route 28J, express West Terrace and stop 20. Departs West Terrace approximately 5.43 p.m.

RAIL CARS

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

1. Were spare parts for new generation 2000 class rail-cars unavailable for a period of time and, if so, why?

2. Were delays occasioned to the rail-cars because of waiting for spare parts and, if so:

(a) what were these spare parts;

(b) where did they have to come from; and

(c) how long were these units out of traffic as a result?

3. What has been the cause of each malfunctions of equipment on the 2000 class rail-cars during 1980, what were the number of delays each month and the time involved on each occasion in which the travelling public was inconvenienced?

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

1. No.
2. Delay occurred on one occasion due to the unexpected early failure of a traction engine exhaust valve.
 - (a) Cylinder head for the traction motor
 - (b) M.A.N. in Germany
 - (c) The railcar was out of service for five days.
3. The honourable member was advised of equipment malfunctions in reply to Question No. 905—Part 1. Delays due to 2000 class railcar malfunction occurred on an average of five times a month during 1980. Information is not available on the time involved on each occasion the travelling public were inconvenienced.

STA BUSES

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

1. How many STA buses are there of each year for each make?
2. How many buses are air-conditioned and what is the type and year of manufacture of each?
3. Are all air-conditioned buses used on weekends during the summer months and, if not, why not?
4. What areas of metropolitan Adelaide do not have a fully air-conditioned bus service during weekends?

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

1. The STA fleet comprises:

1970-1973 AEC Swift (691)	292
1977-1979 Volvo B59	307
1978-1979 AEC Swift (760)	66
1980-1981 Volvo B58 Rigid and Articulated	120*

*45 not yet in service.
2. All buses acquired since 1977 are equipped with evaporative air-cooling units.
- 3 and 4. Wherever practical, air-cooled buses are used on off-peak and weekend runs in all areas serviced by the authority.

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

1. How many signalling equipment failures have occurred since 1 August 1979 from the following STA signal cabin areas:
 - (a) Adelaide yard;
 - (b) Wye; and
 - (c) Mile End junction?
2. What was the nature of those signalling and equipment failures and what was the cause?
3. What was the number of delays to passenger train services and commuters in each instance and the respective time delays?
4. How many inquiries were held by the appropriate authorities to determine the exact nature of these delays and:

- (a) what were the findings of those inquiries in each instance; and
- (b) how many employees were disciplined and/or cautioned or were charged as a result of each inquiry and what penalties were involved in each instance?

5. What is the condition of the communications network within the defined areas of the Adelaide-Wye cabin and the Mile End Junction cabin area?

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

1. The authority has engaged John Connell and Associates to study the metropolitan railway signalling system. They will be commencing work on 6 April 1981 and it is expected that their final report will be to hand in August 1981. This contract covers the following:
 - A review of the present equipment in relation to its condition and suitability for the task required.
 - A recommendation as to how the signalling system should be upgraded to cover modern traffic requirements.
 - An estimate of the cost of carrying out this work.
 - A timing sequence showing the order in which the work should be carried out and over what period.
- The signalling equipment is so designed that when a malfunction occurs, signals cannot be cleared from the stop position and all trains in the vicinity are brought to a halt. In this way there is no possibility of trains colliding or derailling.

The number of signalling malfunctions which occurred during the twelve months of 1980 were fifty-seven at Adelaide yard; thirty-four at Adelaide Wye and thirty-six at Mile End junction. The signalling equipment is still considered to be safe and, although very old, suffers generally fewer fail-safe malfunctions than other installations in the metropolitan area because the original design resulted in extremely reliable apparatus. Information related to malfunctions prior to January 1980 is not readily available.

As a matter of urgency, to restore the confidence of the signalmen, an electronic data recorder is being purchased at an estimated cost of \$10 000, to continuously monitor the operation of the signal cabin. When this is installed it will be possible to determine whether an intermittent fault is occurring and, if so, what the fault or faults are so that corrective action can be taken.

2. Typical malfunctions have been due to track circuit leakage; non-operation of switches, lever plunger locks and circuit controls. Causes include changes in atmospheric conditions, low batteries and broken wires. Most other causes can be attributed to normal wear and tear.
3. The number of trains delayed during 1980 at the three locations was six, nine and one respectively. The total time the signalling equipment was out of service was respectively forty-nine minutes, sixty minutes and five minutes resulting in an average delay to the sixteen trains of seven minutes each.
4. All malfunctions of signalling equipment were investigated by engineering officers.
 - (a) The malfunctions were attributed to normal wear and tear.
 - (b) None.
5. The communication equipment is maintained in good working order.

FEEDER BUSES

935. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Will the Minister implement the suggestion made on page 675 of *Hansard* of 3 November 1977 to institute a system of feeder buses centred on the Northfield railway station and covering the suburbs of Pooraka, Ingle Farm, Para Hills and Valley View and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The State Transport Authority investigated the proposal at my instigation.

However, it is not proposed to implement the suggestion in the foreseeable future. The investigation showed that there would be little travel time advantage to passengers at this stage.

STA FARES

936. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What is the estimated gross and net revenue, respectively, that will be earned from the last rise in bus, tram and train fares during 1980 and 1981?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The change in STA fares in August 1980, is expected to result in an increase of \$4.09m in the STA's revenue in a full year. This includes \$1.56m in reimbursements from the Treasury for carrying concession riders. The loss of revenue to the STA due to the free travel to pensioners and other concession riders between 9.00 a.m. and 3.00 p.m. on weekdays is estimated at \$2m.

LEVEL CROSSINGS

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

1. How many level crossing accidents involving motor vehicles with freight trains and passenger trains, respectively, have occurred each year since 1970 in the metropolitan area and how many persons were injured or killed?

2. What type of level crossing warning devices were in operation in each instance?

3. How many persons have been injured or killed at level crossing accidents where protective boom gates were operating?

4. How many railway level crossings are there in the metropolitan area:

(a) where boom gates operate in conjunction with warning bells and lights; and

(b) where only warning lights and bells operate?

5. What is the program for installing boom gates at railway level crossings in the metropolitan area in 1981-1982-1983 and what is the anticipated cost in each year?

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

1. One hundred and eighty-five level crossing accidents have occurred in the metropolitan area since 1 July 1969. Twenty-two people were killed and eighty-six injured. Information regarding the type of trains involved in the level crossing accidents is not readily available.

2. The type of warning devices operating in each instance were as follows:

Automatic half arm boom barriers and flashing lights and gong	5
Flashing lights and gong	100
Wig-wag	10
Gong only	3
Standard level crossing signs	67
	<hr/>
	185

3. Two killed and two injured.

4. (a) Thirty-seven.

(b) Sixty.

The State Transport Authority expends approximately \$130 000 per annum on the upgrading of level crossing protection. Priorities are determined annually by the Interdepartmental Committee for Level Crossing protection.

DRINK-DRIVING

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

1. What programs are available or provided by the Government for the rehabilitation of persons convicted of drink-driving offences?

2. What are the names of those organisations, how are they funded and how many persons availed themselves of this program of rehabilitation in 1980?

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

1. Under the Road Traffic Act, all second and subsequent drink-driving offenders apprehended in the metropolitan area, are assessed at the board's driver assessment clinic as to whether they suffer from alcoholism and/or addiction to other drugs. If found to be suffering from a dependency, the offender is offered treatment within the facilities of the board but few take advantage of this offer as most of them are required to serve a gaol sentence. An officer of the board provides a counselling service to the gaols and it has been found that some of these offenders, on release, take advantage of the treatment facilities offered by the board. There has been no record kept to date of numbers.

The Cadell Training Centre, through a psychologist who was trained by officers of the board, also offers group therapy and counselling for dependent persons and many drink-driving offenders are sent to that centre.

2. The Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board is the statutory authority in South Australia for the treatment of those suffering from dependencies on alcohol and/or other drugs and provides its services free of charge as and when required. The board receives State Government funds in the form of a grant, community health funds in the case of its sobering-up unit (Osmond Terrace clinic) and funds under the cost-sharing arrangement between the State and Commonwealth for St Anthony's Hospital.

VEHICLE INSURANCE

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

1. What was the percentage of motor vehicle owners that did not carry third party or third party property insurance in each year since 1970 in each category?

2. Does the Government intend to introduce legislation compelling owners of all types of motor vehicles to carry at least third party property insurance and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

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

1. Third party bodily insurance is a compulsory requirement of the registration of all motor vehicles. Information relating to third party property insurance is not available to the Government.

2. No. The South Australian Government Committee of Inquiry into Compulsory Third Party Property Insurance, set up by the Hon. G. T. Virgo, concluded that it was not possible to implement a scheme that would help vehicle owners without imposing major disadvantages.

ROAD FUNDS

942. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: How is South Australia's 1980-1981 Commonwealth road grant allocation to be spent and what are the programs and costs for the metropolitan and country area?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Road grants allocated to the States by the Commonwealth Government are provided subject to the provisions of the Roads Grants Act, 1980. The Act defines the road categories which it covers and specifies the grants allocated to each category for each State. In addition, the Act specifies the type of expenditure (namely construction or construction and maintenance) which are covered by the grants, and the matching quotas which are to be met by each State.

Subject to the provisions of the Act, South Australia during 1980-1981 is to receive the following grants:

- (i) \$24.973m for the construction of national highways and developmental roads, and for the maintenance of national highways.
- (ii) \$6.33m for the construction of urban arterial roads.
- (iii) \$8.943m for the construction of rural arterial roads.
- (iv) \$11.371m for the construction and maintenance of local roads.

The estimated cost of proposed works on these roads for 1980-1981 far exceeds the grants provided by the Commonwealth Government and is summarised below:

	\$m
National highways—Construction	21.642
Maintenance	4.041
Developmental roads—Construction	1.464
Urban arterial roads—Construction	18.663
Rural arterial roads—Construction	9.844
Urban local roads—Construction	2.878
Maintenance	0.146
Rural local roads—Construction	4.685
Maintenance	5.329

STA BREAKDOWNS

943. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What delays and/or breakdowns occurred each month during 1980 which involved inconvenience to the travelling public involving:

- (a) STA buses; and
- (b) STA trams,

and what were the causes?

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

- (a) The authority's personnel attended approximately 11 000 service calls to buses in 1980, as follows:

January	783	July	1 086
February	1 074	August	714
March	935	September ..	815
April	950	October	907
May	946	November	1 017
June	960	December	1 007

The highest single failure items of the 100 or so total causes are:

	Per Cent
Ticket machines	9.5
Door operation	6.0
Fuel pipes and unions	5.3
Globes	4.5

- (b) The number of STA tram delays during 1980 totalled 354. Monthly figures were:

January	23	July	20
February	28	August	33
March	36	September ..	22
April	37	October	24
May	18	November	26
June	39	December	48

The main causes, in order of decreasing frequency, were defective doors, dewirements and trolley pole problems, defective brakes, minor electrical problems, motor defects, radio problems, lack of operating air.

RAIL-CAR No. 300

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

1. Is the refurbishing of STA rail-car No. 300 being held up because of the need to handle asbestos linings and, if so, what negotiations are being held with the organisations responsible to carry out this work?

2. What are the organisations involved and what are the specific alterations to this unit and what is the anticipated cost?

3. What progress is being made with the 'Red Hen' fleet and what is the program for completion of refurbishing?

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

1. No.

2. A contract has been awarded to Consolidated Contractors to remove the asbestos lining from rail-car No. 300. The State Transport Authority will then carry out the refurbishing of the rail-car at its Regency Park workshops. The car will be re-clad externally and the interior will be upgraded. The anticipated cost is \$80 000.

3. When the refurbishing of rail-car No. 300 is completed, an assessment will be made to determine the scope of upgrading of the remainder of the 'Red Hen' rail-cars.

POLICE CARS

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

1. What has been the increase in the number of unmarked police cars in 1979 and 1980 to detect reckless driving, drunken driving and other road offences?

2. How many breaches of the Road Traffic Act were detected by unmarked police cars in 1979 and 1980?

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

1. Unmarked cars are not specifically acquired for the purpose of detecting breaches of road traffic laws.

2. Statistical data produced does not identify the type of vehicle used in detecting offences.

CIRCLE LINE BUSES

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

1. Will the Government extend the Circle Line bus route into the north-western suburbs, in particular suburbs such as Seaton, Grange, Findon, West Lakes, Royal Park and Hendon and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

2. Have representations been made to the Minister and/or the Director-General of Transport on this matter and, if so, by whom and how far have these discussions progressed?

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

1. The Circle Line bus route was introduced to fulfil a need for cross-suburban travel through those suburbs where no alternative was available, other than travel via the city. The route chosen was a compromise between endeavouring to serve as many suburbs as possible but at the same time keeping the route between western and northern suburbs as direct as possible.

Were the Circle Line bus service extended to serve all of the suburbs mentioned it would have to meander to a significant degree making the service unattractive to all but the very short distance passenger.

For this reason, and because most of the suburbs mentioned are served by inter-connecting bus routes to the city, West Lakes Mall and Port Adelaide (and in several cases Glenelg and Marion shopping centres), it is not proposed to extend the Circle Line service as suggested.

2. From time to time requests are received for extensions of the Circle Line bus service. These requests have been answered on the above basis.

STA SERVICES

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

1. Have members of the travelling public complained about the lack of accommodation on STA bus and rail services which serviced 'Carols by Candlelight' at Elder Park on Sunday 21 December 1980 and, if so:

- (a) how many reports were received by the authority of overcrowding and lack of services; and
- (b) how many employees reported overcrowding of services and in what areas?

2. What criteria is used to cater for such functions (i.e. number and frequency of services)?

3. What particular STA services were heavily used carrying persons to and from 'Carols by Candlelight' at Elder Park?

4. What reports were received by Inspectors as to overcrowding and what were their comments relating to this function?

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

1. (a) No complaints from the travelling public on bus services were received. Four reports on rail services were received.

(b) No reports were received from employees.

2. Passenger loading figures from previous years are used and services are augmented accordingly.

3. The 6.31 p.m. train from Noarlunga Centre to Adelaide was heavily used resulting in the above four complaints.

No bus service was overloaded.

4. After the concert there was one heavy load to Gilles Plains but the following Ingle Farm West bus which shares a common route to the junction of Main North East Road and Galway Avenue carried only 15 passengers.

STA INSPECTORS

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

1. Will the Minister advise what are the duties of STA inspectors on:

- (a) bus and tram services; and
- (b) rail car services?

2. When new bus, tram or rail-car services are introduced, what STA staff survey the views of the travelling public as to their acceptance or otherwise of these services and if surveys are carried out, what have been the results of all surveys since 1979?

3. How many surveys have been carried out by private consultants since October 1979 and what were the firms involved, the costs and the purpose in each case?

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

1. (a) (1) Supervise traffic operations on the road.
(2) Ensure that the service and frequency of the service is maintained and that timetable running is adhered to.

(3) Arrange and supervise detours.

(4) Attend and report on accidents.

(5) Arrange for additional service to sporting fixtures, etc.

(6) Arrange for cut in buses in the event of breakdowns or delays.

(7) Supervise bus operators, motormen, conductors and street queue sellers in the performance of their duties.

(8) Carry out passenger counts or surveys and report on overloading or light loading.

(9) Check and supervise school services and buses.

(10) Carry out ticket checking on buses and trams.

(11) Sign employees on and off.

(12) Prepare despatch sheets.

(13) Berth and despatch buses.

(14) Supervise the arrival and departure time of buses to and from depots.

(15) Answer questions and give information to the public.

(16) Answer public enquiries and give out detailed information regarding services and routes.

(17) Take public complaints.

(18) Operate two-way radio communications.

1. (b) (1) Conduct examinations of tickets and passes on trains.

(2) Report on breaches of by-laws and ticket irregularities.

(3) Instruct guards and collectors on correct procedures for 'on train' examination and issue of tickets.

(4) Check the efficiency, uniform and appearance of guards and collectors and report incidents of misconduct by staff or passengers.

(5) Report on the running, staffing and consists of trains. Undertake passenger counts of all STA trains at regular intervals.

(6) Other duties as directed by the Assistant Superintendent.

2. The State Transport Authority do not seek the views of the travelling public directly but regularly monitor actual patronage on services.

3. Four.

Murray F. Young & Associates: \$
Noarlunga Centre Interchange Study 5 327

S.P. Foley:
Passenger Surveys 3 100
Beeline/City Loop Surveys 8 000

R. Travers Morgan:
Public Transport Market Research Study . . . 6 500

ROAD TANKERS

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

1. How many road tankers carry inflammable fuels and gases along Tapleys Hill Road through to the Birkenhead and Port Adelaide installations each month?

2. How often are these prime movers and the bulk carrying equipment inspected and tested by Department of Labour and Industry inspectors?

3. Are these inspections carried out at random or upon notification to the firm involved?

4. How many prime movers or their equipment have been found unsafe since 1970 and what action, if any, was taken against firms using this equipment?

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

1. Although the Highways Department counts traffic throughout the road network, it does not subdivide beyond commercial vehicles and non-commercial vehicles. Hence, the information sought is not available.

2. (a) Flammable liquid tankers: Inspections are made on a random basis after the units come into service. The designs of all new flammable liquid tankers are approved by the Chief Inspector and the vehicle manufactured to the Australian Standard 2016; Road Tank Vehicles for Flammable Liquids.

(b) Liquefied petroleum gas tankers: The designs of all tankers are approved by the Chief Inspector prior to construction. Construction is supervised by officers of the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment in South Australia, or accredited representatives in other States. The frequency of inspection when tankers are in service is dependent on the type of material used in construction; low carbon steel vessels are inspected every two years, while quenched and tempered steel vessels are inspected yearly.

3. (a) Flammable liquid tankers are inspected on a random basis.

(b) LPG tankers are inspected on a scheduled basis. Should owners not arrange the inspection when due, notification is given for the inspection.

4. This information is not available.

ADELAIDE HILLS MINING

958. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier:

1. Does the Government intend to permit large-scale mining activities in the Adelaide Hills in the future and, if so, what type of mining will the Government permit?

2. How many licences for exploration and mining have been issued and what are the names of the respective companies and the operations permitted?

3. What mining or exploration operations are currently being carried out in the Adelaide Hills and by whom?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The replies are as follows:

1. Approval of proposed mining development in the Adelaide Hills, as elsewhere in the State, is subject to detailed assessment of environmental impacts and effects on coexisting or competing land users. In co-operation with the Department of the Environment and other concerned departments, conditions of operation are devised to minimise impacts. Proposed developments will continue to be assessed in this way and approved where justified in the State's interest subject to appropriate conditions.

2. & 3. There are at present seven current mineral exploration licences issued to C.R.A. Exploration Pty Ltd (5), Western Queen (S.A.) Pty Ltd (1), and Britas Diamonds N.L. and Terrex Resources N.L. (1), in the Adelaide Hills, between Gawler and Strathalbyn. Early-stage mineral exploration surveys are carried out intermittently on all of these.

There are a few hundred current mining leases and private mines in the same area being worked more or less continuously for a wide variety of industrial minerals and construction materials and gold. Mining operations are mostly small open pits or quarries.

JUVENILE DRINKING

960. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many cases of juveniles drinking alcohol were brought before the courts during 1980?

2. What were the categories and respective numbers, how many involved illegal use of motor vehicles and of these, how many were released on bonds?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. The following table shows the number of juvenile offenders involved in alcohol related offences during the 1979-1980 fiscal year:

Drive under influence	47
Prescribed concentration alcohol	187
Drunk	133
Minor consume	243
Special permit (minor consume)	6
Consume near dance	8
Total	624

2. The amount of time and expense involved in answering this part of the question is not warranted.

JUVENILE SHOPLIFTING

961. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many persons including juveniles were convicted of shoplifting during 1980 and what were the age brackets and sexes involved?

2. What was the value of goods stolen?

3. How much did the RTA estimate was stolen by shoplifting during 1980?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. The following table provides the information required:

Age	Male	Female
Under 14 years	467	442
14 years	214	284
15 years	204	228
16 years	138	144
17 years	70	89
18 years	56	65
19 years	46	67
20 years	43	57
21 years	41	65
22 years	33	38
23 years	28	46
24 years	38	31
Over 24 years	861	1 132
Total	2 239	2 688

2. The reported value of goods stolen during 1980 was \$338 988.

3. This information is not available to the Government.

HOUSEBREAKING

963. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many housebreakings occurred over the Christmas-New Year period in 1980-1981 and what was the estimated loss to home owners?

2. What was the incidence of housebreaking in each Police region for 1979-1980 and July 1980 to 30 January 1981?

3. What are the suburbs most predominant for theft and housebreaking?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. The amount of time and expense involved in obtaining this information is not considered warranted.

2. The only figures available in this format for release are the first nine months of 1980 for the metropolitan regions:

	1.1.80 to 31.3.80	1.4.80 to 30.6.80	1.7.80 to 30.9.80
Region B	640	794	923
Region C	765	1 063	1 116
Region D	576	850	737

3. See 1 above.

INCEST

964. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: How many cases of incest have been reported since 1979 and of these cases, how many have involved step-parents and natural parents, respectively?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Twelve cases were reported in 1979 and eleven cases were reported in 1980. The amount of time and expense involved in answering the honourable member's further question is not warranted.

STOLEN VEHICLES

965. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many motor vehicles, and motor cycles were stolen in South Australia each month during 1980 in the:
(a) metropolitan area; and
(b) non-metropolitan area?

2. What was the recovery rate each month during 1980 for each area?

3. How many motor vehicles and motor cycles were not recovered in 1980 and what was the overall cost involved?

4. How many arrests and convictions were recorded for illegal use in each month of 1980 and what were the age brackets in each category?

5. What was the total value of motor vehicles and motor cycles stolen and the overall damage done to those vehicles?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. Vehicles stolen in 1980

Month	Motor Vehicles	Motor Cycles	Total Stolen	Total Value	Recovery Rate	Arrests	*Not Recovered
January	428	38	466	713 780	435	77	31
February	394	23	417	1 117 045	396	179	21
March	360	43	403	1 063 460	387	48	16
April	446	39	485	975 045	469	137	16
May	425	49	474	915 620	448	94	26
June	365	33	398	781 155	366	21	32
July	386	37	423	874 835	402	76	21
August	432	42	474	829 047	451	98	23
September	522	37	559	1 108 880	526	113	33
October	442	37	479	962 490	463	149	16
November	408	34	422	829 070	405	101	17
December	457	41	498	1 003 095	492	99	6

* includes motor cycles.

(a) and (b) The amount of time and expense involved in providing this information is not warranted.

2. See 1.

3. See 1. The amount of time and expense involved in providing overall cost figures is not warranted.

4. See attached tables.

5. Value of stolen motor vehicles and motor cycles was \$11 173 522. The overall damage to those vehicles is not known.

Attempt sexual intercourse (Male under 12)	0
Sexual intercourse (Female under 17)	46
Sexual intercourse (Male under 17)	5
Gross indecency (Female under 16)	11
Gross indecency (Male under 16)	5
Indecent assault figures are not kept in relation to children.	

(a), (b), (c), (d). Judicial statistics in South Australia do not incorporate information on the age of victims.

INDECENCY OFFENCES

966. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: What number of indecency offences involving children have been reported since October 1979 and:

(a) how many convictions resulted;

(b) how many offenders were gaoled and for what periods;

(c) how many offenders were placed on parole and for what periods; and

(d) how many offenders were placed on a bond, for what period and for what amount?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The following statistics cover reported indecency offences for October 1979 to September 1980. Figures for the October 1980 to December 1980 quarter are not yet available:

Sexual intercourse (Female under 12)	16
Sexual intercourse (Male under 12)	0
Attempt sexual intercourse (Female under 12) ...	0

CRIME

967. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Did the incidence of armed robbery and bank hold-ups increase in South Australia in 1980?

2. What was the incidence of armed robbery and bank hold-ups, respectively, for each year since 1970?

3. Did the incidence of rape and child molestation increase in South Australia in 1980?

4. What are the statistics for rape and child molestation, respectively, for each year since 1970?

5. Did vandalism increase in South Australia in 1980?

6. What are the statistics for vandalism damage and costs each year since 1970?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. See 2.
2. Armed hold-up and bank hold-up figures from 1970 are grouped under 'Robbery Under Arms'.

1969-1970.....	13
1970-1971.....	10
1971-1972.....	14
1972-1973.....	14
1973-1974.....	3
1974-1975.....	17
1975-1976.....	39
1976-1977.....	33
1977-1978.....	37
1978-1979.....	40
1979-1980.....	67
3. See 2.
4. Reported rape and attempts:

1969-1970.....	24
1970-1971.....	31
1971-1972.....	60
1972-1973.....	52
1973-1974.....	100
1974-1975.....	91
1975-1976.....	131
1976-1977.....	149
1977-1978.....	172
1978-1979.....	165
1979-1980.....	222

No offences are kept under the heading of 'Child Molesting'.
5. See answer to Question 974.
6. These figures are not available.

HITCH HIKING

968. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Does the Government intend to introduce on-the-spot fines for hitch hiking similar to those in Queensland, if so, why and, if not, why not?
2. As a result of hitch hiking, what number of assaults in each category have occurred each year since 1970 to:
 - (a) the hitch hiker; and
 - (b) the owner of the motor vehicle,
 and what age brackets and sexes were involved?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. Hitch hikers are presently charged under the following sections of the Road Traffic Act:

Section No.	Offence
87.....	Pedestrians—walk without due care and consideration.
88 (1) (a)	Pedestrians—fail to walk on footpath.
88 (1) (b)	Pedestrians—fail to walk on right of carriageway.

These offences clearly fall into the category of minor traffic offences and as such have been included in the expiation scheme. The expiation fee for each of these offences is \$20.

2. The amount of time and expense involved in answering part 2 of the honourable member's question is not warranted.

VANDALISM

969. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: What were the categories of vandalism, that occurred at Whyalla, Port Augusta and Port Pirie, respectively, during 1980 and how many offenders were:

- (a) arrested; and
 - (b) convicted,
- and what were the ages of the offenders in each category?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The amount of time and expense involved in answering the honourable member's question is not warranted.

RAFFLES

972. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Does the Government intend to abolish the tax imposed on moneys collected by charitable and voluntary associations through the conduct of raffles and, if so, when and, if not, why not?
2. What happens to such revenue?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. The matter is under consideration.
2. Lottery licence fees are paid into General Revenue.

POLICE FORCE

973. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What is the number of persons employed in the Police Force in the following sections:
 - (a) drug;
 - (b) vice squad;
 - (c) crime;
 - (d) traffic; and
 - (e) personnel?
2. How many motor vehicles are allotted to each of the above sections?
3. What are the estimated costs of running each of the sections in 1980-1981 and 1981-1982?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) 26
(b) 7
(c) 502
(d) 366
(e) 15
2. (a) 5
(b) 2
(c) 75
(d) 238
(e) 2.
3. 1980-1981.
(a) 597 000
(b) 139 000
(c) 10 784 000
(d) 719 700
(e) 316 000

1981-1982

It is premature to answer this part of the question.

EUROPEAN CARP

970. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Do European Carp have a detrimental effect on riverine environment and indigenous fish species and, if so, what action has the Government taken or is intended to remedy this situation?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Although European Carp have been cited as creating problems in the fresh water environment by increasing turbidity and destroying aquatic vegetation, it has not been proven that they have damaging effects on the mature fresh water species. Although some interaction of carp with mature species occurs, it is thought that the European Carp use food which is not utilised or is under utilised by mature species and they therefore fit into a niche independent of Callop and Murray Cod.

There is some evidence that the reduction in the yabbie population could correlate with the onset of European Carp and this aspect is being investigated in yabbie research work currently being undertaken.

JUVENILE OFFENDERS

971. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many offenders appeared in the juvenile courts during 1980?

2. What number of juveniles appeared for each type of offence committed and, of these, how many were—

- (a) first offenders;
- (b) second offenders;
- (c) third offenders; and
- (d) fourth or subsequent offenders?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. 2235.

2. The following table shows the major offence with which the children were charged:

Offence	First Offender	Second Offender	Third Offender	Four or More
Assault	61	35	13	45
Robbery	14	3	—	4
Rape	2	—	—	—
Sexual offences	10	4	—	5
Break and enter	234	85	61	104
Vehicle theft	99	48	19	79
Other theft	245	85	45	68
Wilful damage	65	10	11	9

Offence	First Offender	Second Offender	Third Offender	Four or More
Receiving	17	9	5	7
Fraud	37	11	7	21
Drug offences	36	22	6	7
Driving and traffic	111	28	14	29
Liquor	35	19	12	7
Unlawfully on premises	6	5	3	8
Indecent behaviour	7	2	1	4
Disorderly behaviour ..	86	43	26	38
Other	59	18	12	14
Total	1 124	427	235	449

VANDALISM

974. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What has been the incidence of vandalism since October 1979 and what categories of vandalism were involved?

2. Has vandalism increased or decreased since October 1979?

3. What has been the incidence of vandalism each year since 1970?

4. What specific actions has the Government taken to reduce vandalism since October 1979, when were these programs introduced, what has been the cost of such programs, how effective have they been and what arrests and convictions have been recorded each month from October 1979 to December 1980?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1.

	1979 Oct.-Dec.	1980 Jan.-March	1980 Apr.-June	1980 July-Sep.	Total
Wilful damage by fire and wilful damage other	10	14	12	20	56
Wilful damage, Educ. school, any means	187	213	150	163	713
Wilful damage, Educ. school, fire	2	2	3	—	7
Wilful damage, Educ. school, firearm	1	1	2	—	4
Wilful damage, other school, firearm	8	2	—	2	12
Wilful damage, other school, any means	13	18	12	22	65
Wilful damage, by firearms	139	65	42	74	320
Wilful damage, by explosives	1	5	3	—	9
Wilful damage to commercial building	488	385	344	362	1 579
Wilful damage to dwelling	569	408	348	392	1 717
Wilful damage to motor vehicle	1 135	942	787	873	3 737
Wilful damage to M.T.T. property	4	2	7	6	19
Wilful damage to other public utility	131	102	50	74	357
Wilful damage to other property	968	551	741	642	2 902
Wilful damage by fire	32	23	18	21	94
Total	3 688	2 733	2 519	2 651	11 591

2. Decreased.

1973-1974

1974-1975

3. Total number of offences involving wilful damage:

1969-1970

1970-1971

1971-1972

1972-1973

1975-1976

1976-1977

1977-1978

1978-1979

1979-1980

6 050

6 863

7 111

7 741

8 754

10 022

13 221

4. The number of offenders involved in wilful damage from October 1979 to September 1980 is provided. December figures are not available at this time.

Wilful Damage

Quarter	Offenders
October/December, 1979.....	491
January/March, 1980	576
April/June, 1980	364
July/September, 1980	333
Total	1 764

SEXUAL MOLESTATION

975. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What are the statistics on sexual molestation of children in South Australia in each month from October 1979 to December 1980?

2. What are the classifications of rape and incidence thereof between October 1979 and December 1980?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1 and 2. Monthly statistics are not kept by the Police Department.

ARSON

976. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. When, how many and which Adelaide night clubs have been subjected to fires and suspected arson in each year since 1970?

2. When, how many and which business premises have been subjected to fires and suspected arson in each year since 1970?

3. What were the Police Department and Fire Brigade reports on the likely causes of fire in each instance?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The amount of time and expense involved in answering the honourable member's questions is not warranted.

977. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

What additional police campaigns and patrols were carried out in the December-New Year period and:

- (a) how many additional staff were involved;
- (b) what overtime, if any, was worked;
- (c) how successful were these campaigns and patrols; and

(d) how many arrests were made for driving under the influence?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

- (a) None.
- (b) None.
- (c) The objective of such campaigns is to provide an extensive visible police presence on the roads to discourage acts of driving which may cause accidents or interrupt the free flow of traffic. It is not possible to measure the success of this strategy.

(d) 89.

HINDLEY STREET

978. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many arrests have occurred each year since 1970 in Hindley Street, and what were the number of arrests and ages of offenders in each category of offence which occurred?

2. What increases in foot and vehicle policing of this area has occurred each year since 1970 and at what times of the year are the patrols increased?

3. How many arrests, pertaining to use and/or selling of narcotics have occurred in this area since 1970 and how many prosecutions were successful?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Figures for the nominated period are not readily available and the amount of time and expense involved in providing this information is not warranted.

RADAR AND AMPHOMETER UNITS

979. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What regular checks are carried out on the use of radar and amphotometer units and by whom, where and when are they carried out?

2. What other States use the same equipment as South Australia and are such checks of this equipment compared with other States and, if so, what anomalies have been revealed as a result?

3. Have any units been withdrawn as a result of these checks and, if so, when, why and what were the numbers and cost price of each type withdrawn?

4. Were any of these units reintroduced and, if so, how many, when and what was the cost of any repairs?

5. How many successful appeals against speeding convictions have occurred since the introduction of radar and amphotometer units?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. Checks are made in accordance with the maker's specifications by the policy operators before, during and after being set up at each separate location.

2. Queensland police are believed to have some radar equipment of similar type to that used in South Australia. Victoria and Northern Territory police are believed to operate digitector devices similar to South Australia.

3. No.

4. See 3.

5. Radar—one
Amphotometer (now digitector)—One

SHIPPING

980. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What were the arrival and departure times of all overseas and interstate ships at Port Adelaide and Outer Harbor, respectively, from 16 December to 19 December 1980 and what were the cargoes of each vessel?

2. How many vessels during this period had to anchor off-shore waiting for pilot availability and what were the respective waiting periods?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. See attached schedule.

2. Nil.

PORT ADELAIDE—VESSEL MOVEMENTS 16.12.80 to 19.12.80 INCLUSIVE

VESSEL	INNER HARBOR				OUTER HARBOR				CARGO
	Arrived		Departed		Arrived		Departed		
	Date	Time	Date	Time	Date	Time	Date	Time	
<i>Lysaght Endeavour</i>			16.12.80	1315					Steel products
<i>Daishin Maru</i>			16.12.80	1355					Motor vehicles
<i>Iron Duke</i>	16.12.80	0730	16.12.80	1840					Steel products
<i>Cannis Minor</i>	16.12.80	0715	18.12.80	1515					CKD steel products
<i>Pavlograd</i>	16.12.80	1710							Wool
<i>Allunga</i>	17.12.80	0650	18.12.80	1525					General
<i>Hojin Maru</i>					17.12.80	1050	18.12.80	0205	
<i>Mary Holyman</i>	18.12.80	0645	19.12.80	1200					General
<i>Anro Asia</i>	18.12.80	1830							General
<i>Al Khaleej</i>	19.12.80	0745							Live sheep
<i>Lloyd Auckland</i>	19.12.80	0700							General
<i>Sunny Peak</i>					19.12.80	0935			Motor vehicles
<i>Ravidas</i>	19.12.80	2010							Titanium oxide

WEST LAKES

981. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Who is responsible for the testing of the quality and salinity of water in West Lakes?

2. What tests are carried out, how often are they conducted and are there any health factors which may cause concern to local residents and swimmers using this lake and, if so, what are they and what action is being taken to rectify these problems?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. The Minister of Marine through the Department of Marine and Harbors for the quality of water and the Engineering and Water Supply Department has been commissioned to carry out regular sampling and testing.

2. Five locations within the lake and one location off Semaphore Beach are monitored for the following determinants—*E. coli*, total coliforms, *Pseudomonas*, salinity, turbidity, total organic carbon, dissolved oxygen, temperature, biochemical oxygen demand, suspended solids, oils and greases, detergents, ammonia, nitrate, total Kjeldahl nitrogen, phosphorus, pH and algae.

Surveys are conducted monthly in summer and every two months in winter. Special surveys are conducted in the vicinity of three drains following periods of significant stormwater input.

Deterioration of bacterial water quality occurs in the lake water adjacent to the stormwater drains following heavy stormwater discharge.

Monitoring of the water in the vicinity of the drains has been intensified during periods of stormwater discharge to determine the extent and duration of unsatisfactory water quality.

BOATING ACCIDENTS

982. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many boating accidents have occurred each year since 1970 involving—

(a) another craft;

(b) injuries to boat crews and/or swimmers; and

(c) deaths of boat crews and/or swimmers?

2. Where did these accidents occur and what number of prosecutions and convictions, respectively, were recorded?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The time and expense involved in providing this information is not considered warranted.

PORT RIVER SILT

984. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What were the reasons for the build up of silt near J Berth in the Port River which delayed the berthing of the oil tanker *Ahida* on 5 January 1981?

2. How often are inspections carried out, and by whom, to ascertain the build up of silt at berths at—

(a) Outer Harbor; and

(b) Port Adelaide?

3. What delays have occurred to other vessels since 1979, for what reasons and what were the periods involved in each instance?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. The build up of silt was due to run-in of material from the bank caused primarily by wakes of vessels washing along the river bank.

2. The berths are sounded by hydrographic surveyors at regular intervals not exceeding two years.

3. None.

DREDGING

985. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What is the dredging program by the Department of Marine and Harbors for all estuaries, rivers and harbours in South Australia during 1981?

2. What are the names of the dredges involved in each instance and the costs of dredging operations of each vessel?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. The Department of Marine and Harbors' dredging program for 1981 is as detailed below:

(1) Completion of the 12 m LW entrance channel to Outer Harbor, Port Adelaide, including new 12 m LW swinging basin opposite No. 6 Berth, Outer Harbor.

(2) Completion of the widening of the Port Adelaide River channel from 107 m to 152 m. This project begun in 1964 includes the deepening and widening of the channel—final stages of widening opposite Osborne will be completed later this year.

- (3) Enlargement of the Port Adelaide inner harbor swinging basin opposite No. 3 dock.
 - (4) Deepening of No. 1 Berth, Outer Harbor, by 1 m to 11 m.
 - (5) Deepening of berth and approaches to Klein Point to 6.5 m LW to accommodate *Accolade II*.
 - (6) Maintenance dredging to American River entrance channel.
 - (7) Maintenance dredging of berths in Port Pirie.
 - (8) Maintenance dredging of berths in Port Adelaide.
 - (9) Dredging and pumping ashore of sand between the Port Adelaide River channel and the future waterfront alignment for reclamation of remaining low lying areas at the northern end of Le Fevre Peninsula.
2. The names of dredges and operating costs are:
- (1) Bucket dredge *A.D. Victoria* will be used on projects 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. Cost \$2.50 to \$3.50 per cubic metre, depending on location and material to be dredged.
 - (2) Grab/hopper dredge *Andrew Wilson* will be used on projects 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8. Cost \$7 to \$10 per cubic metre depending on location and material to be dredged.
 - (3) Cutter/suction dredge *South Australian* will be used on project 9. Cost \$2 per cubic metre.

PORT RIVER WASTES

986. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

- 1. In relation to each company which discharges waste products into the Port River:
 - (a) what is the discharge rate per year since 1975; and
 - (b) what are the types of chemicals and wastes discharged?
- 2. What water quality control tests in the Port River have been carried out each year since 1975 and on how many occasions has it been found that waste products constituted a danger to the public using the river, what were these waste products and who were the companies responsible in each instance?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

- 1. ICI Australia Operations Pty Ltd discharges lime bearing seawater at Osborne at an unknown rate.
- 2. Results can be obtained from the Department of Marine and Harbors library, reference 80/13.

ASSAULT AND ROBBERY

987. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: How many citizens of each sex over sixty-five years of age were assaulted or robbed during 1980—

- (a) in the streets of metropolitan Adelaide; and
 - (b) outside the metropolitan area,
- and during what time of the day did most assaults and robberies occur?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The amount of time and expense involved in answering the honourable member's questions is not warranted.

POLICE SEA RESCUES

989. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

- 1. What has been the number and cost of police rescue operations involving disabled or distressed persons at sea each year since 1978 and of these how many were as a result of:

- (a) craft running out of fuel;
- (b) unseaworthy or inadequate vessels for the trip;
- (c) mechanical failures;
- (d) not heeding weather forecasts; and
- (e) other causes?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation requiring boat owners to carry radios and/or two way radio equipment and, if so, why and, if not, why not?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

- 1. 1978—figures not available; 1979—13; 1980—19; 1981—12 (to date).

The cost of these operations is not readily available and there are no records to show the nature of the breakdown or reason for the mishap.

2. No; as the cost of providing such equipment is quite substantial and most of the waters in South Australia where the pleasure boats operate are relatively sheltered, it is not considered reasonable to require all pleasure boat owners to carry radio equipment.

PRIVATE BUSES

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

- 1. How many private buses have been inspected by Government inspectors each year since 1970 and what were the major defects on those vehicles?
- 2. What prosecutions were initiated against private bus operators for driving unsafe vehicles since 1970 and what companies were involved in each instance?
- 3. What random inspections have been carried out each year since 1970 on private buses after inspections had occurred at Government inspection depots and what did those inspections reveal, if no inspections were carried out, why not?

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

- 1. Prior to 1976 all roadworthiness inspections were carried out by officers of the Police Department. Since 1976 authorised Government inspectors employed by the Central Inspection Authority have examined on an average 2 280 privately owned passenger buses each year. Inspections are carried out on a twice yearly basis. The major defects have been in braking, steering and suspension components.
- 2. The Central Inspection Authority does not maintain prosecution records.
- 3. The Central Inspection Authority does not conduct a program of random inspections. However, between ten and twelve inspections of this type are carried out each year usually in response to requests from the general public.

Defects revealed at random inspections have been in the areas of braking, steering and condition of tyres.

SMOKING HAZARDS

995. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What action will the Minister take on the statement on the sale of tobacco to minors from page 1601 of *Hansard* of 16 February 1978:

“in view of the health hazards involved in smoking, and in view of the urgent need for preventive health measures and good health education, especially among children in relation to drugs, it is imperative that the Government enforce section 80 of the Act, and that it does so effectively”?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Government has initiated a major program to prevent the health hazards of smoking. No further action has been taken to enforce Section 80 of the Community Welfare Act at this stage.

DIALYSIS

996. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many country residents suffering from renal disease have regular journeys to the Q.E.H. for dialysis treatment and training in use of these machines?

2. How many units are made available to residents in metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas, respectively, for dialysis treatment in their own homes?

3. What other hospitals in South Australia have dialysis machines available, what are those locations and how many machines are located at each hospital?

4. What complaints, if any, has the Minister received from patients regarding lack of availability of renal dialysis equipment?

5. How many complaints have been received since October 1979, what were the respective hospitals involved and what remedial action was required?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. As at 19 February 1981, there were two country patients who regularly attended The Queen Elizabeth Hospital for renal dialysis. A further two country patients attended the hospital for training in home dialysis.

2. As at 19 February 1981, forty patients were maintained in their own homes on artificial kidney devices in South Australia. It should be noted that there continues to be no restriction on the availability of machines for patients desiring to do their dialysis at home.

3. The Royal Adelaide Hospital has approximately twelve machines and the Flinders Medical Centre has five.

4. None.

4. See 4. above.

ENCEPHALITIS

1000. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How much money has been allocated to South Australia by the Federal Government for the encephalitis control program?

2. What proportion of this money will be used for:

(a) training and how many trainees are involved;

(b) education; and

(c) research projects?

3. In what areas is this virus considered to be most prevalent?

4. What is the considered carrier of this virus?

5. What eradication programs have been and are to be conducted in an attempt to eliminate those carriers?

6. How many cases of encephalitis have been reported in South Australia since 1970 and what areas, if any, were these outbreaks more predominant?

7. How many deaths have occurred from encephalitis since 1970 and what were the predominant areas, if any, in South Australia where these deaths occurred?

8. What are the likely or possible side effects of this severe illness, how many South Australians have been so affected since 1970 and what are the age categories involved?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Federal Government has allocated \$59 542 to South Australia. This was met \$1 for \$1 from State Revenue.

2. (a) 10 per cent; Twenty-six South Australian health surveyors received this training.

(b) 10 per cent.

(c) 80 per cent.

3. The virus could be prevalent in any area of fresh water where there are large populations of water birds and the mosquito, *Culex annulirostris*. The Murray basin is the area of significance in South Australia.

4. The carrier is considered to be *Culex annulirostris*.

5. Mosquito abatement programs are conducted by local health authorities around the towns on the Murray. A survey of probable breeding sites for *Culex annulirostris* mosquitoes is being conducted. This provides data for planning emergency control measures.

6.

Sex	Age	Place of Infection	Date of Onset of Symptoms	Deaths
F	7 years	Goolwa	29.1.74	
F	76 years	Renmark	1.2.74	
M	8 years	Kilburn	18.2.74	
M	4 years	Murray Bridge	22.2.74	
M	5 years	Amata (Musgrave Ranges)	11.3.74	D
M	61 years	Aldinga	12.3.74	
F	23 years	Barmera	28.3.74	D
F	52 years	Alawoona Loxton	24.3.74	
M	3 years	Yunta	5.4.74	
M	26 years	Murray Bridge	15.4.74	D

7. There was one death in a proven case of encephalitis in 1974. There were two deaths in cases presumed to be Australian arbo-encephalitis, also in 1974.

8. Survivors of Australian arbo-encephalitis are often left with neurological sequelae such as mental retardation, paralysis, deafness or blindness.

CHILD HEALTH

1003. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Is the Minister aware of the article in the News of 16 December 1980, 'Ads lure kids to ill health' and, if so:

(a) what studies have been carried out by the Health Commission involving children in this age bracket;

(b) what were these results and are they readily obtainable and, if so, where; and

(c) is it the intention of the commission to conduct such a survey and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

Yes.

(a) No studies have been undertaken by the South Australian Health Commission concerning children's eating and television commercials. This matter has been the subject of discussion by the National Committee on Nutrition Education, which was convened by the Commonwealth Department of Health. When the committee's recommendations are released they will be examined by the South Australian Health Commission with a view to developing

a Nutrition Education campaign as part of the commission's on-going health promotion activities.

(b) Not applicable.

(c) No. Priorities for future research and educational campaigns are being reviewed. Health promotion resources will be directed into those areas which offer the greatest opportunity for cost-effective intervention and community benefit.

FOODS

1004. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Is the Minister aware of the article in the *News* of 16 December 1980, that 'Proper foods improve sight' and, if so, does the Minister agree with the views expressed in this article and, if not, why not?

2. Have the Government health services provided information to schools, clinics, service organisations, etc., supporting these views by issuing pamphlets and booklets advertising such benefits and, if not, why not and, if so, where is information available from and to whom is it issued?

3. What 'junk foods' have been banned in South Australia since 1970 and who were the manufacturers of these commodities?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. A healthy diet promotes health in all body systems including the eyes. Officers of the Health Commission are seeking further information about Dr Raiford's research.

2. There is a wide range of educational material which is available from several Government and non-government sources on nutritional matters. The Health Promotion Services of the Health Commission distribute some of these materials as do many other health agencies.

3. None.

THERAPY UNIT

1008. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many full-time staff are employed at the Western Regional Rehabilitation Service Work and Recreational Therapy Unit at Royal Park and what are the functions of each staff member?

2. How many part-time staff work at the unit, what are their functions and their salaries?

3. What was the purpose of establishing this unit?

4. What other projects are planned for this unit and what are the estimated costs?

5. How many people have been rehabilitated and in what categories, in each year since the unit became operational?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Thirteen full-time staff are employed at the Western Regional Rehabilitation Service, Work and Recreation Therapy Unit, (Alfreda). Seven of these have varying amounts of shared responsibility with other functional units of the Rehabilitation Service.

The following functions are performed by the full-time staff members:

Trade instructors	2
Paramedical aides	2
Supervisory occupational therapists	1
Occupational therapists	3
Physiotherapist	1
Social worker	1
Clerical officer	1
Physical educationist	1
Speech therapist	1

2. Four part-time staff work at the Alfreda unit. Their function and annual salary is as follows:

	\$
Senior visiting medical specialist	10 308
Medical officer	13 850
Supervisory physiotherapist	16 100
Physiotherapist	6 060

The supervisory physiotherapist also has varying responsibilities in other functional areas of the Rehabilitation Service.

3. The purpose of the Work and Recreational Therapy Unit is to rehabilitate persons of the working age group, that they may regain fitness and skills to enable them, within a short period of time, to return to their previous occupation and life-styles.

4. No additional treatment programs are planned for the Alfreda Unit at this stage.

5.

30 July 1977-21 December 1977	
Total admitted	7
Workers comp.	3
Sickness benefits	4
Other	—
January 1978-December 1978	
Total admitted	75
Workers comp.	37
Sickness benefits	19
Invalid pension	7
Other	12
January 1979-December 1979	
Total admitted	109
Workers comp.	63
M/V accident	10
Sickness benefits	18
Invalid pension	3
Other	15
January 1980-December 1980	
Total admitted	132
Workers comp.	67
M/V accident	9
Sickness benefits	23
Invalid pension	8
Other	25
January 1981-16 February 1981	
Total admitted	21
Workers comp.	8
M/V accident	1
Sickness benefits	3
Invalid pension	3
Other	6

MERCURY LEVELS

1009. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Has the Minister investigated the lead and mercury levels in the Adelaide water supply and, if so, when were those studies last carried out and what did the investigation reveal?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes. The studies of mercury and lead levels were last carried out in March 1977 and August 1980 respectively. Monitoring revealed that levels of these metals were well below World Health Organisation standards for drinking water (1971).

PARKING FOR DISABLED

1013. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many reserved parking spaces for motor vehicles for the disabled are there outside Government buildings and depots in Adelaide, what are their locations and how many are at each location?

2. What special provisions are made for the disabled at sporting venues in Adelaide for:

(a) parking of motor vehicles; and

(b) viewing of sporting fixtures,

and where are the sites located?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Although 'on street' car parking is the responsibility of local government, a total of eight off street parking spaces outside Public Buildings Department offices and depots are reserved for disabled persons.

Location	No. of Reserved Parking Spaces
Netley complex, Marion Road	4
Gawler Place car pool, Adelaide	2
Wakefield Street car park, Adelaide	2

The reserved parking spaces are used by six departmental employees and two members of the Secretariat of the International Year of the Disabled.

2. (a) Generally disabled persons can obtain a permit which allows a stay of ninety minutes in addition to the time set for any parking zone under local government regulations. This provides individual disabled persons with a range of choices in parking.

Disabled persons wishing to park in areas controlled under the Private Parking Areas Act should contact the management of the sporting facility concerned.

(b) Most State sporting associations provide assistance and special areas at sporting fixtures for the viewing of events by disabled persons. Details may be obtained from the appropriate association.

ESTCOURT HOUSE

1017. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Are certain sections of Estcourt House regarded as fire hazards as claimed in a letter to the Editor of *The Advertiser* of 26 December 1980 and, if so, what are those sections?

2. How many 'Retarded-bed ridden patients' reside at Estcourt House?

3. How many staff are on duty at any one time at Estcourt House and what are their classifications?

4. What fire drill procedures are carried out on a regular basis by the staff and:

(a) who supervises the drill procedures; and

(b) what is the anticipated evacuation time for all patients and staff in the event of a major fire?

5. How often has the S.A. Fire Brigade visited Estcourt House in the past 24 months and what upgrading of fire drill procedures, if any, has been recommended by the Brigade and if the Brigade has not visited the House, why not?

6. Has the upgrading of Estcourt House been recommended and, if so:

(a) on what date was that recommendation made and by whom;

(b) what upgrading of fire prevention and detection facilities are to be installed;

(c) what is the cost of installation;

(d) when will it be commenced and completed; and

(e) how many months will elapse before automatic fire detection equipment will be installed?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. All parts of Estcourt House require upgrading to varying degrees to match present-day standards of fire protection, and the work has either been completed (in the part already occupied) or is nearing completion.

2. Forty patients, as at 5 March 1981. It is planned that this number will increase to 100 during April of this year.

3. Staff complement:

Senior registered nurses	1
Registered nurses	8
State enrolled nurses	14
Nurse attendants	18
Total	41

At specific times, depending on roster:

7.00 a.m.—1.15 p.m.

Registered nurses 2 or 3
S.E.N. or N. attend 12

1.15 p.m.—3.30 p.m.

Registered nurses 4 or 5
S.E.N. or N. attend 20

3.30 p.m.—9.45 p.m.

Registered nurses 2 or 3
S.E.N. or N. attend 8 or 9

9.35 p.m.—7.00 a.m.

Registered nurses 1
S.E.N. or N. attend 3

Additional during the day:

Hospital orderly 1
Physiotherapist aide 1
Activities supervisor 1

4. Since the first group of staff moved to Estcourt House on 2 February 1981 there have been two fire demonstrations/lectures given by the fire security officers from the Public Buildings Department.

When the premises are fully occupied (approximately 10 April 1981), further demonstrations/lectures will be given, and follow-up performances will be given at six-monthly intervals. With new staff, fire lectures form a normal part of their general induction lectures.

(a) The fire procedures are supervised by officers from the Fire Brigade or the fire security officers from the Public Buildings Department, or specially-trained staff from Ru Rua.

(b) Currently, the evacuation time would range between 3 to 10 minutes.

5. The South Australia Fire Brigade has visited Estcourt House on a regular six-monthly basis during the past twenty-four months. Recommendations with regard to improvements were made in December 1980.

6. (a) The recommendation to upgrade fire protection at Estcourt House was made in November/December 1980 by the Public Buildings Department fire cell and the South Australian Fire Brigade.

(b) Complete upgrading in accordance with the recommendations of the South Australian Fire Brigade and the Public Buildings Department fire cell.

(c) \$55 000.

(d) The work commenced in November 1980 and is scheduled for completion by the end of March 1981.

(e) The automatic fire detection system has been installed.

DIETHYSTIBAESTROL

1019. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Can the drug diethystibaestrol cause side effects such as vaginal abnormalities, infertility and sterility in sons?

2. Has the Victorian Health Department alerted doctors to check all female patients aged twelve to thirty-five for exposure to the drug which has been found to cause abnormalities in the reproductive organs and, if so, what warnings have been issued by the South Australian Health Commission to women in South Australia and when were they issued and, if none, why not?

3. What research has been carried out in South Australia, over what period and what has been the incidence of cancer per 1 000 persons?

4. Has a working party from the Australian College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists warned of the dangers of this drug?

5. Has this drug been withdrawn from the market in South Australia, and if so, when and, if not, why not?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The drug diethystibaestrol has been reported to cause vaginal abnormalities and is also considered to have an effect in terms of genital tract abnormalities and reduced sperm counts in males.

2. Yes. Doctors in South Australia have been aware for some years of the association between maternal ingestion of diethystibaestrol in early pregnancy and possible vaginal abnormalities in their female offspring. For a number of years checks have been made whenever there has been a known case of a woman with this drug history in her own mother. There has been no requirement to issue a warning in this State.

As this particular method of treatment for threatened miscarriage was commonly used in Victoria it is appropriate for the Victorian Health authority to take special steps to follow-up those females potential at risk. This particular treatment method was rarely used by South Australian obstetricians and therefore the risk factor for young females in the reproduction age group in this State is very low indeed.

3. No research has been carried out in South Australia into this particular condition which arose twenty to twenty-five years ago. All information relating to possible cases is collected at State level in all Australian States and is collated internationally in a special centre set up for this purpose in Chicago, U.S.A. As this drug has not been used to treat threatened miscarriage for many years there is no justification for conducting current research in this matter.

The incidence of vaginal clear cell carcinoma resulting from intra-uterine exposure to diethystibaestrol is extremely rare. Only 300 cases of vaginal clear cell carcinoma have been reported throughout the world. In South Australia there have been two known cases.

4. A working party has now been set up by the Royal Australian College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists and to date no report has been made.

5. No. It is a most valuable therapeutic drug in a number of conditions and is an important therapeutic adjunct in certain cases of cancer such as prostatic cancer.

CYSTIC FIBROSIS

1020. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What is cystic fibrosis and what are the symptoms of the disease?

2. What has been the incidence of this disease each year in South Australia since 1970?

3. What drugs and/or treatment are available for medication?

4. What restrictions are placed on the dispensing of this drug at each hospital in South Australia?

5. Are these drugs free or subsidised through pharmaceutical benefits schemes and, if so, by how much and, if not, why not?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Cystic fibrosis is a generalised hereditary disorder associated with widespread malfunction of the exocrine glands, which results in the accumulation of excessively thick and tenacious mucus and abnormal secretion of sweat and saliva.

The symptoms vary widely. Although it is congenital it may not manifest itself to any appreciable degree during the early weeks or months of life. It may cause intestinal obstruction and perforation in the newborn.

All degrees of the severity of the disease are known—some persons may reach adulthood with very few symptoms and others are born with intestinal obstruction requiring surgery in the neonatal period.

2. No State records are kept. However, based on records from certain hospitals, the overall incidence in South Australia would appear to be about one in 2 000 births.

3. The following drugs are used in this condition:

(1) pancreatic enzyme supplements, e.g. Cotazym*

(2) Antibiotics

(a) Oral—Ampicillin*, Chloramphenicol*, Cloxacillin*, Co-trimoxazole*, Erythromycin*, Flucloxacillin Fusidic Acid*, Penicillin*, Probenecid*, Tetracycline*.

(b) Intravenous—Carbenicillin*, Cephaloridine*, Gentamicin*, Lincomycin*, Methicillin*, Piperacillin, Ticarcillin, Tobramycin*.

(c) Inhalation—Gentamicin*.

(3) Glucose electrolyte mixture.

(4) Bronchodilators, e.g. Ventolin*, Salbutamol*, Aminophylline*, Orciprenaline*.

(5) Dietary therapy:

(a) Special milk formulas, e.g. Triglyde*, Pregestimil*, De-Lact Infant*.

(b) Medium chain triglyceride oil*.

(c) Sodium bicarbonate solution*.

(6) Antacid therapy where indicated, e.g. Cimetidine*.

(7) Vitamin supplementation with vitamins A, D, E and K*.

In addition, some of these drugs are given by inhalation and Mucomyst machines are made available by hospitals for patients requiring them. Physiotherapy and surgical treatment are offered where indicated. It is occasionally

desirable for persons suffering from this disease to sleep in a highly humidified atmosphere and tents are made available by hospitals to permit this where necessary.

4. None, other than restrictions which apply normally to all drugs prescribed through hospital pharmacies, i.e. one month supply is the maximum usually prescribed.

5. These drugs are free for hospital service patients and those marked with an asterisk are available through the Commonwealth Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme and the usual financial arrangements apply to them.

The Commonwealth Minister of Health is responsible for the administration of the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme and further information should be sought from him.

TRACHOMA

1022. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What is the 'trachoma program' for South Australian Aboriginals for 1981 and:

- (a) how many people will be involved and at what locations;
- (b) what Health Department officers will be involved; and
- (c) what is the amount of funding obtained from the Federal Government for this program?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows: The 1981 trachoma program for South Australian Aboriginals will involve the provision of eye treatment for people located on the remote north-west Aboriginal reserves of the State, Oodnadatta, Ceduna (and environs), Yalata and the Coober Pedy Aboriginal community. It is planned to involve eye specialists, the Royal Flying Doctor Service, local medical practitioners and health commission staff in the program as appropriate.

- (a) The number of persons to be treated in this program during 1981 are:

	Persons
Remote North-West reserves: (Amata, Ernabella, Mimili, Fre- gon, Indulkana).....	590
Oodnadatta	30
Coober Pedy	16
Ceduna (and environs).....	12
Yalata	10

- (b) Thirty staff of the Aboriginal Health Unit of the South Australian Health Commission, as part of their normal duties, will be involved arranging and providing the trachoma treatment.
- (c) The Commonwealth Government has not provided a special allocation of funds for this program in 1981. The program is supported financially through the operation of existing health schemes administered by the Commonwealth Department of Health. The Aboriginal Health Unit of the South Australian Health Commission contributes to the Trachoma Program as part of its normal operations which are financed by the Commonwealth Government. No specific amount is identified in the unit's budget for the trachoma program.

X-RAY EQUIPMENT

1023. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Where will the diagnostic X-ray equipment, as per item No. 190 in the Supply and Tender Board advertisement in *The Advertiser* on 19 January 1981 be installed and at what cost?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yalata Labour Prison at a cost less than \$20 000.

VALIUM

1028. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Has the Minister seen the article in *The National Times*, 18-24 January 1981, entitled 'Does Valium Promote Cancer' and, if so, what action has the Government taken or is intended to restrict or ban the use of valium?

2. How many prescriptions for valium have been made each year since 1975 in South Australia?

3. What research has been carried out in South Australia on the use of valium, by whom, over what period, how many persons were involved in the study and what were the results?

4. Has the Minister obtained a report on the allegations made in *The National Times* and, if so, what were the results and, if not, why not?

5. What reviews of patients using this drug are carried out by doctors and other qualified persons who prescribe this drug and what have those reviews revealed?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. The Australian Drug Evaluation Committee is reviewing the scientific data upon which the article 'Does Valium Promote Cancer' was based. No action will be taken to restrict the availability of valium pending the outcome of the committee's investigation.

2. It is not possible to give an accurate figure for the number of valium prescriptions dispensed in South Australia since 1975. However, data collected on a national basis indicates that the overall number of prescriptions dispensed has fallen by 8-9 per cent since 1975.

3. No special research into the use and effects of valium has been carried out in South Australia.

4. Officers of the Health Commission are preparing a report into the allegations made in the *National Times*. It is anticipated that the report will be available in the near future.

5. Reviews of the usage of valium are carried out on an individual basis by a patient's doctor, and the results of those reviews necessarily remain a confidential matter. Health authorities are not aware of any large scale reviews of patient usage of valium ever being carried out in Australia. To date, no persuasive scientific evidence has been produced that demonstrates any link between the usage of valium and the incidence of cancer.

OUT-PATIENT COSTS

1031. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What has been the cost of out-patient services at each teaching hospital in each year from 1976 to 30 June 1980?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:

Teaching Hospital	1975-1976 \$'000	1976-1977 \$'000	1977-1978 \$'000	1978-1979 \$'000	1979-1980 \$'000
Royal Adelaide	11 003 ⁽¹⁾	13 195 ⁽¹⁾	11 819 ⁽¹⁾	13 037 ⁽³⁾	13 220 ⁽³⁾
The Queen Elizabeth	4 949 ⁽¹⁾	6 544 ⁽¹⁾	8 354 ⁽¹⁾	7 795 ⁽²⁾	8 601 ⁽³⁾
Flinders Medical Centre	— ⁽¹⁾	5 388 ⁽¹⁾	7 519 ⁽¹⁾	8 041 ⁽²⁾	8 596 ⁽³⁾
Adelaide Childrens	4 287 ⁽²⁾	5 429 ⁽³⁾	6 503 ⁽³⁾	6 517 ⁽³⁾	6 995 ⁽³⁾
Queen Victoria	563 ⁽³⁾	726 ⁽³⁾	746 ⁽³⁾	794 ⁽³⁾	786 ⁽³⁾

- (1) Calculated from Auditor General's Report.
- (2) From hospital's annual report.
- (3) From hospital's records.

AERIAL SPRAYING

1034. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. When does the Minister expect to receive the N.H. & M.R.C. report on the aerial spraying of insecticides and the recommended usage and spraying techniques of agricultural chemicals?
2. Is it anticipated that amending legislation will be introduced and, if so, when?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The expert committee of the National Health and Medical Research Council that is studying the aerial application of insecticides has not yet completed its investigations, nor has it indicated when it expects to release a report on its findings.
2. The need for changes to State legislation relating to the aerial application of insecticides will only be considered after the N.H. & M.R.C.'s recommendations on the matter have been made available for consideration.

DRUGS

1037. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What is the practice of supplying drugs at Government hospital outpatients departments and what is the quantity and availability of drugs at each hospital?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Pharmaceutical issues supplied from hospital outpatient departments to Non-inpatients (outpatients) are limited to a maximum of one month's supply on a time-dose basis. Where exceptional circumstances prevail three month's supply may be issued to patients requiring long term therapy. Hospitals may not provide pharmaceuticals for non-hospital patients (private outpatients) except for those special drugs available only through hospitals. Pharmaceuticals issued from outpatient pharmacy departments are only made available upon the prescription of the consulting medical officer of the hospital.

PUBLIC SERVICE VACANCIES

1039. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: How many vacant positions were available in the Public Service for school leavers during December 1980, in what areas and departments were they and how many applications were received?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It is not practical, because of the lapse of time and the cost involved, to indicate how many vacant positions were available during December

1980 for school leavers. Some of the available positions would have been filled during December; others would have remained vacant until January, or even February.

During the month of December 1980, sixty-one positions were filled. A wide range of candidates were available for selection to those vacancies, including school leavers. Twelve (12) or 20 per cent of those positions were filled by persons coming from secondary schools, or tertiary education institutions. Those people were placed as follows:

Department	No.
Corporate Affairs Commission	2
Correctional Services	2
Education	1
Engineering and Water Supply	1
Police	1
Public Buildings	2
Public Service Board	1
Transport	1
Woods and Forests	1

The Government has introduced a program (known as the Young Peoples' Program) involving the recruitment of up to one hundred (100) school leavers in the current financial year. Subject to satisfactory performance these people will gain permanent employment. Approximately eighty (80) school leavers have already been taken on under that particular program.

During the month of December 1980, 292 applications for employment were received, 148 being from school leavers (secondary schools and tertiary institutions).

BLUE ASBESTOS

1042. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: How many public buildings still contain blue asbestos and:

- (a) what are the names of those establishments and where are they located; and
- (b) what action is currently being carried out or is intended to be carried out on Government buildings in 1981 and what are the anticipated costs in each instance?

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

- (a) There are nine Government owned buildings in which blue asbestos is known to be present. Future inspections may reveal other sites where it exists.
 1. The Royal Adelaide Hospital, North Terrace, Adelaide.
 2. Port Lincoln Hospital, Port Lincoln.
 3. South Australian Tourist Bureau, King William Street, Adelaide.

4. School of Art and Craft, Stanley Street, North Adelaide.

5. Old Boys Institute Building, Wakefield Street, Adelaide.

6. I.M.V.S. Building, Frome Road, Adelaide.

7. Modbury Hospital, Smart Road, Modbury.

8. Northfield Wards, R.A.H., Hampstead Road, Northfield.

9. Open College of Further Education, Kilkenny, Humphries Terrace, Kilkenny.

- (b) An Asbestos Advisory Committee consisting of relevant Government and union representatives was established in September 1979. The committee monitors asbestos levels to determine the priority for asbestos removal and treatment work in Government buildings. The risk posed by the presence of asbestos in buildings depends on several factors including the type of asbestos, its location in the building and the condition of the insulation material.

However, expert advice indicates that, while left undisturbed, the risk of the asbestos to occupants of the buildings and to the public is negligible. These risks, along with other factors, are taken into account by the committee in considering the recommended actions to be taken in any particular building. It is planned that remedial work will be undertaken in 1981 at the Port Lincoln Hospital at an estimated cost of \$600 000 and at the North Adelaide School of Art and Craft at an estimated cost of \$375 000.

BUILDERS LICENSING

1057. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: How many complaints were received by the Builders Licensing Board during 1979-1980 and to date in 1980-1981 and of these how many were resolved in favour of the client and the builder, respectively?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The following complaints have been received by the Builders Licensing Board: 1979-1980—490; 1.7.80-27.2.81—82. Statistics are not available on the number of complaints resolved in favour of the client and builder, respectively. The resolution of many complaints involves some degree of compromise and it is not possible to categorise them as having been resolved 'in favour of' one or other of the parties.

1062. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. When and where were discussions held with fire-safety authorities regarding fire precautions at Charles Moore's building, and what were the names of the officers from all departments involved?

2. What specific recommendations came out of each of these meetings, on what dates and at what venues?

3. What recommendations will be or have been implemented as a result of those meetings?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The Law Courts project team have been involved in discussions with officers of the Fire Brigade, the City of Adelaide, the consultant architects Hassell and Partners and the Building Advisory Committee since September 1980. The meetings took place at regular intervals, as required.

Recommendations were formulated over the entire period of the meetings and further discussions will be held to resolve any further fire protection matters which may arise in the course of construction.

As a result of the meetings, the project team have incorporated extensive fire protection measures into the building design including *inter alia*, sprinkler systems, smoke detectors, fire dampers, stairway pressurisation, emergency generators and a full evacuation control system.

WATER QUALITY

1064. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. How many complaints were received from residents in the north-western suburbs complaining of the poor quality of the water through E. & W.S. mains during 1980 and what were the nature of the complaints and locations in each instance?

2. Have crustaceans or other bodies blocked mains and householders water supplies and if so, on how many occasions and what remedial action has been taken in each instance?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. See attached schedule.

2. Whilst not blocking water mains, crustaceans have been responsible for very rare occurrences of blockages in householders' water supplies. Flushing of the mains in the immediate vicinity of the complaint is used to remedy the problem.

Suburb	Dirty Water	Smelly Water	Organisms
North Haven	10	—	—
Largs Bay	5	—	—
Taperoo	7	—	—
Semaphore Park	62	—	1
Port Adelaide	1	—	—
Rosewater	2	—	—
Regency Park	1	—	—
Alberton	1	—	—
Cheltenham	2	—	—
Royal Park	1	—	—
Queenstown	1	—	—
West Lakes	80	1	1
Semaphore	7	—	—
Seaton	8	—	—
Woodville	10	—	—
Albert Park	1	—	1
Kilkenny	1	—	—
Croydon	5	—	—
Bowden	3	—	—
Hindmarsh	1	—	—
Flinders Park	4	—	—
Findon	5	—	—
Grange	21	—	—
Beverley	3	—	—
Birkenhead	6	—	—
Welland	2	—	—
Total	250	1	3

Note:

(1) Some listed suburbs incorporate adjacent areas with similar suburb name connections, viz., Woodville West included in Woodville.

(2) Except for (1) above, suburbs not listed did not generate any complaints.

(3) Major areas of complaint were the newly developing areas of West Lakes, Semaphore Park, Grange and North Haven.

WATER SUPPLY

1066. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What are the major areas and townships that do not have a reticulated water supply system and what is the program and estimated cost for installing reticulated water supplies to these areas and townships during 1981, 1982 and 1983 and how many persons can be expected to be serviced each year as part of the program?

2. What is the present situation in relation to cost of cartage of water to those townships and what subsidies are provided by the Government in relation to the cost of supplying carted water to these areas?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. There are no major areas and townships in this State which do not have a reticulated water supply available.
2. Not applicable.

E. & W.S. ADVERTISEMENTS

1067. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. How many E. & W.S. advertisements were presented on radio and television stations in 1979 and 1980 and at what cost, respectively?

2. How effective were these advertisements in reducing water consumption in this State and what criteria was used to gauge the effectiveness or otherwise of these advertisements?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. See schedule below. As our Australian summer traverses calendar years, the information requested has been provided by financial years.

2. The effectiveness of the advertising campaigns in reducing water consumption cannot be reasonably assessed in the short-term because other factors, principally the weather, have a very strong influence in this regard. The campaigns, while aimed at reducing the short-term consumption level, are also intended to encourage the development of positive long-term attitudes to water conservation.

The effectiveness of campaigns is determined by follow-up research to assess the public's opinion of campaigns and recall of slogan used.

WATER CONSERVATION ADVERTISING

Medium	1978-79			1979-80			1980-81			Total—3 Campaigns		
	Number Paid	Number Free	Cost \$	Number Paid	Number Free	Cost \$	Number Paid	Number Free	Cost \$	Number Paid	Number Free	Cost \$
Radio	420	—	8 643	594	406	12 570	482	506	12 628	1 496	912	33 841
Metro TV	223	—	42 314	110	110	26 904	101	100	25 407	434	210	94 625
Country TV	168	—	9 641	42	42	2 919	42	42	2 664	252	84	15 224
	811	—	60 598	746	558	42 393	625	648	40 699	2 182	1 206	143 690

FLUSH CISTERNS

1068. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: Has the Minister requested that all Government departments and depots, in the interest of conserving water, review the amounts of water used for flushing of toilet and urinal systems and, if so, when, and, if not, why not and does the Minister intend to investigate such possibilities and, if so, when?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: Not at this stage. An investigation has been undertaken to review the amounts of water used for flushing toilets and urinal systems. Subject to the development of an acceptable standard, it is the intention of the Government to endorse the use of dual flush cisterns in the interests of water conservation.

Metropolitan Adelaide

Plant Location	Estimated Cost (\$ million)	Construction Start	Schedule Complete
Barossa Reservoir ..	16.4	Sept 1977	April 1982 (est.)
Little Para Reservoir ..	16.9	Nov. 1979	Sept 1983 (est.)
Happy Valley Reservoir ..	46.5	Nov. 1981 (est.)	Oct. 1987 (est.)
Myponga Reservoir ..	18.2	June 1987 (est.)	Oct. 1990 (est.)

WATER FILTRATION

1069. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What is the water filtration program for country and metropolitan areas over the next ten years?

2. What are the specific locations, costs and timetabling in each instance?

3. Have any water filtration projects been deferred and, if so, which are they and what was the original and what is the deferred timetabling?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. Water Filtration Program

Country Areas

Cabinet recently gave approval for an expenditure of \$3 million for the Engineering and Water Supply Department to proceed with the development of conceptual and final designs, specifications and tender documents for two water filtration plants on the Morgan-Whyalla and Swan Reach-Stockwell pipelines.

2. See schedule above.
3. No.

WATER SUPPLY

1070. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. From what reservoir do residents in the north-western suburbs receive tap water?
2. When will that water supply be filtered, at what cost, and what is the anticipated commencement date for the complex to filter such water?
3. What quality control measures are carried out, and on what basis, to these suburbs?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. Hope Valley and Happy Valley reservoirs.
2. Hope Valley water filtration plant was commissioned in November 1977 at a cost of \$19.7 million.

It is anticipated that the Happy Valley water filtration plant will be commissioned late in 1987 at a cost of \$55.2 million.

3. The water from Hope Valley reservoir is filtered and chlorinated at the Hope Valley water filtration plant. Happy Valley water is unfiltered but is continuously chlorinated to control the bacteriological quality of this supply. Bacteriological samples are collected twice weekly from standard locations in north-western suburbs; based on these results chlorine dosage rates are adjusted.

SCHOOL VANDALISM

1072. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What damage was reported involving vandalism at primary and secondary schools over the recent Christmas school holidays and what were the respective costs involved for each school?
2. How many arrests if any, were made as a result of such vandalism?
3. How many persons were spoken to by various authorities concerning their unauthorised presence in school grounds during this period?

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

1. Damage of this nature falls into two broad categories, namely, buildings and equipment. Building repairs are the responsibility of the Public Buildings Department, and repairs are attended to following liaison between schools and that departments regionally based District Building Officers. Information concerning building damage caused by vandal attacks is not readily available, and the amount of time that would be involved in collating such information cannot be justified. Repair or replacement of equipment is the responsibility of the Education Department. As yet, all information has not yet come to hand and costings have not been completed. It is likely to be several weeks before the information can be supplied.

2. This information is not readily available at this stage from the Police Department. However, nine persons were apprehended and handed over to the police by private security patrols on contract to the Education Department.

3. This information is not readily available, and the amount of time that would be involved in obtaining it cannot be justified. However, the private security patrols removed forty-four persons from school grounds during the Christmas period.

CLASS SIZES

1073. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What are the student numbers in the respective classes/grades at the following:

- (a) Seaton North High School; (b) West Lakes High School;
- (c) Seaton North Primary School;
- (d) Hendon Primary School;
- (e) Findon Primary School;
- (f) Woodville Primary School;
- (g) Semaphore Park Primary School; and
- (h) West Lakes Shore Primary School?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: As the information requested is of a very detailed nature it has been forwarded direct to the honourable members electorate office. The figures are relevant to 28.2.81 enrolments.

1074. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What formula exists for determining the staffing arrangements for high and primary schools and, if categories exist, what are they?

2. Has the Government altered the formula of the previous Government and, if so, what changes have occurred?

The Hon. A. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. There are four categories of staffing formulae—junior primary, primary, area and secondary. The formulae for each of these categories are as detailed below:

Junior primary schools

For enrolments up to 169

$$\text{Staffing target} = 0.8 + \frac{\text{Enrolment}}{22.5}$$

For enrolments of 170 and above

$$\text{Staffing target} = 2.0 + \frac{\text{Enrolment}}{25.5}$$

Primary Schools

Enrolment	Total Basic Staff
0-22	1.2
23-46	2.3
47-57	2.5
58-70	3.4
71-99	3.4 + 1 for each additional 21 pupils
100-199	4.6 + 1 for each additional 21 pupils
200-245	9.1 + 1 for each additional 22 pupils
246-299	11.2 + 1 for each additional 24 pupils
300-399	13.3 + 1 for each additional 25 pupils
400-499	17.2 + 1 for each additional 25.5 pupils
500 to Second Deputy	21.2 + 1 for each additional 25.5 pupils
From the appointment of the Second Deputy	
600 +	25.2 + 1 for each additional 26 pupils
700 +	29.0 + 1 for each additional 26 pupils

Area Schools

$$\text{Staffing target} = 1.0 + 0.5 + \frac{E}{SF}$$

(1.0 = Principal, 0.5 = Deputy's non-teaching. E = Enrolment, SF = Staffing)

The following staffing factors will apply:

Enrolment	Staffing Factor
79-199	22.2
200-299	24.2
300-Second Deputy	25.5
From Second Deputy (R-7)	25.9

N.B. Enrolments = R-7 enrolments.

Secondary Schools

Enrolment (E)	Staff
50-195	2.3 + $\frac{E}{12.3}$
195-380	3.6 + $\frac{E}{13.4}$
380-600	6.1 + $\frac{E}{14.7}$
Over 600	10.1 + $\frac{E}{16.3}$

It should be noted that teachers additional to the basic formula are allocated for special needs of schools. This is approximately 5 per cent of the total number of teachers available to schools.

2. There have been minor changes to the formulae as follows: In the primary area the teacher allocation to small schools has been marginally improved. In the secondary staffing basic entitlements were increased, while special entitlements were slightly decreased. It must be emphasised that because the overall teacher allocation to schools is dependent on the special needs factor no conclusions can be drawn just from consideration of the base formula. There has been a marginal improvement in the pupil teacher ratio at all levels from 1980 to 1981.

SCHOOL SECURITY

1075. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Are primary, high schools and technical colleges policed by security firms in this State and, if so:

- (a) how many;
- (b) what are their names and locations; and
- (c) which security firms are involved and what is the cost per annum to each school?

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

- (a) Fifty-three primary and high schools are patrolled by security firms in the metropolitan area and a further six are patrolled in country districts.
- (b) In the interests of security, I do not consider it appropriate to divulge information concerning the particular schools that are patrolled.
- (c) Two companies, namely Metropolitan Security Services and Wormald International Security, currently hold contracts for the patrol services. The total cost of the patrol services for the fifty-nine schools is \$87 321.

MARION HIGH SCHOOL

1077. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

- 1. Will the Government reconsider its withdrawal of financial support for the community development programme at Marion High School and, if not, why not?
- 2. What is the amount required for the remainder of 1980-81 and 1981-82 to support this programme?
- 3. How many disadvantaged adults and children have been assisted since this programme was introduced and were these results positive and, if not, why not?
- 4. When was this programme introduced at this school and what amounts have been received each year since the inception of this programme?

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

- 1. No. The programme is outside the funding guidelines established for the Local Government Assistance Fund, administered by the Minister of Local Government.
- 2. Not known.
- 3. Not known.
- 4. 1977. The amount received from State sources have been 1977 (\$4 000), 1978 (\$4 400), and 1979 (\$5 644).

DRUGS

1078. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

- 1. What is the Government's policy on drugs in schools in South Australia, when was it announced, by whom and who were the persons involved in the formation of that policy and what were their qualifications?
- 2. How many cases of:
 - (a) drug taking;

- (b) drug trafficking; and
- (c) pill popping,

were reported in each school in this State for each month from December 1978 until December 1980?

3. How many juveniles and adults were arrested and/or convicted as in 2. above?

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

1. There are two aspects to Education Department policy:

- (1) Any incident involving illicit drugs in schools will be dealt with according to the usual processes of law. Guidelines on Policy Action in Schools are provided in Administrative Instructions and Guidelines, Education Department of South Australia.
- (2) Policies relating to licit drugs (e.g. tobacco, alcohol) are the responsibility of school principals. Guidelines for schools on drug issues and on developing school policies were circulated to schools in 1978. The booklet was called 'Schools and Drugs'. Many schools have a clearly stated policy. Parents (particularly school councils) have been involved in developing school policies. The booklet 'Schools and Drugs' was prepared by a group with representatives from the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board, Crown Law Department, Health Commission of South Australia, South Australian Police Department, Services of Youth Council, Catholic Education Office, Independent Schools Board, and the Education Department of South Australia.

2. The Education Department does not keep statistics of these items.

3. The Police Department may be able to provide information on arrests and convictions.

ABORIGINAL HEALTH

1079. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

- 1. How many Aboriginal children in South Australia suffer from hearing problems, what are their ages, the specific nature of their problem and what is being done to overcome it?
- 2. What surveys have been carried out, at what cost and by whom into the health of Aboriginal people in South Australia?

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

1. No information is available concerning the incidence of hearing problems amongst Aboriginal children in metropolitan and country areas of South Australia.

For the children of 2 000 (approximately) Aboriginal people living on remote settlements, some information is available but this relates mainly to middle ear infection, which does not necessarily lead to hearing problems if appropriate treatment is provided.

Four surveys conducted on remote Aboriginal settlements have yielded the following results:

(1) Dr N. Reilly (specialist)	1971 Yalata	Hearing loss*	Per cent
(2) Dr G. S. Vercoe et al. (specialist)	1977 Yalata	Perforated drum (one or both sides)	40
(3) Dr R. L. Guerin (specialist)	1974 N. W. Reserves	Perforated drum (one or both sides)	42

(4) Dr D. Moran	1976 'Red Centre' (including N.W. Reserves of S.A.)	Otitis media	33
-----------------	---	--------------	----

*in 10 per cent of these wax or other obstruction caused the hearing loss.

From the above it can be concluded that, because of an episode or episodes of middle ear infection 30-40 per cent of children in the areas surveyed had temporary hearing loss.

The age range of these children was six months to fifteen years. Infection is commoner under eight years and much less common in older children.

The specific nature of the problem is spread of infection from nose and throat to the middle ear: frequent recurrences occur mainly as a result of poor environmental living conditions.

To overcome the problem the following is being done:

- (a) health education of the children.
- (b) upgrading the living environment by improving living standards, hygiene, sanitation and housing.
- (c) early detection and full treatment of middle ear disease using specialists as necessary.

2. The following information is from the files of the Aboriginal Health Unit and the memory of the Senior Medical Officer of the unit. The surveys are listed in chronological order.

It is not possible to provide an estimation of the cost of these surveys.

1. General Health

J. B. Cleland (Prof.) The natives of the north-west of South Australia. Reported in Medical Journal of Australia, June 1934.

2. Sexually transmitted disease and trachoma

K. J. Wilson, M. C. Moore et. al. (Drs), V.D. and trachoma survey (Musgrave Park—Mount Davies). 1 special S.A. Public Health Report 1963.

3. Measles

K. J. Wilson (Dr) et. al. Survey following measles epidemic at Ernabella. Special S.A. Public Health Report 1966.

4. Chest infection

G. M. Maxwell (Prof.) et. al.

Survey and treatment of chest infections in Aboriginal children. Commenced 1968 . . . continuing.

5. Tinea

G. Donald (Prof.). Survey of tinea infection in Aborigines. M.D. Thesis Univ. Adelaide 1970.

6. Culture and Health

A. Hamilton (Mrs). Socio-cultural factors in health among the Pitjantjatjara. Special S.A. Public Health report 1970.

7. Middle ear infection

N. Reilly (Dr). Survey into possible allergic origin of middle ear infection in Aborigines (Yalata and Koonibba). Special S.A. Public Health Report 1971.

8. Huntington's Disease

M. A. Angas (Mrs). Survey into Huntington's disease in South Australian Aborigines—1972 and subsequently (= basis for special assistance program).

9. Aboriginal Child Health

A student group (Prof. Maxwell). S.A. Clinics, Adelaide Children's Hospital 1973.

10. Growth of Aboriginal Children

Survey of height/weight records for remote community children in South Australia 1973 and subsequently Aboriginal Health Unit Staff.

11. Dental Health

Survey of dental health on remote reserves in South Australia. 1973 and subsequently (allied with treatment program) arranged by S.A. Department of Public Health and S.A. Health Commission (especially Dental Health and Aboriginal Health Sections).

12. General hygiene and sanitation

Survey and supervision of sanitation, hygiene etc. on remote reserves in South Australia (including food storage, sale, handling). 1973 and subsequently health surveyor (and other) staff of the Aboriginal health unit.

13. Health problems of adults

Health services for outback South Australia 1973 (includes paper by Dr P. H. Wise on health problems of the adult Aboriginal). S.A. Department of Public Health Report.

14. Physical standards

A. A. Abbie (Prof.) Physical standards of nomadic Aboriginal children (including South Australia). Medical Journal of Australia 1974.

15. Anaemia investigations

Haemoglobin surveys of women and children 1974 and subsequently Aboriginal health unit staff.

16. Middle ear infection

Survey of middle ear infection in remote reserve Aborigines in north-west of South Australia (combined with treatment and assessment program) 1974 and subsequently Dr R. L. Guerin and Aboriginal health unit staff.

17. Growth pattern of Aborigines

A. A. Abbie (Prof.) studies in physical anthropology Vol. II (including studies on South Australian Aborigines) Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, Canberra, 1975.

18. Family planning

Aileen F. Connon (Dr—University of Adelaide) family planning among Aborigines. Medical journal of Australia 1975.

19. Blood pressure and heart conditions

R. J. Craig (Dr) et al. Blood pressures and electrocardiographic findings in the South Australian Aboriginal. 1975 special report.

20. Blood chemistry

G. W. Dart (Dr) et al. Haematological investigation of the South Australian Aboriginal (including haemoglobin, vitamin levels and blood glucose). 1975 special report.

21. Vision

F. M. Edwards (Dr) et al. Visual acuity and retinal changes in South Australian Aboriginal. 1975 special report.

22. Blood fat levels

D. W. Thomas (Dr) et al. Lipid abnormalities in the South Australian Aboriginal. 1975 special report.

23. General health

Survey of health of Aborigines (and others) living in remote camps along the railway line—Port Augusta to Cook. S.A. Department of Public Health report (A. D. Packer) 1976.

- 24. Venereal Disease
V.D. work in Aboriginal settlements in South Australia. S.A. Department of Public Health Report 1977. (Alan Finger).
- 25. Health Education
Who should learn what? Health Education amongst traditionally orientated Australian Aborigines. S. Stacy (Miss)
Food and Nutrition (Commonwealth Department of Health) 1977.
- 26. E.N.T. Problems
Survey of Aboriginal E.N.T. Problems in the Ceduna—Yalata area.
Private Report by G. S. Vercoe (Dr) et. al. 1977.
- 27. Alcohol Abuse
Kuitpo—A personal report by an Aboriginal on withdrawal from alcohol abuse.
S.A. Department of Public Health Report (P. Young) 1977.
- 28. Child Growth Rates
Comparison of weights of South Australian remote reserve Aborigines with normal Aboriginal values.
S.A. Health Commission report (Clinton, Vimpani and Packer—Drs) 1978.
- 29. Child Health
Survey of Health of all children on remote north-west Aboriginal reserves (associated with follow-up treatment) S.A. Health Commission Report (Clinton, Vimpani and Packer) 1978.

CAR REGISTRATIONS

- 1083. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Premier:
 - 1. Did October 1980 new car registrations in South Australia drop 6.3 per cent?
 - 2. Were new car sales for 1980 nine per day below 1979 levels?
 - 3. Have recent new car sales in South Australia slumped to one of the lowest levels on record and, if not, why not?

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

 - 1. Registration of new cars in October 1980, as compared with September 1980, showed a drop of 0.3 per cent. However, registration of all vehicles in October 1980, as compared with September 1980, showed an increase of 0.18 per cent.
 - 2. and 3. The South Australian Government does not have statistics relating to the number of new cars sold, only those registered. Many cars are sold that are not registered, e.g., Commonwealth Government vehicles and vehicles not driven on public roads.

POPULATION MIGRATION

- 1093. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Premier: What will be the long-term cost to South Australia of the present migration of population and capital from this State to the rest of the country resulting from Government policies and the lack of work creative schemes?
- The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Interstate migration is something which we recognise as a by-product of variations of employment opportunities from State to State over time. The ebb and flow of interstate migration is such that the long-term costs to the State can be minimal. As employment prospects continue to improve in South Australia, ex-South Australians will move back and people of other States such as New South Wales and

Victoria will migrate to live here. The objective of my Government is to stem this outflow by increasing employment opportunities within the private sector of South Australia.

Our policies are already working. In an answer to yet another of the honourable member's questions, I have demonstrated the employment gains made in this State and the good prospects for further gains. The allegation of a net capital outflow and the issue of any long-term costs are of little consequence in the face of renewed investment interest in South Australia.

SPEAKER

- 1095. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Premier:
 - 1. Does the Government intend to introduce legislation to appoint an independent person, such as a judge, to the position of Speaker in the House of Assembly and, if so, when?
 - 2. Has the member for Mitcham been approached by the Government to consider such a position and, if so, what did he indicate?

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

 - 1. No.
 - 2. See answer above.

OIL SPILLS

- 1098. Mr PETERSON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:
 - 1. What were the dates of and the size of all oil spills at Port Stanvac in 1980 and to date this year?
 - 2. What types and quantities of dispersants were used on each occasion?
 - 3. What is the chemical name for 'Dispersant AB' supplied for use at Port Stanvac?
 - 4. Has any Government department undertaken a study into long-term effects of dispersants on sea life and, if not, why not?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

 - 1.
 - (1) 19.8.80..... Less than 318 litres
 - (2) 12 & 13.9.80..... Quantity unknown
 - (3) 18.11.80..... 7 950 litres
 - (4) 14.11.80..... Less than 159 litres
 - (5) 17.12.80..... Quantity unknown
 - (6) 16.12.80..... Less than 159 litres
 - (7) 24.1.81..... Less than 159 litres

- 2.
 - (1) BP-AB..... 400 litres
 - (2) BP-AB..... 3 780 litres
 - (3) BP-AB..... 29 520 litres
 - (4) BP-AB..... 400 litres
 - (5) BP-AB..... 100 litres
 - (6) BP-AB..... 600 litres
 - (7) BP-AB..... 200 litres
- 3. The dispersant BP-AB does not have a chemical name as such but its chemical composition is:

	Per cent
Kerosene (carrier)	60
Hexylene Glycol	5
Oceic acid ethoxylate	17½
Tall oil ethoxylate	17½
- 4. Yes.

ADVISORY TEACHERS

1099. **Mr PETERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. For each year since 1975 and to date in 1981:
 - (a) how many advisory teachers have been appointed;
 - (b) what were the classifications of those appointments; and
 - (c) what was the term of tenure for each advisory teacher appointment?
2. What is the Government policy on the appointment of advisory teachers and if there has been an alteration to the policy on such appointments, why was it considered necessary?
3. Has there been an alteration to the policy on the term of tenure for advisory teachers and if so:
 - (a) what is the current policy; and
 - (b) why was the alteration considered necessary?

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

1. (a) The numbers of teachers seconded from the classroom to advisory/consultation positions from 1975-1981 were as follows:

- 1975, 296 (whole persons)
- 1976, 352 (whole persons)
- 1977, 452 (whole persons)
- 1978, 425.2 (full-time equivalents)
- 1979, 429.1 (full-time equivalents)
- 1980, 434.5 (full-time equivalents)
- 1981, 382.8 to date (full-time equivalents)

(b) Until 1979, teachers seconded into advisory/consultation positions were classified by the status of their substantive position and paid the salary due to this status together with a consultants allowance. In 1979 seconded teacher positions were reclassified into levels according to the responsibilities of each position, i.e. level 1, level 2 and level 3. Teachers seconded into level 1 positions work in schools with classroom teachers in a particular region, those in level 2 positions have regional responsibilities and those in level 3 positions have state-wide responsibilities.

(c) Until 1979, seconded teacher positions had an initial period of tenure of two years followed by the possible negotiation of another two years without the positions being advertised.

2. Positions have always been created in response to educational needs but since 1979 regions and central directorate have been given fixed quotas for advisory teacher positions. For 1981, the quotas for metropolitan regions and central directorates were reduced. This rationalisation was undertaken through the careful consideration of current departmental priorities for school support services.

3. (a) For 1981 the tenure for the majority of seconded teacher positions within the metropolitan area was fixed at one year instead of two years. This policy provided greater flexibility for the possible reorganisation of the school support service at the end of 1981, following a departmental review of the service which will be completed in May 1981.

(b) Tenure for country advisory positions remains at two years.

URANIUM PLANT

1101. **Mr O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: Will the Minister assure this House that the Government will not allow the establishment of a uranium treatment plant within the metropolitan area of Adelaide?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is assumed the uranium treatment plant referred to by the honourable member is in fact a uranium enrichment plant. The Government has received advice from the Uranium Enrichment Committee that requirements for such a facility can be met in the Iron Triangle area.

TRANSPORT

1109. **Mr O'Neill** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: When does the Minister intend to begin handing over sections of public transport to private enterprise, what areas of public transport will be handed over and does the Government intend to ensure that the practice of converting trucks and other non-passenger type vehicles to passenger-carrying vehicles will be stopped?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Government does not intend to 'hand over' sections of public transport to private enterprise. However, where the private sector can provide economic public transport services, it will be encouraged to do so. The conversion of truck type vehicles and other non-passenger type vehicles to passenger carrying vehicles is considered to be acceptable providing the alterations are undertaken in accordance with correct engineering procedures. All South Australian registered passenger buses are subject to regular inspection by the Central Inspection Authority to ensure that they comply with the requirements of the regulations.

TAFE

1110. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Does the Minister accept the Williams Committee's criticism of the lack of reliable statistics in the TAFE sector and, if so, what is being done to overcome the problem?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The February 1979 report of the Williams Committee 'Education Training and Employment' did make severe criticism of TAFE statistics. Although these criticisms are well founded at a national level, it is worth pointing out that South Australia is the acknowledged leader among the States in the development of systems to provide reliable statistics. Many of the Williams Committee's criticisms are no longer applicable to TAFE in South Australia and further developments are occurring. Examples of these developments include:

1. The development of a computerised student enrolment system about which the TAFE Council has reported '... this new approach to the collection of student enrolment data in South Australia is welcomed by the council as a measure designed to enhance the reliability and planning significance of TAFE statistics'.

2. The development of an overall strategy for both management and educational applications of computer systems.

3. The development of program performance budgeting, a consequence of which will be improved data collection procedures leading to more informative programme based statistics.

FURTHER EDUCATION

1112. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What pre-service training exists for appointees to senior positions in Department of Further Education colleges and what changes are planned?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Some group activities are arranged, such as induction seminars for new senior lecturers, when numbers warrant. Similarly the department organises, or assists the relevant group of senior officers to organise, conferences of Principals, heads of school, or other functional groups. The department will continue to take and create opportunities for senior staff to broaden their experience, and will seek to ensure that people appointed to senior positions are properly prepared, inducted and provided with opportunities for continuing development.

COLLEGE MANAGERS

1116. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Does the Government intend to introduce into the Department of Further Education the United States' 11-month contract system for senior college managers?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: In his report on an overseas study tour in 1979, the Director-General of Further Education commented favourably on the common practice in U.S. Community Colleges of senior college managers working an 11-month year—in short, enjoying leave conditions similar to those for Public Service administrative positions rather than the conditions applying to classroom teachers. Given the increasing complexity of the management role in our major colleges of further education and the desirability of avoiding extended close-down periods, it is appropriate that consideration should be given to the availability of senior college managers throughout the year. However, this issue is not seen as one for which an immediate short-term solution is possible and there are at present no proposals formulated to alter the conditions of service of college managers.

SEAT BELTS

1125. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Does the Minister still hold the view that the wearing of seat belts in motor vehicles 'Is a subtle way to destroy cuddling by lovers' as stated in *Hansard* on page 2781 on 20 February 1979 and, if so why and what representations has he made to the Minister of Transport to alter the law pertaining to the wearing of seat belts?

2. Does the Minister still hold the view that 'If there is a selt beat fitted in the driver's position and another fitted on the extreme left, with no belt fitting the centre a girl is forced to sit on the left hand side divorced from her lover. It is cruel that the Minister should destroy such a practice' and if so why?

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

1. No.
2. No.

NOISE LEVELS

1130. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. How many complaints were received in 1980 from residents pertaining to:

- (a) industrial noise levels exceeding the prescribed number of decibels; and
- (b) household noise levels exceeding the prescribed number of decibels;

2. How many prosecutions were taken against persons for exceeding the decibel noise levels in the above?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. During 1980.

(a) 273 complaints.

(b) 413 complaints were received by the Noise Control Section of the Department for the Environment.

In the majority of these cases, the noise when first measured exceeded the appropriate prescribed noise level.

2. Most complaints were satisfactorily addressed without the need to prosecute. Prosecution is only undertaken when co-operation is not forthcoming from the noise source owner.

Consequently only one prosecution was undertaken by the Noise Control Section during 1980.

UNEMPLOYMENT

1131. **Mr Hamilton** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many unemployed persons attempted suicide during the period from 1 January 1977 to 31 July 1980 and what were the age brackets involved during each year?

2. How many unemployed persons were convicted for criminal offences during the above period and what were the ages and types of convictions, category by category, in each instance?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. The Police Department does not record information on attempted suicides.

2. The amount of time and expense involved in answering the honourable member's questions is not warranted.

AMOEBIC MENINGITIS

1133. **Mr Hamilton** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What is the mortality rate incidence in South Australia of—

(a) viral amoebic meningitis; and

(b) bacterial amoebic meningitis?

2. What treatment is available for viral and bacterial meningitis and what is the success rate of each treatment for both types?

3. Does amoebic meningitis thrive in warm to hot water and, if so, under what conditions and what preventative measures are taken in these circumstances?

4. Are extremely high temperatures recorded in the Morgan-Whyalla pipe line which services Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Whyalla and what records are kept of the temperatures of this water and what is the regularity of health tests of this water during periods of high temperatures?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The disease amoebic meningitis is caused by the organism *Naegleria fowleri* which is neither a bacterium nor a virus but a protozoan.

There has been one death from amoebic meningitis since 1972, in January 1981. This represents an incidence rate of approximately 0.1 cases per million persons per annum.

2. Amoebic meningitis is a disease with a very high case fatality rate; most people who contract it die. Many drugs have been tested for their efficacy, singly and in combination and research is continuing.

Meningitis caused by bacteria is treated with antibiotic drugs to which the organism concerned is sensitive. The success rate with such treatment is high. Viral meningitis is a common illness which may be caused by a wide range of viruses. There is no specific treatment.

3. Disease-causing amoebae apparently thrive in warm waters. Chlorination of water supplies and swimming pools and public education to warn the population of the risks of infection are the recommended preventive measures.

4. Water temperatures in the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline are monitored weekly all year round. The highest temperatures recorded for water entering the pipe at Morgan between 1974-1979 were 27°C to 28°C. At Napperby, about three-quarters of the way along the pipe, the highest summer temperatures in the same year ranged from 31°C to 34°C.

5. This summer a temperature of 42°C was recorded at Lincoln Gap and 40°C was recorded once where the pipe terminates at Whyalla.

YORKE PENINSULA ROADS

1134. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Do the roads in the Central Yorke Peninsula district between Ardrossan-Arthurton, Urania-Ardrossan-Pine Point, South Kilkerran-Cunningham, Maitland-Sandilands-Pine Point, need upgrading and, if so, what is the estimated cost of upgrading each road and when will this upgrading commence?

2. Do fifteen roads in the Kimba area need upgrading and, if so, what are the names of each road, the cost and programme of upgrading for each road?

3. In the Loxton district, do the Loxton-Mindarie, Taplan-Nadda, Loxton-Noora and the Wunkor-Kingston Roads need upgrading and if so, what is the length, cost and the respective programme for each road?

4. Do the following arterial roads need upgrading and, if so, what is the cost of upgrading and time table in each instance—

- (a) Merriton-Narridy;
- (b) Wandereah-Crystal Brook; and
- (c) Crystal Brook-Huddlestone?

5. Have council road building costs been rising at 15 per cent regularly per year?

6. Are all South-East councils concerned at the decreasing allocation of Federal Government grants for local government roads?

7. Is there to be a reduction in the Federal Government's future road funding of—

- (a) minus 11.5 per cent for 1980-1981;
- (b) minus 9 per cent for 1981-1982;
- (c) minus 7 per cent for 1982-1983;
- (d) minus 6 per cent for 1983-1984; and
- (e) minus 6 per cent for 1984-1985?

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

1., 3. and 4. All roads listed are classified for the purpose of Commonwealth funding as 'rural local roads' and are maintained by the appropriate local government authority. Consequently, it is not possible to provide the information sought by the honourable member.

2. It is not possible to provide the information sought by the honourable member.

KING WILLIAM STREET

1135. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What action does the Government intend to take, and when, to increase the traffic flow in King William Street during peak hour traffic?

2. What action does the Government intend to take, and when, to overcome the congested situation that occurs outside the Government Tourist Bureau involving S.T.A. buses and tourist buses?

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

1. Responsibility for traffic control measures in the city rests with the Corporation of the City of Adelaide.

2. No action. Only on odd occasions tourist bus loading and unloading outside the Government Tourist Bureau causes congestion in this area. Authority buses are not unduly inconvenienced except on days when a tourist bus arrives to unload between 5.00 p.m. and 5.15 p.m. and is unable to use the loading zone because of motor vehicles parked in the zone.

SOUTH ROAD

1136. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Government intend to widen South Road from Henley Beach South to Tonsley and if so:

- (a) what portions of that road will be widened and what are the names of all suburbs so affected;
- (b) how many shop fronts will be:
 - (i) affected by this widening; and
 - (ii) purchased, including part thereof;
- (c) what will be and has been the cost of shop acquisitions; and
- (d) what is the width of the proposed roadway to be constructed?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Highways Department is presently investigating proposals to determine the appropriate configuration for the widening of South Road between the River Torrens and Daws Road. The investigation will be completed in approximately 18 months. Properties on each side of South Road have been subject to a 2.14 m (7 ft) widening requirement for approximately 35 years. The land required for road purposes has been acquired progressively. Approximately 91 per cent of the property requirements between Anzac Highway and Daws Road have been obtained; 36 per cent of the property requirements have been obtained between the River Torrens and Anzac Highway. The effect on the remaining properties will depend on the road configuration to be adopted. Up to August 1980 approximately \$2.3m has been expended in acquiring land for road purposes from properties abutting South Road. Considerable time and expense would be incurred in providing details on the cost of shop acquisitions and this cannot be justified.

POLICE FORCE

1137. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Can Aborigines and Chinese persons seek admission (providing they have the necessary qualifications) to the South Australian Police Force and, if not, why not?

2. What restrictions, if any, are placed on other than British subjects who wish to enter the Police Force in South Australia?

3. What was the ethnic mix of personnel within the Police Force during 1980?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. None.

3. Aborigine, Australian, Austrian, British, Dutch, Italian, German, Malaysian, Malaysian-Chinese.

URANIUM PLANT

1143. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What evidence has the Government available which can justify its statements that the uranium enrichment plant at Port Pirie has had no effect upon residents in the vicinity of that plant and will the Minister provide a copy of that evidence to the Parliament and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

2. What surveys have been conducted by this and past Governments on the effects of the plant on the health of residents in Port Pirie, when were they carried out and what were the results?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. There was no uranium enrichment plant at Port Pirie.

2. See above.

PORT ADELAIDE GAOL

1145. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Has the Minister inspected the conditions at the Port Adelaide Gaol and, if so, when?

2. Does the Government intend either to build a new gaol or renovate it and, if so, when and at what cost?

3. When was the last report from a medical officer into the conditions of the gaol received and what recommendations were made about upgrading it?

4. Has the Minister seen the conditions under which police officers are required to carry out their duties and what actions does this Government intend to take to improve them, when and at what cost?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. Renovation and upgrading of the cell accommodation at Port Adelaide was completed in July 1979 at a cost of \$53 000.

3. The facility is not inspected by medical officers.

4. See 1. above.

MURRAY RIVER

1147. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What was the total amount of effluent discharged from sewerage treatment works into the River Murray during 1980 and what were the locations and respective amounts discharged?

2. What alternative methods are being or have been investigated to eliminate discharging sewerage into the river?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

	Megalitres
1 Mannum Sewerage treatment works	80
Murray Bridge sewerage treatment	480

560

2. The quality of treated effluent which is discharged is such that it has a minimal effect on the quality of the water in the river. In view of this, no alternative disposal methods have been or are being investigated.

The Mannum and Murray Bridge sewerage treatment works have been operating satisfactorily since 1968 and 1970 respectively and all alternative disposal systems were evaluated prior to each plant's commissioning.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE

1150. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What were the individual amounts paid to each local government authority for 1980-1981 in—

(a) the metropolitan area; and

(b) country areas?

2. What amount will be distributed to each council in 1980-1981 as a grant for district roads?

3. What protests have been received from councils regarding insufficient funds, which were those councils and what was the percentage decrease in each instance?

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

1. and 2. (a)

Council	Total road grant allocation for 1980-1981 as at	Proportion allocated for local roads as at
	17.2.81	17.2.81

Central Eastern

Corporations:		
Adelaide	130 000	90 000
Burnside	50 000	50 000
Campbelltown	83 000	83 000
Kensington and Norwood	54 000	54 000
Payneham	21 000	21 000
Prospect	91 000	91 000
St. Peters	50 000	50 000
Unley	70 000	70 000
District Councils:		
East Torrens	35 000	35 000
Mount Barker	30 000	30 000
Onkaparinga	35 000	35 000
Stirling	38 000	38 000
Total	687 000	647 000

Central Northern

Corporations:		
Elizabeth	39 000	39 000
Enfield	95 000	95 000
Gawler	57 000	57 000
Salisbury	223 000	223 000
Tea Tree Gully	154 000	154 000
District Councils:		
Angaston	24 000	24 000
Barossa	41 000	41 000
Gumeracha	20 000	20 000
Kapunda	30 000	30 000
Light	30 000	30 000
Mallala	30 000	30 000
Mount Pleasant	40 000	40 000
Munno Para	147 000	147 000
Tanunda	18 000	18 000
Total	948 000	948 000

Central Southern

Corporations:		
Brighton	37 000	37 000
Glenelg	35 000	35 000
Marion	144 000	144 000
Mitcham	116 000	116 000
Noarlunga	159 000	159 000

Council	Total road grant allocation for 1980-1981 as at 17.2.81		Proportion allocated for local roads as at 17.2.81	Council	Total road grant allocation for 1980-1981 as at 17.2.81		Proportion allocated for local roads as at 17.2.81
	17.2.81	17.2.81			17.2.81	17.2.81	
District Councils:				Northern			
Meadows	183 000	183 000		Corporations:			
Port Elliot and Goolwa	30 000	30 000		Port Augusta	49 000	49 000	
Strathalbyn	40 000	40 000		Port Pirie	41 500	41 500	
Victor Harbor	30 000	30 000		Whyalla	60 000	60 000	
Willunga	87 000	87 000		District Councils:			
Total	861 000	861 000		Carrieton	47 000	7 000	
Central Western				Crystal Brook	26 500	26 500	
Corporations:				Georgetown	26 000	26 000	
Henley and Grange	33 000	33 000		Gladstone	28 000	28 000	
Hindmarsh	25 000	25 000		Hallett	100 000	Nil	
Port Adelaide	110 000	110 000		Hawker	45 000	10 000	
Thebarton	29 000	29 000		Jamestown	100 000	Nil	
West Torrens	70 000	70 000		Kanyaka-Quorn	25 000	25 000	
Woodville	108 000	108 000		Laura	70 000	70 000	
District Councils:				Mount Remarkable	107 250	47 250	
Dudley	32 000	22 000		Orroroo	53 000	13 000	
Kingscote	58 000	58 000		Peterborough	110 000	Nil	
Total	465 000	455 000		Pirie	48 000	48 000	
Eyre				TOTAL	936 250	451 250	
District Council:				South Eastern			
Cleve	85 000	85 000		Corporations:			
Elliston	160 000	30 000		Mount Gambier	53 500	38 500	
Franklin Harbor	85 000	15 000		Naracoorte	27 500	27 500	
Kimba	74 000	39 000		District Councils:			
Le Hunte	80 000	65 000		Beachport	40 000	15 000	
Lincoln	104 000	104 000		Lacepede	47 000	47 000	
Murat Bay	75 000	75 000		Lucindale	105 000	45 000	
Streaky Bay	84 000	84 000		Millicent	50 000	50 000	
Tumby Bay	83 000	83 000		Mount Gambier	42 000	42 000	
Total	830 000	580 000		Naracoorte	57 000	57 000	
Murray Lands				Penola	65 000	65 000	
Corporations:				Port MacDonnell	56 000	56 000	
Renmark	40 000	40 000		Robe	63 000	63 000	
District Councils:				Tatiara	57 000	57 000	
Barmera	20 000	20 000		TOTAL	663 000	563 000	
Berri	40 000	40 000		Yorke and Lower North			
Browns Well	30 000	30 000		Corporations:			
Coonalpyn Downs	55 000	20 000		Moonta	40 000	40 000	
Karoonda—East Murray	60 000	—		Walleroo	25 500	25 500	
Lameroo	55 500	55 500		District Councils:			
Loxton	67 500	67 500		Balaklava	40 000	Nil	
Mannum	70 000	70 000		Blyth	60 000	Nil	
Meningie	70 000	70 000		Burra Burra	63 000	45 000	
Morgan	90 000	—		Bute	20 000	20 000	
Murray Bridge	40 000	40 000		Central Yorke Peninsula	40 000	40 000	
Paringa	36 500	36 500		Clare	40 000	40 000	
Peake	35 000	35 000		Clinton	40 000	40 000	
Pinnaroo	38 000	38 000		Eudunda	60 000	Nil	
Ridley	110 000	—		Kadina	77 000	77 000	
Truro	40 000	40 000		Minlaton	28 000	28 000	
Waikerie	50 000	35 000		Owen	20 000	20 000	
Total	947 500	637 500		Port Broughton	30 000	30 000	
				Port Wakefield	16 500	16 500	
				Redhill	80 000	Nil	
				Riverton	25 000	25 000	
				Robertstown	45 000	8 000	

Council	Total road grant allocation for 1980-1981 as at 17.2.81	Proportion allocated for local roads as at 17.2.81
Saddleworth and Auburn	102 250	22 250
Snowtown	80 000	Nil
Spalding	30 000	30 000
Warooka	40 000	40 000
Yorketown	33 000	33 000
Total	1 035 250	580 250
State Totals	7 373 000	5 723 000

The administrative effort required to provide the nature of the complaints could not be justified.

2. (a) one
(b) none
3. (a) one—total fine \$300 plus costs
(b) not applicable.

4. 1977 1 complaint, 1978 2 complaints, 1979 1 complaint, 1980 1 complaint and a referred petition signed by 61 residents, 1981 1 complaint.

A number of remedial measures has been taken by Allied Engineering in consultation with the Department for Industrial Affairs and Employment.

Discussions to determine alternative solutions are continuing.

The matter is currently the subject of an investigation by the Ombudsman.

3. To obtain the information sought would require considerable investigation and expense.

Road Grant funds have been distributed on a needs basis and continuity of funding to local government authorities could not be guaranteed. At present an inter-departmental committee is investigating a procedure for the distribution of road grant funds.

NOISE

1162. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. How many complaints were received each month during 1980 under the Noise Control Act from householders and what were the nature of the complaints?

2. How many prosecutions were initiated against:
(a) neighbours; and
(b) industries?

3. How many prosecutions were successful against:
(a) neighbours; and
(b) industries,
and what was the total amount of fines imposed?

4. How many complaints have been received from constituents in the Albert Park electorate, complaining about industrial noise at the premises of Allied Engineering, Royal Park, in each year since the Noise Control Act was proclaimed and what action does the Government intend to take to assist residents and the company to eliminate this problem?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON The replies are as follows:

1. Monthly complaints were as follows:

January	93
February	109
March	61
April	80
May	49
June	34
July	49
August	43
September	33
October	79
November	87
December	65
Total	782

These figures include a total of 96 requests for advice by households on noise control measures.

WATER SUPPLY

1174. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What is the capacity of each reservoir in South Australia?

2. What was the water consumption from each reservoir for 1979 and 1980 during the summer months?

3. What was the cost and the amount of water pumped from the River Murray during the 1979 and 1980 summer periods?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. Metropolitan Reservoirs

Reservoir	Total Capacity at Full supply level (Megalitres)
Onkaparinga River	
Mount Bold	47 300
Happy Valley	12 700
Myponga River	
Myponga	26 800
Torrens River	
Millbrook	16 500
Kangaroo Creek	24 400
Hope Valley	3 470
Little Para River	
Little Para	20 800
South Para River	
Warren	5 080
South Para	51 300
Barossa	4 510

Country Reservoirs

Beetaloo Reservoir	3 700
Bundaleer Reservoir	6 370
Baroota Reservoir	6 120
Nectar Brook Reservoir	700
Tod River Reservoir	11 300
Strathalbyn Reservoir	141
Middle River Reservoir	470
Hindmarsh Valley Reservoir	480

2. With the interlocked water distribution system which operates throughout the majority of this State, it is impossible to give consumption figures for each reservoir. The only comparable figure to that requested is the offtake from the reservoir or river systems as described in the previous schedule. This offtake figure represents both

consumption and the transfer of water between reservoirs and includes water pumped from the Murray via these reservoirs.

OFFTAKES
(Megalitres)

River system or reservoir	December	January	February
1979-1980			
Onkaparinga River	7 937	8 234	8 958
Myponga Reservoir	2 776	2 756	2 661
Torrens River	8 666	8 799	9 810
Little Para Reservoir	2 442	2 525	2 269
South Para River	1 952	1 398	1 852
Beetaloo Reservoir	0	0	0
Bundaleer Reservoir	826	853	839
Baroota Reservoir	926	889	875
Nectar Brook Reservoir	53	53	28
Tod River Reservoir	589	585	531
Strathalbyn Reservoir	34	30	39
Middle River Reservoir	43	64	52
Hindmarsh Valley Reservoir	90	116	120
1980-1981			
Onkaparinga River	9 960	11 717	9 468
Myponga Reservoir	784	1 141	1 875
Torrens River	4 948	5 644	8 485
Little Para Reservoir	1 855	2 071	2 134
South Para River	2 468	2 362	2 039
Beetaloo Reservoir	225	193	184
Bundaleer Reservoir	844	900	781
Baroota Reservoir	932	326	524
Nectar Brook Reservoir	4	5	3
Tod River Reservoir	523	589	460
Middle River Reservoir	41	69	44
Strathalbyn Reservoir	45	41	23
Hindmarsh Valley Reservoir	157	160	191

3.

Year	Month					
	December		January		February	
	Qty. (ML)	Cost (\$)	Qty. (ML)	Cost (\$)	Qty. (ML)	Cost (\$)
1979-1980	7 064	223 500	8 079	273 300	8 606	268 900
1980-1981	13 066	472 500	15 670	507 000	13 380	395 310

WATER MAINS

1175. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. How many instances of bursting of water mains have occurred during 1980 in—

- (a) the metropolitan area; and
(b) the non-metropolitan area,
and what were the major causes?

2. How much money has been allocated during the 1980-1981 and 1981-1982 financial years to replace inadequate water mains in—

- (a) the metropolitan area; and
(b) country areas,

and what is the programme for 1980-1981 and 1981-1982?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) 1215. As a result of the reorganisation of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Metropolitan Operations Branch now administers the area from Victor Harbor to just south of Clare.

(b) 799.

The main causes of failure were external or internal corrosion, earth movement and traffic damage.

2. There is no specific allocation made for the replacement of water mains. Funds to replace mains which warrant such action are drawn from the allocation for miscellaneous water supply minor works in the Engineering and Water Supply Department's capital works programme.

DRUGS

1178. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Did the growing of marijuana increase in South Australia during 1980 and, if so, what was the increase over 1979 in kilograms?

2. Why has the activity been allowed to grow to such proportions and what action is the Government taking to curtail it?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. Figures show that the quantity of marijuana plants discovered by police during 1980 increased significantly over comparable figures for 1979. There are no available figures to show the weight in kilograms.

2. There is no conclusive evidence to confirm that the growing of marijuana has increased.

Police have in recent times given closer attention to surveillance of this type of illegal activity in an endeavour to combat the problem and it is proposed that police action in this direction will continue.

HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

1191. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many handicapped children are integrated into junior primary, primary and secondary schools, respectively, in:

- (a) the electorate of Salisbury; and
(b) the Northern Region of the Education Department?

2. How is such integration done and what impact does it have on:

- (a) existing teacher ratios;
(b) existing levels of funding;
(c) special education funding to schools; and
(d) other support (guidance officers, special education teachers, and teacher aides)?

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

1. The Education Department does not seek to identify those students who are 'handicapped' on the basis of particular medical or psychological categories. The policy followed is that children with a variety of physical, mental and sensory deficits are quite able to cope with the normal school situation with small adaptations of programmes and circumstances without the input of resources above those available to all schools. Children are referred for additional help when the local circumstances and resources appear inadequate, or when advice is needed.

For these reasons, we do not have records of all 'handicapped' children and this question is unable to be answered numerically.

Rather than integrate, the policy has been not to remove children from their regular situations in the first place.

2. Occasionally a child who has been in a special school is reintegrated into a regular school. Such an occurrence is

generally accompanied by advice and support, usually from a guidance officer, for a limited period, or on request.

There have been progressive improvements in (a), (b), (c) and (d) over a number of years.

EDUCATION FINANCE

1192. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Will the Minister now answer part (c) of Question No. 782 and, if so, what is the answer and, if not, why not?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Recent ABS statistics which have been received enable me to reply to part (c) of Question No. 782.

The April-June 1980 figure of \$5.004 m for approvals for education projects for South Australia has been revised to \$7.889 m.

These statistics also supersede the earlier reply to parts (a) and (b) of Question No. 782. A full and updated response is as follows:

782 (a) For the April-June 1979 period, \$6.453 m of the \$12.754 m was allocated to Government schools, representing 50.6 per cent.

(b) For the April-June 1980 period, \$6.638 m of the \$7.889 m was allocated to Government schools, representing 84.1 per cent.

The reply to 782 (c) is therefore that there has not been a reduction from 1979 to 1980 in approvals for education projects involving Government schools.

The Australian Bureau of Statistics points out, however, that 'the two proportions above are not directly comparable because of a change from a "loan schedule" to a "contracts-let" basis, in the treatment by ABS of approvals data received from the Public Buildings Department.' This change has been effected from December 1979 to coincide with the introduction of the ABS revised statistical system from Buildings Statistics its main impact being on the time period in which approvals are recorded.

LOTTERIES

1194. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: For each year since 1970, what has been the volume of lotteries business transacted at each of the following agencies—800, 2307, 672, 1092, 280 and 514?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The reply is as follows:

Agency No.	\$
800	
1970	30 030.00
1971	33 106.50
1972	32 542.00
1973	38 925.50
1974	55 641.75
1975	103 391.50
1976	103 545.00
1977	115 700.75
1978	170 959.75
1979	331 829.50
1980	234 268.75
2307	
1979	33 506.25
1980	96 973.00
672	
1970	28 269.00
1971	32 062.00
1972	29 635.00
1973	33 814.50

Agency No.	\$
672	
1974	61 587.25
1975	81 067.50
1976	81 956.75
1977	107 907.00
1978	121 990.00
1979	193 942.00
1980	160 605.75
1092	
1970	56 315.50
1971	71 110.00
1972	67 848.00
1973	79 655.00
1974	140 812.00
1975	205 122.75
1976	209 909.25
1977	276 014.75
1978	396 019.50
1979	523 604.25
1980	438 642.00
280	
1970	31 518.00
1971	37 961.00
1972	27 363.00
1973	37 106.00
1974	55 579.50
1975	90 587.75
1976	74 531.50
1977	102 487.50
1978	116 988.75
1979	178 919.75
1980	176 240.75
514	
1980	177 384.25

MESSAGE PARLOURS

1201. Mr O'NEILL (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many message parlours have been forced to close by the Minister's decision to station police cars outside such establishments?

2. Was the tactic successful and if so, does the Minister intend to station police cars and breathalyser units at the exits from hotel car parks to reduce the number of drink driving offences prior to offences being committed?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. Four.

2. It is not possible to say if this method of policing was the primary reason for the closure of the four establishments concerned. There are no plans to introduce similar tactics in respect of hotel car parks.

RETIRED PUBLIC SERVANTS

1202. Mr O'NEILL (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How many retired officers of departments under the Minister's control are contracting to any departments under the Minister's control in a private enterprise capacity?

2. Is the nature of the service supplied similar to the work which was done by such former officer/officers prior to retirement from the Public Service?

3. What are the names of any such officers and what are the services being supplied?

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

1. One (1).

2 and 3. The person concerned is Mr Jack Merchant, who, prior to his retirement, was employed as the Equal

Opportunities Officer in the Department of the Public Service Board.

Mr Merchant has been engaged on the development and implementation of equal opportunity programmes in the South Australian Public Service, principally as they relate to aboriginal employment.

In view of the specialised nature of the work, and because the volume is variable and does not warrant the employment of an additional permanent employee, Mr Merchant has been engaged on a part-time arrangement for a period of one year.

1203: Mr O'NEILL (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier:

1. How many retired officers of departments under the Minister's control are contracting to any departments under the Minister's control in a private enterprise capacity?

2. Is the nature of the service supplied similar to the work which was done by such former officer/officers prior to retirement from the Public Service?

3. What are the names of any such officers and what are the services being supplied?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The replies are as follows:

1. Three.

2. Yes.

3. (a) Dr N. H. Ludbrook—preparation of the book *Fossils of South Australia* and for consultation as a molluscan and foraminiferal specialist.

(b) Mr A. T. Armstrong—preparation of the book *Earth Resources in the Use of the Community*.

(c) Sir S. B. Dickinson—Adviser to the Government on uranium developments.

1204. Mr O'NEILL (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many retired officers of departments under the Minister's control are contracting to any departments under the Minister's control in a private enterprise capacity?

2. Is the nature of the service supplied similar to the work which was done by such former officer/officers prior to retirement from the Public Service?

3. What are the names of any such officers and what are the services being supplied?

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

1. None.

2. Not applicable.

3. Not applicable.

1205. Mr O'NEILL (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many retired officers of departments under the Minister's control are contracting to any departments under the Minister's control in a private enterprise capacity?

2. Is the nature of the service supplied similar to the work which was done by such former officer/officers prior to retirement from the Public Service?

3. What are the names of any such officers and what are the services being supplied?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. One.

2. Yes.

3. (a) Mr K. W. Halliwell.

(b) (i) assist in the development and application of port marketing facilities and port promotion strategies at the Port of Adelaide;

(ii) identify and investigate market potential for the Port of Adelaide;

(iii) arrange for the collection of market and economic data.

1206. Mr O'NEILL (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. How many retired officers of departments under the Minister's control are contracting to any departments under the Minister's control in a private enterprise capacity?

2. Is the nature of the service supplied similar to the work which was done by such former officer/officers prior to retirement from the Public Service?

3. What are the names of any such officers and what are the services being supplied?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: At this stage neither the Department of Agriculture nor the Woods and Forests Department have retired officers contracting services to the respective departments in a private enterprise capacity.

1208. Mr O'NEILL (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many retired officers of departments under the Minister's control are contracting to any departments under the Minister's control in a private enterprise capacity?

2. Is the nature of the service supplied similar to the work which was done by such former officer/officers prior to retirement from the Public Service?

3. What are the names of any such officers and what are the services being supplied?

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

1. None.

2. See 1.

3. See 1.

RETIRED OFFICERS

1209. Mr O'NEILL (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many retired officers of departments under the Minister's control are contracting to any departments under the Minister's control in a private enterprise capacity?

2. Is the nature of the service supplied similar to the work which was done by such former officer/officers prior to retirement from the Public Service?

3. What are the names of any such officers and what are the services being supplied?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: With regard to departments under the Minister of Health and Minister of Tourism, the answers are as follows:

1. None.

2. See above.

3. See above.

1210. Mr O'NEILL (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. How many retired officers of departments under the Minister's control are contracting to any departments under the Minister's control in a private enterprise capacity?

2. Is the nature of the service supplied similar to the work which was done by such former officer/officers prior to retirement from the Public Service?

3. What are the names of any such officers and what are the services being supplied?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The replies are as follows: Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment, Nil. Department of Trade and Industry, Nil.

Public Buildings Department, 1. Three; 2. Yes; 3. A. Dancauskis—structural engineer; T. Kilgariff—architect; K. R. Pointon—architect.

1211. **Mr O'NEILL** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. How many retired officers of departments under the Minister's control are contracting to any departments under the Minister's control in a private enterprise capacity?

2. Is the nature of the service supplied similar to the work which was done by such former officer/officers prior to retirement from the Public Service?

3. What are the names of any such officers and what are the services being supplied?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. Nil.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.

BUS ACCIDENTS

1215. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. In relation to accidents involving S.T.A. buses during 1980:

- (a) how many occurred, what type were they and how many of each type occurred;
- (b) how many were articulated buses;
- (c) what was the cost of damage; and
- (d) how many passengers were injured?

2. Does the S.T.A. carry out its own crash repairs and if so, where and if not, by whom are the repairs done?

3. What was the total amount of damages awarded by courts against the S.T.A. during 1980 where passengers were injured or killed?

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

1. (a) 649 reportable accidents. They have been classified into the following accident types:

Motor vehicle	582
Motor cycle	5
Bicycle	19
Pedestrian	36
Animals	7

(b) One.

(c) Because of the 'Knock for Knock' Agreement with various insurance companies, this information is not available.

(d) 318 accidents involved passenger injuries. The number of passengers injured is not readily available and it would require considerable work to obtain this figure.

2. Repairs are carried out at the S.T.A.'s Regency Park Workshop and depots.

3. This information is not readily available and would require considerable research to determine.

TRAM ACCIDENT

1216. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What were the circumstances that led to the collision of two trams on the Glenelg tramline recently?

2. How many persons were injured and what were the respective injuries?

3. What was the amount of damage caused to both trams, when will repairs be undertaken and when will they be back 'in traffic'?

4. What inquiries have been or are about to be initiated by the S.T.A. to determine the cause of this collision?

5. What safety regulations were broken and if any, what disciplinary action has been put into effect?

6. What, if any, malfunctioning of equipment was involved and have other trams been inspected for similar conditions and if not, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows: Glenelg Tram Accident on 6 February 1981

1. At 5.20 p.m. a coupled set No. 351/377 was involved in a collision with a girl cyclist at Greenhill Road, Wayville. Although not injured, the Motorman suffered shock and was taken to hospital. As a result of this delay the following coupled set No. 370/371 was held up behind coupled set No. 351/377.

A Traffic Inspector attended at the scene of the accident between the girl cyclist and the coupled set of trams and, to avoid further delay, took charge of and drove the coupled set en route to Glenelg. The conductor on one of the two trams driven by the inspector was inadvertently left at the scene of the accident. The conductor joined the following tram and was transferred to his correct tram at Stop No. 8.

The tram driven by the inspector had stopped at stop No. 9 and the doors had been opened to allow passengers to alight when it was struck in the rear by the following coupled set tram 370/371.

2. Thirteen passengers were slightly injured and two conductors reported minor injuries. One passenger was taken to hospital and some of the remainder sought medical attention at a later date.

3. The estimated cost of repairs to tram 370 is \$5 000 and to tram 377 \$8 000. Work has already commenced on repairing tram 370. It is anticipated that tram 370 will be returned to traffic in May 1981 and tram 377 in June 1981.

4. Following the accident, static air brakes examinations were carried out on tram 370 and revealed no faults.

The undamaged tram of the rear coupled set (tram No. 371) was track tested by traffic and engineering officers and, although it made a number of normal stops, some breaking irregularity was detected. Subsequent checks made by authority engineers on tram 371 indicated that there was an intermittent braking defect which could have caused the accident.

It was found that there was a crack in the brake cylinder leather of tram 371 which could have reduced its braking efficiency.

5. No safety regulations were broken—no disciplinary action has been put into effect.

6. See 4. above.

Other trams were subsequently checked and where there was any sign at all of deterioration of the leathers they were replaced.

As part of a major brake examination conducted of all trams each 18 months, brake cylinders are dismantled and an internal inspection made of the leathers and other equipment. The anticipated life of a brake cylinder leather is three years so that an 18 month inspection is well within the safety limits of its expected life. However, as an extra safety precaution internal brake cylinder checks have now been scheduled for 12 months intervals.

O'BAHN

1217. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Is it a fact that the Minister, by himself or in the company of the Member for Torrens, 'when in contact with Mercedes-Benz in Australia prior to the 1979 elections', made any kind of commitment to that company with regard to the implementation of the O'Bahn busway in Adelaide and, if so:

- (a) when and where did these discussions take place;
- (b) who were the Mercedes-Benz officials and/or representatives; and
- (c) over what period of time did discussions take place and what commitments were given to the company and on whose authority?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: No.

ARTICULATED BUS

1218. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is it a fact that the S.T.A. is considering obtaining a Mercedes-Benz articulated bus from Perth for testing and evaluation and if so:

- (a) when;
- (b) what costs will be involved and against what department will they be debited; and
- (c) is the vehicle being brought to Adelaide specifically for the purpose of testing and evaluating it for the proposed North-East O'Bahn busway and if so, why?

2. If the bus is not to be obtained from Perth, will it be obtained from another State and if so, when and at what cost?

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

1. No.
2. No.

NORTH-WESTERN SUBURBS TRANSPORT

1220. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

—What types of complaints and how many of each type were received by the S.T.A. bus and rail inspectors during 1980 and January 1981, respectively, regarding services in the north-western suburbs?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Statistics of this detail are not available.

SEATON PARK STATION

1221. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What was the purpose of counting the motor vehicles in the Seaton Park railway station by an S.T.A. traffic inspector during the week ended 14 February 1981?

2. How many vehicles were those of employees at the nearby bakery?

3. What action does the S.T.A. intend to take to safeguard car space for commuters?

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

1. Cars were counted at the Seaton Park railway station on 14 February as part of the normal check to determine the usage of S.T.A. station car parks.

2. The ownership of the vehicles was not investigated.

3. As adequate space is available for commuters no action is considered necessary.

DESTINATION SIGNS

1222. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many of the existing S.T.A. bus fleet will be converted to show destination names instead of route numbers, what will be the cost of their conversion, what will be the cost of reprinting the relevant timetables and what program is planned for these alterations?

2. Does the S.T.A. intend to introduce uniformity of destination names on the Rail Division services and if so, when and if not, why not?

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

1. It is not proposed to convert any of the existing bus fleet to display destination names, at this stage.

The display of destination names on buses will not necessitate reprinting of timetables.

2. The '2000' class railcars are equipped with route numbers similar to those displayed on the Authority's buses and it is proposed to introduce route numbers on the '300' and '400' class cars.

Destination names will not be introduced on the rail services.

Trains operate over fixed routes and destination names are displayed at all boarding locations. It is, therefore, unnecessary to provide destination names on trains.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE

1223. **Mr TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. Who authorised the alterations at the basement entrance to Parliament House from the car park, what was the cost of these alterations, who is responsible for the design of these alterations and was any handicapped person actually consulted to see whether the alterations would be suitable for an incapacitated person in a wheelchair?

2. Why was the left hand entrance door chosen for modification, instead of the right hand one which is immediately opposite the glass doors from the car park and which has a passageway leading to the actual base of the ramp adjacent to the elevator doors?

3. Was consideration given to the fact that non-handicapped people would now be at risk of striking their heads against the door lintel?

4. Is it a fact that the doorway was left open for a lengthy period during the alterations with the alarm disconnected but without the caretaker being informed?

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

The alterations to Parliament House to allow better access and facilities for disabled persons include modifications to the Strangers Galleries and to entrances at various points of the building, including the basement entrance at the Festival Theatre car park. It is estimated that the total cost of all the modifications will be in the vicinity of \$25 000. With respect to the basement entrance, it is acknowledged that the original modifications did not allow easy access by disabled persons. A revised proposal has now been implemented to remedy the problems associated with the previous modifications.

BRIGHTON RAILWAY LINE

1226. **Mr TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Which stations have been phased out as ticket selling points along the Adelaide-Brighton railway line and why, and are further closures planned and if so, why?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows: Clarence Park, Emerson, Edwardstown. The present

ticketing system has simplified station accounting. In addition, the volume of ticket sales at many suburban stations does not require the retention of permanent station staff. Further closures are proposed for the reasons stated above.

MOTOR VEHICLE CONTROLS

1227. **Mr TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is the Minister aware of an article in the R.A.A. journal *South Australian Motor* of January 1981 listing a wide variety of symbols used to identify motor vehicle controls and what steps towards standardisation is the Minister promulgating?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Yes. At the present time the larger vehicle manufacturers are co-operating with the International Organisation for Standardisation, Geneva, in an endeavour to evolve a uniform international vehicle control identification system. This matter is handled on a national basis through the office of Road Safety, Canberra.

NUCLEAR STATION

1229. **Mr TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier. Is the Minister aware of a nuclear power station that was closed down in West Germany in 1977 which has since been discovered to be beyond repair and, if so, have officers of his department researched the methods and costs of disposing of that radioactive reactor and if so, what did that research reveal and have any costings that may have been conducted for a possible South Australian nuclear reactor included that particular cost factor?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have seen reports referring to the 240 MWe BWR Lingen nuclear power station in West Germany which commenced operation in 1968 and was shut down in 1977. I understand that in 1979 a decision was taken to remove the reactor from service. Officers of my department have not researched the methods and costs of disposing of that reactor.

HARTLEY COLLEGE

1236. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

Has the Minister received a letter dated 4 February 1981 from the Secretary, State Council of Academic Staff Associations and if so, does the Minister accept Mr Hindson's contention that an 'awkward precedent' has been created by a recent appointment to the Hartley C.A.E. Council and if so, what does he intend to do about it?

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

- (a) Yes, the letter referred to has been received.
- (b) No an awkward precedent has not been set.

SPEECH THERAPIST

1237. **Mr TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Is it a fact that a speech therapist has indicated her willingness to be appointed to the Murray Lands Region but cannot be appointed there as no funds are available for that purpose in the Region?

2. Has the Minister received representations from various sources concerning the need for a speech therapist for schools in the area and if so, did the Minister's reply

suggest this need would be filled as soon as a therapist was available to be appointed and if so, why has no-one yet been appointed?

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

1. A speech pathology student at Sturt College of Advanced Education has made inquiries about the possibility of an appointment at Murray Bridge when she graduates later this year. However, there is no full-time position available at Murray Bridge.

2. Yes. Responses to these representations have emphasised the need to provide an equitable speech therapy service for school children across the State. It was certainly suggested that the Murray Lands would receive a Speech Therapy service on that basis, and this has been provided. It was not intended that such a service would necessarily be in the form of a full-time speech therapist appointment to Murray Bridge.

GAS COMPANY

1241. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education—Did any companies associated with the Bond Corporation or Alan Bond sell shares in the South Australian Gas Company within the month prior to the Government's move to involve S.G.I.C. in the ownership of the company?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Information about the transfers of shares in companies can be obtained from a search of the share registers of such companies.

WOOD CHIPS

1243. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Is the Minister aware of the report of his statement in the *Advertiser* of 7 February 1981, as follows: 'So far as the Japanese company Marubeni was concerned he had never had any dealings with that company (Marubeni), before, after, or since the termination of the contract with Punalur. To his knowledge none of his officers had had dealings with the company?'

2. Did the Director of Woods and Forests have discussions with Marubeni officials on October 1980 as reported in the *Advertiser* of 7 February 1981, or at any other time?

3. Was the Minister aware of these discussions and if not, why not and if so, when did he become aware?

4. Did the Minister inform the *National Times* that he had a meeting with a Marubeni representative on 17 March 1980?

5. Did the Minister discuss the Marubeni letter with these officials on 17 March 1980 and if not, why not?

6. What other meetings has the Minister had with Marubeni officials or representatives and what were the dates of those meetings?

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

1. I have previously on numerous occasions described the contacts with Marubeni which did not include 'dealings' in relation to South Australian wood resources.

2. Any contacts or discussions the Director may have had with Marubeni were of a similar nature wherein there were no dealings or negotiations concerning the South-Eastern wood resource.

3. I was aware that many parties including Marubeni had made inquiries and expressed interest following the signing of the December 1979, agreement and even before September 15 1979.

4. Yes. I quote my exact words:

'I met a guy from Marubeni in Adelaide, I think about the

17 March . . .', and this date is confirmed in part 6. Further . . . I explained to that Marubeni agent and to each other that came to me that under no circumstances could we negotiate with any other country or any other company because we had a commitment to Mr Dalmia and we were going to honour it.'

5. No; not relevant.

6. Courtesy meetings with Marubeni representatives occurred 17 March 1980, 22 April 1980, 14 July 1980, 15 October 1980.

EDUCATION REGIONAL OFFICES

1247. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many regional offices of the Education Department are there, where is each situated and when was it first occupied for its present purpose?

2. How many of these premises are owned by the Government and what is the estimated value of each of them?

3. How many of these premises are leased and what, in the case of each, is the annual rental, who is the landlord, how long a term is the lease and is there a right of renewal and if so, for how long?

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

1. (a) 10.

(b) These offices are situated at: Central eastern region, 45 Osmond Terrace, Norwood, January 1980; Central northern region, Raleigh Chambers, Elizabeth Town Centre, Elizabeth East Primary School, July 1979; Central southern region, 4th Floor, Noarlunga House, Noarlunga Centre, January 1980; Central western region, 21 Mary Street, Pennington, October 1977; Eyre region, 34 Oxford Street, Port Lincoln, February 1978; Murraylands region, Beatty Terrace, Murray Bridge, 1973; Northern region, 115 Nicholson Avenue, Whyalla Norrie, October 1976; Riverland region, 3 Kay Avenue, Berri, February 1977; South east region, Commercial Road West, Mount Gambier, October 1970; Yorke and lower north region, Main North Road, Clare, 1973.

2. (a) 8.

(b) The estimated values are based on information issued by the Valuer General on 11 August 1980, on comparisons with what information, and on the costs of recent work on some of the offices. Central eastern region, estimated value \$370 000; Central northern region, estimated value \$290 000; Eyre region, estimated value \$487 000; Murray lands region, estimated value \$300 000; Northern region, estimated value \$158 000; Riverland region, estimated value \$350 000; South east region, estimated value \$252 000; York and lower north region, estimated value \$316 000.

3. (a) 2.

(b) Central northern region—annual rental. Rooms 10-11 \$9 150 for a two year term commencing 21 July 1978 and expiring 24 July 1981. There is no right of renewal. Rooms 1-9 annual rental \$15 156 for a three year term commencing 3 March 1979 expiring 5 March 1982. There is no right of renewal. These offices are leased from the South Australian Housing Trust.

(c) Central southern region, annual rental \$117 600 for a six year term commencing 1 January 1980 and expiring 31 December 1985. There is a four year right of renewal. These offices are leased from T. & G.

BOWDEN LAND

1248. **Mr ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: What progress is being made in the proposed rezoning to residential use of the District

Commercial Zone between Hawker, Ninth and Drayton Streets and the northern railway line at Bowden?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: A proposal to investigate the rezoning of portion of the District Commercial Zone between Hawker, Ninth and Drayton Streets and the northern railway line at Bowden was made by the Hindmarsh Steering Committee in its final report to the Government last year.

The question of rezoning comes under the Planning and Development Act, which provides for a council or the State Planning Authority to undertake the rezoning process. As is usual in local matters, this role is being undertaken in this case by Hindmarsh council.

I understand that the Hindmarsh council is in the process of preparing a report on the matter that will be made available for public discussion.

ABORIGINAL EDUCATION

1249. **Mr ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Will the Minister make further funds available to the Aboriginal Education Foundation of South Australia Incorporated for the purpose of transporting three and four year old Aboriginal children to the Alberton and Taperoo Kindergartens and if not, why not?

2. Is the Minister aware that the A.E.F.'s grant of \$10 000 for the 1980-1981 financial year has already been expended?

3. Is the Minister also aware that from 1 July to 31 December 1980, the A.E.F. has spent \$10 916?

4. If the transport assistance ceases from 1 March 1981, how will the 50-odd Aboriginal children, many of whom come from isolated areas and outer suburbs, be able to attend the Alberton and Taperoo Kindergartens?

5. Does the Minister support the view that the transporting services provided by the A.E.F. should be retained at all costs and if not, why not?

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

1. \$1 000 has been granted to the foundation pending a full review of funding arrangements.

2. The foundation's grant of \$10 000 which was 20 per cent higher than in the previous year has according to the foundation been spent.

3. The foundation has advised me that \$10 916 has been spent.

4. Transport assistance did not cease from 1 March 1981.

5. The foundation provides an important service. The review referred to in 1. will ascertain the most effective way of providing a service to the Aboriginal community.

STATE FLAGS

1250. **Mr ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Premier: When will the Government's free issue of State flags to associations of sporting and recreation bodies become available and what guidelines have been established for their distribution?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The issue of State flags to associations of sporting and recreation bodies has commenced. The guidelines are that State flags be issued free of charge to State associations of sporting and recreation bodies recommended by the Department of Recreation and Sport.

RAIL CARS

1252. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is it a fact that the S.T.A. had ordered another series of 2000 generation rail cars and then cancelled such an order in favour of articulated buses and if so—

- (a) when was the order cancelled;
- (b) what were the reasons for two decisions; and
- (c) was any cancellation fee involved and if so, how much was paid and to whom?

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

No.

- (a) not relevant
- (b) not relevant
- (c) not relevant

NUCLEAR POWER

1253. Mr TRAINER (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: Has the attention of the Minister been drawn to an article in the 9 January *Financial Review* claiming that a U.S.A. Energy Department report states that the real cost of nuclear power is between 3.8 cents and 4.7 cents per kilowatt hour (if Government subsidies in research, uranium marketing promotion, management of wastes and promotion of foreign reactor sales are included) and that this cost exceeds the present 3.75 cents per kilowatt hour cost in the U.S.A. of oil-fired electricity (which uses the most expensive of fossil fuels) and are those figures comparable with estimates for South Australia and if not, how do they differ?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The article in the *Financial Review* relating to nuclear power costs has been examined in the Department of Mines and Energy but unfortunately the U.S.A. Department of Energy report is not available at this stage. It is therefore difficult to comment on the accuracy of the cost estimates, and on such factors as the inclusion of Government subsidies in oil or coal fired stations. Nevertheless, the general orders of magnitude reported in the article are in agreement with estimates for South Australia.

FREELING SCHOOL

1254. Mr TRAINER (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Is the Freeling Primary School being demolished to allow a new school building to be erected and if so—

- (a) what is the cost of demolition;
- (b) what is the cost of the new building being erected; and
- (c) what was the school's enrolment for the years 1978, 1979, and 1980, what is the current 1981 enrolment and what is the projected enrolment for 1982 and 1983?

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

The Freeling Primary School at present comprises seven free standing buildings. The three classroom stone and brick building which was the original school will not be demolished. Transportable accommodation currently on site will be relocated to other schools upon the completion of the new additions.

(a) Galvanised iron lean-to structures attached to the western and northern verandahs will be demolished by the School Council at no cost to the project to enhance the appearance of the existing building.

(b) The cost of the total building work including siteworks is:

	\$472 389	
plus	23 619	for contingencies
	496 008	
totalling	496 008	

(c) Past, current and projected enrolments at Freeling Primary School for February of each year are as follows:

1978	131
1979	125
1980	130
1981	135
1982	125
1983	130

SOUTH PLYMPTON WATER SUPPLY

1255. Mr TRAINER (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Is it a fact that a section of the South Plympton area has the lowest water pressure in the metropolitan area and that the pressure at a fire hydrant was inadequate to prevent a house in the vicinity of Waterhouse Road, from burning down some time ago and if not, how does the pressure compare with that in other suburbs?

2. If the pressure in the South Plympton area is exceptionally low, does the Government have any plans to rectify the situation?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

- 1. No. The pressure compares favourably with that in other suburbs.
- 2. Not applicable.

SOLAR HEATING

1256. Mr TRAINER (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier:

1. Is the Minister aware of a report in the February 1981 *Resource Brief* newsletter from the Conservation Council that a Glenelg developer's solar hot water heaters will be put in the shade if 12-storey flats are erected nearby and that 'solar access' laws exist in 30 states of the U.S.A.?

2. Does the Government have any plans for legislation to protect rights to solar energy from interference and to award costs where the efficiency of existing solar equipment is interfered with by other constructions and if not, why not?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The replies are as follows:

- 1. Yes.
- 2. This matter is under consideration by the South Australian Energy Council and the Energy in Buildings Consultative Committee.

SEWAGE TREATMENT

1257. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. Where are all the sewerage treatment works situated and when were they built and brought into operation in each instance?

2. Where are the discharge points for the respective sewerage treatment plants and what are the daily discharge rates in megalitres at each outlet?

3. What is the faecal coliform bacteria criteria, per 100 millilitres of water, in water surrounding each outlet and how often since 1 January 1980 has this level been exceeded at each outlet and for what period of time?

4. What is the faecal coliform bacteria criteria, per 100 millilitres of water, for designated bathing areas along the coastline, what are the names of these sites and how often

are these areas tested for excesses, based on the criteria of the Government department responsible, of:

- (a) faecal coliform bacteria;
- (b) surface stains; and
- (c) grease deposits?

5. How often have excesses been revealed, when did they occur, at what localities and for what period of time?

6. What advice, if any, was given to the public in each instance where excesses were recorded and if none, why not?

7. How many Government and/or private employees are involved in water quality control testing, what are those departments or private firms, how often are quality control tests carried out and on what basis?

8. How often have excesses been responsible for an adverse affect upon:

- (a) marine life; and
- (b) the bathing public,

and when did they occur and what were the adverse affects?

9. What is the Government program for upgrading and control of sewerage treatment and works in the next ten years and what is the estimated cost in each instance?

10. What new sewerage treatment works are to be built in the next 10 years and at what locations?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. Refer attached schedule.
2. Refer attached schedule.

3. There are no criteria set.

4. There are no criteria set.

5. Not applicable.

6. Not applicable.

7. The Engineering and Water Supply Department is the only organisation concerned with quality control in connection with the discharge of sewage treatment works effluent. Fifteen officers are involved in testing the treatment works effluents for twenty chemical parameters of intervals of 3 days to 4 weeks, depending on the operational requirements of the plant.

Surveys are also periodically conducted for a range of chemical, microbiological and biological parameters in the vicinity of sewage treatment works discharges in order to assess any long term changes in the marine environment.

8. Not applicable.

9. As growth rates are difficult to predict, a detailed program is not available. Costs are also uncertain because the best means of upgrading a works can only be determined by a specific study carried out at the appropriate time.

Operational laboratories located at Bolivar, Glenelg, Port Adelaide and Christies Beach will continue to service works control. Control analyses for country treatment plants are carried out at the Christies Beach Treatment Works.

10. It is planned to build a new sewage treatment works at Mount Gambier.

Sewage Treatment Works	Commissioning Date	1980 Discharge Rate (ML/d)	Receiving Water
<i>Metropolitan Areas</i>			
Glenelg:		48	St Vincent Gulf
First stage	1932		
Extended	1942		
Extended	1961		
Extended	1973		
Port Adelaide:		34	Port River
First stage	1935		
Extended	1947		
Extended	1953		
Bolivar	1966	110	St Vincent Gulf
Christies Beach:		11	St Vincent Gulf
First stage	1971		
Extended	later in 1981		
Happy Valley:		1.4	Field River
First stage	1970		
Upgraded	1978		
	(to be decommissioned 1981)		
Coromandel Valley	1973	0.35	Sturt River
	(may be decommissioned 1982)		
Stirling	1974	0.15	Tributary to River Onkaparinga
	(to be decommissioned 1981)		
Heathfield	Later in 1981	—	Heathfield Stream/Sturt River
<i>Country Areas</i>			
Angaston	1963	0.32	Local creek
Bird-in-Hand	1965	0.86	Tributary to River Bremer
Gumeracha	1965	0.15	River Torrens
Hahndorf	1975	0.33	Tributary to River Onkaparinga
Woodside	1942	No data available	Tributary to River Onkaparinga
	(approximately)		
	Upgraded on transfer from Commonwealth to State in 1975.		
Myponga	1963	0.0056	Creek flowing into Myponga Reservoir
Victor Harbor	1973	0.83	Inman River

Sewage Treatment Works	Commissioning Date	1980 Discharge Rate (ML/d)	Receiving Water
Mannum	1968	0.2	River Murray
Port Augusta West	1977	0.4	Golf course irrigation; surplus to Dempsey Lake
Port Augusta East	1980	negligible	Spencer Gulf
Port Pirie	1971	3.6	Spencer Gulf
Murray Bridge	1970	1.3	River Murray
Whyalla:			
Original works	1966		
Extended	1968	9	Spencer Gulf
Modified	1975		
Modified	1979		
Millicent	1968	1.9	Drain flowing into Lake Bonney
Mount Burr	1963	0.086	Land disposal in pine forest
Nangwarry	1963	0.14	Land disposal in pine forest
Naracoorte	1962	0.82	Naracoorte Creek

HAIRDRESSERS

1258. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. How many apprentice hairdressers have been indentured in each of the last 10 years?
2. How many became journeymen during the last 10 years?
3. How many were suspended during each of the last 10 years?

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

1. This information can be obtained from the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment annual reports.
2. This information is not readily available. To compile an answer would require an inordinate amount of time and expense.
3. Eighty-five and eighty-two were suspended in 1979 and 1980 respectively. Statistics are not readily available before 1979.

LINEAR ACCELERATOR

1259. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Is there a linear accelerator used in the treatment of cancer at Adelaide Hospital which is in need of replacement and if so, is it to be replaced and if so, when and if not, why not?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. Royal Adelaide Hospital has a linear accelerator which is 24 years old and is due for replacement.
2. The South Australian Health Commission is currently processing a request for the provision of funds for a replacement linear accelerator.

LONSDALE BUS DEPOT

1260. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Government have a proposal for setting up a radio base at the Lonsdale bus depot so that the Manager can be in continuous contact with his drivers and if so, when will the equipment be installed and if not, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Tenders have been called for the installation of a radio base station at Lonsdale depot. It is expected that the equipment will be installed by the end of May 1981.

SCHOOL TRANSPORT

1261. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: When does the Minister intend to reply to the member for Baudin's letter of 8 December 1980 concerning transport of children from the Port Noarlunga South area to Willunga High School?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I responded to the honourable member's letter on 13 February 1981.

LANGUAGE DISORDER

1262. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What is language disorder?
2. What facilities exist for language disordered children in South Australian schools?
3. How many speech pathologists are employed by the Education Department and in which regions?
4. How many speech pathologists are in training and where?
5. What expansion in speech pathology services is occurring in the Education Department in this financial year?
6. Has the promised additional speech pathologist for the Murraylands Region yet materialised?

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

1. Commonly, the term 'language disorder' is subsumed under the name 'communication disorder' and the latter divided into 'types'. The usual types in that kind of classification are difficulties associated with articulation, voice, fluency, expressive language and comprehension. A communication disorder exists when speech deviates from the speech of other people to an extent that this interferes with communication. Stress is on communication rather than speech *per se*.

2. Language disordered children may benefit from regular speech and communication training in regular schools and classes, particularly, in the case of the broader definition of such problems. There are several aspects to additional support given to children with more than ordinary difficulties in language and communication. Guidance Officers are available for initial referral and advice. Speech Pathologists are available in relatively small numbers to identify, diagnose and propose specific remedial action. Also a small Language Disorder Unit has been set up to help develop multidisciplinary action within schools. The Unit itself is staffed by a Principal and one teacher. The Principal is a member of a language disorder team whose other members are the Chief Speech Therapist, and a very experienced guidance officer. The

general direction of the Team is to help develop programs for language disordered children which can be used by teachers working in schools. It is not intended that teachers should become 'watered down' speech pathologists, but that the programs provided can be used to advantage in the classroom.

3. A total of 19 speech pathology positions are available within the department. The positions are distributed as follows:

Central Office Chief Speech Therapist and one speech pathologist in support of all Regions	2
Central Southern	3
Central Western	3
Central Eastern	2
Central Northern	3
South East	1
Riverland	1
Yorke and Lower North	1
Northern (one vacant)	2
Eyre	1

4. The departments does not have 'bonded' speech pathologists in training. Sturt College of Advanced Education provides training in South Australia. Training courses are also available in most other Australian States.

5. See Point 4.

6. An additional position at Murray Lands has not been 'promised' although the Department hopes it will be possible to provide such a position as and when the number of speech pathology positions can be expanded to provide an appointment on an equitable basis with the rest of the State.

SCHOOL SECURITY

1263. Mr D. J. HOPGOOD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many contracts are current for security services in schools and to whom have they been awarded?

2. What are the general conditions laid down in these contracts?

3. What steps are taken by the Education Department to ensure that these conditions are adhered to?

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

1. Contracts for security patrol services for 1981 have been awarded to Metropolitan Security Services (28 schools) and Wormald International Security (32 schools).

2. The conditions of tendering require the tendering companies to demonstrate expertise in all aspects of patrol security and to possess vehicles equipped with a two-way radio in direct contact with a 24 hour manned control room. Patrol officers are also required to be dressed in uniform.

3. Education Department security personnel check company patrols at regular intervals and the schools concerned also report any irregularities to the Department. The security companies also employ supervisors who ensure that patrol men are carrying out their duties.

FERTILITY UNITS

1264. Mr MILLHOUSE (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Are there *in vitro* fertility units at the following:

- Flinders Medical Centre
- Queen Elizabeth Hospital; and
- Queen Victoria Maternity Hospital,

and if so, when was each established and for what purpose?

2. Are such units established at any hospitals, other than those already set out and if so, at which hospitals, when was each such unit established and for what purpose?

3. What is the staff of each such unit?

4. What is the annual cost of maintaining each unit and how is that cost made up?

5. How many of such units are working on the production of test tube babies and when does each expect to succeed in producing one?

6. Is the Minister satisfied that there should be so many such units in the State and if so, why and if not, what action, if any, does she propose to take, and when, either to reduce or to increase the number, which and why?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Facilities exist at the Flinders Medical Centre and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The Flinders Medical Centre facility was established in December 1979 and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital facility in March 1980. The purpose of the units is to provide an opportunity for women with damaged fallopian tubes to achieve a pregnancy.

2. Not in South Australia.

3. The *in vitro* programs do not have any exclusive staff. The services form part of the services provided to patients with sub-fertility problems by the fertility clinic at each hospital. No additional staff were required.

4. Separate costs are not available because the facilities are included in Fertility Clinics at the Hospitals.

5. Both *in vitro* facilities are operating and expect pregnancies in the near future.

6. It is considered that at the present time two units are adequate.

SALISBURY STATION

1265. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What amount was spent on maintenance at the Salisbury railway station in the 1979-1980 financial year, and since 1 July 1980?

2. Approximately what proportion of each amount was to repair the effects of vandalism and what types of vandalism were involved?

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

1. Records are not kept of expenditure on maintenance of individual railway stations.

2. Records are not kept of the cost of vandalism at individual railway stations. However, only minor vandalism occurred at Salisbury railway station in the abovementioned period.

ST VINCENT GULF

1266. Mr PETERSON (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Are regular tests made upon crustaceans, shellfish and pelagic and demersal fish from St. Vincent Gulf to ascertain the levels of contaminants contained in their flesh and, if so, by whom and, if not why not?

2. Are there any indications that the levels are increasing and, if so, what are those indicators?

3. Are any readings above the accepted world standards and, if so, in which fish and what are the comparative readings?

4. Are there any health risks from contaminants in consuming some species of seafood and, if so, which species?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. There is no justification for a regular broad-sampling programme to test fish samples from St Vincent Gulf for contaminants. Tests are normally done when contamination of the gulf is known to have occurred, in the event of specific natural events such as algal blooms of other potentially toxic situations, or in response to specific complaints.

2. Not applicable—see 1.

3. Tests were done by the Department of Fisheries in 1976-77 to assess the levels of mercury and other heavy metals in certain fish species. Mercury levels in some samples of shark exceeded the recommended level for mercury in fish. These results were used by the Working Party on Mercury in Fish in preparing a report on mercury in fish and fish products.

4. On a world-wide basis, there are health risks associated with consuming some marine animals due to toxins, microbial or metal contaminants. Examples of these are Ciguatera poisoning from these tropical fish, poisoning from parts of puffer fish, scombroid poisoning from microbial toxins in some tuna, mackerel etc., mercurial poisoning from heavily and bacterial gastroenteritis from heavily contaminated oysters.

Seafoods commercially available for human consumption in South Australia do not pose a hazard to health. This is confirmed by results found during the National Health and Medical Research Council's 'Market Basket Surveys'.

VICTOR HARBOR RAILWAY

1267. **The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is the Minister aware of the recent increase in the rail fares to Victor Harbor?

2. Were the fare increases supported by the Minister and if so, why?

3. Does the Minister consider the increases will affect the number of passengers on the service?

4. Does the Government support the retention of the Victor Harbor line?

5. How does the Government justify the increase in the fare to Goolwa compared with the increase to Victor Harbor?

6. What plans does the Government have to maintain and increase the numbers of passengers to Victor Harbor?

7. Is the Government prepared to work with the Victor Harbor 'Save the Victor Harbor Line' community group?

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

1. Yes.

2. No. I have written to the Chairman, Australian National Railways Commission asking him to reconsider this most recent price rise in the light of the increase imposed last year.

3. Yes.

4. Yes.

5. Australian National are responsible for the increase in fares.

6. My colleague the Minister of Tourism has made efforts to publicise particularly the tourist value of the Victor Harbor line.

7. The Government is prepared to consider any proposals put forward by the 'Save the Victor Harbor Line' community group.

ADELAIDE HIGH SCHOOL

1268. **The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Can the Minister explain why Adelaide High School will not receive the Security Patrol Service in 1981?

2. Is the Minister aware that the deletion of this service may cause the school to be particularly vulnerable to burglary, vandalism and arson?

3. Does the Minister intend to remedy this situation by reinstating the service and if not, why not and what other actions will the Minister take to ensure the safety of the school?

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

1. Adelaide High School was one of several schools which were patrolled during 1980 but which were excluded from the 1981 contract. Consideration was given to many factors, including the incidence of illegal entry and vandal attacks, the needs of other schools with equal or higher priority and availability of funds for security purposes. In weighing up all factors, it was considered that the needs of some other schools were greater than Adelaide High.

2. Any school is vulnerable to burglary, arson and vandalism, even with security services.

3. A contract has been let to Metropolitan Security Services for the provision of nightly and weekend patrol services for Adelaide High School commencing on Monday 23 March 1981.

RAILWAY SURVEY

1269. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many tenders for survey drawings of the Metropolitan railway system were received by the State Transport Authority?

2. Were the time and date for close of such tenders 2 p.m. on Friday 23 January 1981 and if not, what were they?

3. Was any tender accepted after the time and date for close of tenders and if so, why and were any of such tenders the successful tender?

4. What was the lowest tender received?

5. Were the successful tenderers Colin Walker and Associates and Surveyor Simmons and what was their tender price?

6. Was the condition that the contract had to be completed by 31 March waived and if so, why, when and was notice of such waiver given to each person or organisation known to the Authority as being likely to tender and if not, why not?

7. Is the Authority satisfied that the survey can be completed using ground party methods by 31 March?

8. When is it now expected that the survey will be completed?

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

1. 15.

2. Yes.

3. Two late tenders were received. One tender was forwarded by post and the envelope was post marked prior to the closing time.

A second tenderer forwarded a late submission recording his interest but with no price stated. Neither submission was successful.

4. The lowest tender for the complete works was submitted by Colin R. Walker and Associates.

5. The successful tenderer was Colin R. Walker and Associates and their surveyors are Steed and Rundle Pty Ltd. It is not the practice of the Authority to make public tender prices submitted.

6. The original specification required tenderers to complete the contract by 31 March 1981. It was realised that this requirement may be too restrictive and tenderers when collecting the tender documents were advised that the ground surveys and drawings of railway main lines together with other essential work would be required by 31 March 1981, but that some other work not essential to the signalling study could be presented after that date.

7. Yes.

8. See 6 above.

MINISTER'S TRIP

1270. Mr KENEALLY (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. What was the cost of the Minister's and his wife's trip overseas at the end of 1980?

2. How much of the cost was due to travel and how much was due to accommodation?

3. In which countries was the Minister's accommodation and internal travel paid for by the host Government?

4. How many days were spent in these countries and what proportion of the whole trip do these days represent?

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

1. \$16 842.

2. Air fares \$12 373; accommodation \$4 469 (including exchange rate losses throughout trip).

3. Algeria and Tunisia.

4. Nine working days or approximately one third of the whole trip.

WOOD CHIPS

1271. Mr KENEALLY (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Did the Minister attend an Agricultural Council in Hobart on 9 February 1981?

2. Did the Director of Woods and Forests fly to Tasmania to brief the Minister on an article in the *National Times* on woodchip that appeared at or about that time and if so, what was the cost to the taxpayer of the Director's trip?

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

1. Yes.

2. The Director of Woods and Forests did fly to Hobart on 9 February 1981. The article referred to in the *National Times* did not appear until the eighth and was not the cause of the journey. Other urgent matters of administration delayed due to the Director's prior absence from the State made the journey necessary and also provided the opportunities for the Director to discuss matters of forestry with the newly appointed Minister of Forests and Chief Commissioner in Tasmania.

TIMBER MARKETING

1272. Mr KENEALLY (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Does the Woods and Forest Department market timber through Gibbs Bright and if so, in which states does Gibbs Bright handle such timber?

2. Is the marketing arrangement carried out under contract and if so, how long does the contract run?

3. What are the arrangements for the selection of marketing agents in other states and are they subject to tender?

4. What was the value of timber handled by Gibbs Bright and what was the commission applicable in 1979-1980?

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

1. Yes—Victoria, New South Wales, South Australia, Queensland and Western Australia.

2. In Victoria only does a commission based agency agreement exist which agreement was signed in 1976 for an initial period of one year and has continued since then with provision for 6 months' notice of termination by either party.

3. The agency arrangements with Gibbs Bright and Co. Ltd in Victoria are of very long standing, going back to early production of radiata pine flooring in South Australia. It was formalised only in 1976. For a brief period prior to 1976 a second agency was supported in Victoria but insufficient product to satisfy both agents led to termination of one.

4. Market Area	Sales	Commission
Agency basis:		
Victoria	9 409 639.13	438 108.49
New South Wales	3 178 560.01	150 488.74
Sub-total	12 588 199.14	588 597.23
Merchant basis:		
Queensland	439 863.69	—
Western Australia	173 062.36	—
South Australia	87 674.75	—
Sub-total	700 600.80	—
Total	13 288 799.94	588 597.23

FISHING

1273. Mr KENEALLY (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Do the statistics printed on page 30 of *Safic*, February 1981, Volume 5, No. 1, represent the Fisheries Department's official record of catch and effort in the prawn fishery?

2. Were the statistics obtained from returns provided by fishermen and if so, what procedures are taken to check them?

3. Are the statistics, particularly the catch rates per hour, used as a guide to the management of the fishery?

4. Are the statistics used as a guide to determining the number of authorities that can be issued for a zone?

5. Did the return from one fisherman in the West Coast Zone in June 1979 exceed the total catch for the zone according to Fisheries Department statistics and if so, how does the Minister account for the 'negative' catches of the other prawn fishermen in the zone?

6. Has the Fisheries Department examined the surprisingly low catches of these fishermen in other months and does the department intend to take any action to check these figures?

7. Will the Minister serve a 'show cause' notice on those fishermen in the West Coast Zone because of lack of fishing effort?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. Yes. Catches are checked against purchases data obtained from returns submitted by licensed fish dealers.

3. Information on catch rates per hour is one of the several factors used in management of a fishery.

4. Yes.

5. No. All catches by authority or permit holders are included in the published statistics.

6. Not applicable. See 5.

7. Not applicable. See 5.

SPEECH THERAPISTS

1274. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: When does the Minister anticipate funds will be made available for the employment of two additional speech therapists and a community nurse for the Special Services Branch of the Kindergarten Union as approved by the Public Service Board in 1979?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The positions approved very early in 1979 by the Public Service Board included a

speech pathologist, a community nurse and a special education teacher. Funding for these positions was not included in the budget of September 1979, prepared by the former Government. Present priorities lie with the staffing of existing kindergartens. Federal funds have not been increased for several years so that State resources are heavily committed in maintaining services. Any extension will be considered in the light of available resources for 1981-1982.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 3 June 1981

QUESTION ON NOTICE

WATER FILTRATION

1065. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What areas of metropolitan Adelaide are currently serviced by filtered water?
2. What non-metropolitan areas of this State are serviced by filtered water?
3. What percentage of the population is serviced in 1. and 2?
4. Will the Minister consider reducing the unit cost of water for those people who do not have filtered water delivered to their properties and, if not, why not?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. See attached schedule.
2. The South-Eastern towns of Beachport, Kingston, Lucindale and Robe. Although technically these towns receive filtered water, the filtering process is limited to the removal of iron from the water rather than the provision of general water quality improvements as is the objective in the metropolitan area.
3. (i) 34 per cent. A further 6 per cent receive filtered water part of the time.
(ii) The majority.
4. The present investigation into water and sewerage rating practices now being undertaken by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, will consider the various aspects of differential pricing as part of its overall review.

Suburbs served with filtered water from:

- | | |
|------------------|---------------------|
| (a) Anstey Hill | |
| Golden Grove | Northfield |
| Wynn Vale | Windsor Gardens |
| Redwood Park | Highbury |
| The Levels | Newton |
| Para Vista | Firle |
| Tea Tree Gully | Magill |
| Modbury | *Kensington Gardens |
| Hope Valley | *Burnside |
| Clearview | Fairview Park |
| Gilles Plains | Modbury Heights |
| Holden Hill | Green Fields |
| Athelstone | Ingle Farm |
| Rostrevor | Ridgehaven |
| St Morris | Valley View |
| *Kensington Park | Vista |
| Wattle Park | Enfield |
| Surrey Downs | Hillcrest |
| Para Hills | Dernancourt |
| Banksia Park | Paradise |
| Pooraka | Hectorville |

*denotes that a portion of the suburb receives filtered water

- | | |
|---|-------------------|
| Modbury North | Tranmere |
| Gepps Cross | Woodforde |
| St Agnes | *Rosslyn Park |
| Blair Athol | |
| (b) Anstey Hill and Hope Valley | |
| St Peters | Trinity Gardens |
| Maylands | Kensington |
| Norwood | Stepney |
| Evandale | Beulah Park |
| (c) Hope Valley | |
| *Port Adelaide | *Findon |
| Cavan | Ridleyton |
| Alberton | Brompton |
| Mansfield Park | Welland |
| Cheltenham | Hindmarsh |
| Ferryden Park | Thorngate |
| Woodville West | Collinswood |
| Croydon Park | Vale Park |
| Devon Park | Felixstow |
| Nailsworth | Payneham |
| Greenacres | Evandale |
| Campbelltown | Wingfield |
| Croydon | Rosewater |
| Bowden | Athol Park |
| Allenby Gardens | Kilburn |
| Flinders Park | Woodville Gardens |
| Fitzroy | Woodville West |
| Medindie Gardens | Kilkenny |
| Gilberton | Dudley Park |
| Campbelltown | Sefton Park |
| Royston Park | Manningham |
| Payneham South | Klemzig |
| Gillman | Beverley |
| Ottoway | Renown Park |
| Pennington | Ovingham |
| Angle Park | West Hindmarsh |
| Woodville North | North Adelaide |
| *Albert Park | Medindie |
| Woodville Park | Walkerville |
| East Croydon | Marden |
| Prospect | Glynde |
| Broadview | Joslin |
| Hampstead Gardens | |
| Suburbs served with filtered water on occasions from: | |
| (a) Anstey Hill | Erindale |
| Marryatville | Linden Park |
| Leabrook | Heathpool |
| Glenside | Tusmore |
| Burnside (in part) | Hazelwood Park |
| Toorak Gardens | |
| (b) Hope Valley | |
| Outer Harbor | Exeter |
| Taperoo | Glanville |
| Peterhead | Osborne |
| Semaphore | Largs Bay |
| Ethelton | Birkenhead |
| North Haven | Semaphore South |
| Largs North | |