

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Tuesday 9 February 1982

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

**CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)**

His Excellency the Governor, by message, informed the House that he had reserved the Bill for the signification of Her Majesty the Queen's pleasure thereon.

**ASSENT TO BILLS**

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

Administration and Probate Act Amendment,  
 Building Societies Act Amendment (No. 2),  
 Business Names Act Amendment,  
 Coroners Act Amendment,  
 Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment,  
 Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment (No. 2),  
 Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act Amendment,  
 Harbors Act Amendment (No. 2),  
 Housing Agreement,  
 Industries Development Act Amendment,  
 Irrigation Act Amendment (No. 3),  
 Licensing Act Amendment,  
 Local Government Act Amendment (No. 4),  
 Motor Fuel Distribution Act Amendment,  
 Motor Vehicles Act Amendment (No. 5),  
 Parks Community Centre,  
 Planning,  
 Racing Act Amendment,  
 Road Traffic Act Amendment (No. 5),  
 Road Traffic Act Amendment (No. 6),  
 Savings Bank of South Australia Act Amendment,  
 South Australian College of Advanced Education,  
 South Australian Council for Educational Planning and Research Act Repeal,  
 South Australian Film Corporation Act Amendment,  
 South Australian Housing Trust Act Amendment,  
 State Theatre Company of South Australia Act Amendment,  
 Statutes Amendment (Jurisdiction of Courts),  
 Stony Point (Liquids Project) Ratification,  
 Tea Tree Gully (Golden Grove) Development Act Amendment (No. 2),  
 Valuation of Land Act Amendment.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (JUDICIAL REMUNERATION) 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: CLEVE ROADS**

A petition signed by 433 residents of the District Council of Cleve praying that the House urge the Government to provide adequate funds for road construction and main-

tenance in the District Council of Cleve was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

**PETITION: SAMCOR LAND**

A petition signed by 2 250 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to retain the Samcor land at Pooraka as an open space dedicated to environmental and recreational purposes was presented by Mr McRae.

Petition received.

**PETITION: HONEYPOT ROAD**

A petition signed by 440 residents of Hackham West praying that the House urge the Government to provide sufficient funds for the upgrading of Honey Pot Road, Hackham West, was presented by the Hon. D. J. Hopgood.

Petition received.

**PETITION: PRE-SCHOOL COSTS**

A petition signed by 26 concerned residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide sufficient funds to cover all pre-school operating costs was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

**PETITIONS: CASINO**

Petitions signed by 91 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Federal Government to set up a committee to study the social effects of gambling; and reject the proposals currently before the House to legalise casino gambling in South Australia and establish a Select Committee on casino operations in this State were presented by Messrs Blacker and Dean Brown.

Petitions received.

**PETITION: HACKNEY HOTEL NOISE**

A petition signed by 99 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to either accept or reject the recommendations of the inter-departmental report into noise associated with places of public entertainment and introduce legislation without delay to adequately control the noise and associated problems with licensed premises, especially the Hackney Hotel, was presented by Mr Crafter.

Petition received.

**QUESTIONS**

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: All the questions on the Notice Paper except Nos 201, 238, 243, 273, 289, 322, 324, 337, 339, 345, 349, 365, 367, and 368.

**EDUCATION FUNDING**

In reply to Mr **LYNN ARNOLD** (14 October).

The **Hon. H. ALLISON**: The following analysis indicates the proportion of State Budget which is spent by the Education Department, with respect to 1980-81 and 1981-82.

The most common error made in comparison of expenditure in one year with the next is that of comparison of actual expenditure from one year with budgeted expenditure for the following year. That comparison often fails to recognise that the former includes the cost of wage and salary increases, whereas the latter does not. The matter raised by Mr Arnold is complicated further as the 1980-81 actual payments for the Education Department include an additional pay period (merely as a result of the timing of debits) and 1981-82 does not.

If the member wishes to compare, in a meaningful way, the proportion of actual payments for 1980-81 spent on education with the proportion proposed in the 1981-82 Budget, then:

The effect of the actual cost of the additional pay period should be removed from the figures (\$13 230 000).

The actual wage and salary increases paid in respect to the department's employees in 1981-82, and the Government as a whole, should be removed from the 1980-81 figures (Department \$26 900 000—see page XXXVI of the Premier and Treasurer's Financial Statement for 1981-82. Government as a whole \$92 300 000—see page XXXI).

1980-81	401 502 - (13 230 + 26 900)
(\$'000)	1 554 884 - (13 230 + 92 300) = 24.9%

1981-82	412 392*
(\$'000)	1 626 912 = 25.3%

The budgeted expenditure for 1981-82 includes \$942 000 for School to Work Transition Programmes contained as part of the 'round sum allowances'. Cabinet approval of this programme was given on 23 November 1981. On that basis, the Education Department's proportion of the Budget has increased in 1981-82 over its share in 1980-81. The figures quoted by the honourable member do not take into consideration the effect of the additional pay period. While it might be cyclical, it certainly must be discounted if comparisons of the share of the Budget spent on Education from year to year are to be made.

### BEACH SAND

In reply to Mr PETERSON (3 December).

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

1. Both the City of Port Adelaide and the Coastal Management Branch of the Department of Environment and Planning are satisfied with the method of operation regarding the sand removal contract at Semaphore. Disruptions are inevitable in an operation of this type. However, the contractor is doing everything possible to keep these disruptions to a minimum.

2. The contractor has been instructed to keep the beach in a reasonable and safe condition for beach users. Signs are erected around the excavation which give warning of possible irregularities in the beach.

3. With regard to Government funding, the City of Port Adelaide is treated no differently from any of the other 42 seaside councils. Subsidy applications from the council are considered within the context of the present Coast Protection Board and Government priorities.

### FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

In reply to Mr McRAE (14 October).

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** As I stated in my interim reply to the honourable member, I made public

statements on the reason for the project's withdrawal earlier this year, however, I am happy to restate the situation. The M.H. Contract was recommended for approval by me on 19 November 1980, and subsequently approved by Cabinet on 24 November 1980, at a total cost of \$2 080 000, not \$2 800 000 as suggested by the member for Playford. The planned building is to include facilities for the Departments of Ophthalmology and Immunology, plus some additional plant rooms and specialised storage areas. The Ophthalmology and Immunology Departments were planned to include mainly office and research facilities with patient treatment being carried out in their present location, which is well away from the proposed new building.

Tenders were called for the project on 15 December 1980 with a closing date of 6 February 1981. The cost of \$2 080 000 was the lowest tender received. The project was then withdrawn from the approved list of capital works, and Flinders Medical Centre was advised of this in a letter dated 5 March 1981. Other projects in the State were also withdrawn at this time because of a reduction of capital funding available to the commission. The M.H. Contract has still not been given approval to proceed, and must now compete with similarly withdrawn projects and other urgent new projects, for the limited funds available. Both of the departments affected are presently operating at the Flinders Medical Centre, albeit in temporary accommodation, and patient care is not affected as a consequence of the project withdrawal.

### GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE HOUSING

In reply to Mr LYNN ARNOLD (10 November).

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** In response to the honourable member's question, I advise that consideration of the report has been deferred by the Ministers of Education, Housing, and Industrial Affairs.

### FISHERIES

In reply to Mr KENEALLY (16 October).

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The following comments are provided in response to the honourable member's questions on the management of the abalone and prawn fisheries:

**Abalone:** From the date of introduction of transferability, seven abalone authorities have been transferred. The average price declared per authority was \$68 571. Boats and other gear were valued separately. All transfers occurred in the western zone. The price obtained for abalone by divers has increased appreciably since 1979-80 rather than being stable as was suggested, with a major price jump occurring mid-1980. Average prices in 1980-81 were of the order of \$10 to \$11 per kilogram for shelled greenlip and \$9 to \$10 per kilogram for shelled blacklip compared with \$7 to \$8 per kilogram in 1979-80. Current prices, however, are still well below those quoted, especially for shelled blacklip abalone landed on the West Coast.

**Prawns:** Fees for the three vessels in the West Coast prawn fishery are not based on a percentage of value of catch. Fishermen in that area still operate under special permits for which they pay a flat fee. The figures supplied by the honourable member for one vessel relate to the 1980-81 financial year and are not comparable with the figures for 1979-80. These figures show the trend observed in this fishery since fishing effort was reduced. The production figures given in February 1981 SAFIC show that the West Coast yield was above 200 tonnes per annum for each of the calendar years 1970-73. The catch dropped to 16 tonnes

in 1978 through excess effort, but it now appears to be recovering through careful curtailment of fishing effort.

I do not comment on any individual fisherman's production figures because that breaches promises of confidentiality in our handling of fishermen's statistical returns. However, since the honourable member has made the matter public, I feel that I have no choice but to comment on the reported catches of the *Cavalier* for the period July 1980-January 1981. Catch returns lodged with the Department of Fisheries are not greatly inconsistent with the figures advanced by the honourable member—and in fact for one month the figure the honourable member gave is less than the figure in departmental records. Overall, the discrepancies do not warrant investigation.

Increasing prawn catches for the West Coast area are the result of management plans laid down with the Commonwealth for the fishery when proclaimed waters off the West Coast were closed to prawn fishing in July 1979. Before that time, when only State territorial waters (i.e. out to 3 n. miles seaward) were closed, it was not possible to assume that catches should rise in the fishery recovering from collapse. Maintenance of controls on fishing effort in the area should hasten the recovery of the fishery and total catches for 1981-82 should again show an increase, although total recovery is still likely to be a few years off.

#### FISHERIES LAW ENFORCEMENT

In reply to **Mr BLACKER** (16 October).

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** Salaries payable to law enforcement personnel in the Fisheries Department are as follows:

Senior Fisheries Officer, IF-5, \$20 689-\$20 917; Assistant Senior Fisheries Officer, IF-4, \$14 688-\$15 134; Fisheries Officer Grade II, IF-3, \$13 889-\$14 570; Fisheries Officer Grade I, IF-2, \$12 985-\$13 547; Assistant Fisheries Officer, IF-1, \$11 513-\$12 145.

#### A.D. VICTORIA

In reply to **Mr O'NEILL** (16 October).

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** Yes, the band on the A.D. *Victoria* has required regular maintenance at an average cost of approximately \$21 500 per month. However, it is pointed out that the cost of maintaining the bucket band on the *H.C. Meyer* was approximately one half of that amount per month. Therefore, over the nine-month period from the date of purchase of the A.D. *Victoria*, which it is estimated will be necessary to arrange for the replacement of the bucket band on that vessel, the additional cost to the Department of Marine and Harbors in maintaining the existing band will be in the order of \$95 000.

#### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

**The SPEAKER** laid on the table the following interim report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works:

Marla Township Construction.

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

Adelaide Remand Centre—Brompton,

Port Adelaide High School and Primary School—Consolidation.

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

Marla Township Construction.

River Torrens Linear Park and Flood Mitigation Scheme,

Technology Park Adelaide Development.

Ordered that reports be printed.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education):** I seek leave to make a statement to accompany my tabling in the House of the report of the Committee of Inquiry into Education in South Australia, January 1982.

**The SPEAKER:** Is leave granted?

**Mr Millhouse:** No.

**The SPEAKER:** Leave is not granted.

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Ministers to make Ministerial statements as required.

**Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham):** The Christmas holidays would have been a good opportunity to have cleaned up this matter, but apparently all members, particularly the Ministers who are responsible, were too busy away on holiday for anything to be done.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will come to the point.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** My objection to Ministerial statements, because of the flagrant abuse of the process which we have seen during this session particularly, remains. Although today I feel rather mellow and co-operative, and therefore regret having to take this step, until the matter is resolved, I propose on every occasion on which I am here to object to the giving of leave to Ministers to make statements.

**The SPEAKER:** The question is that Standing Orders be suspended. Those in favour 'Aye', to the contrary 'No'.

**Mr Millhouse:** No.

**The SPEAKER:** There being a dissentient voice, there must be a division. Ring the bells.

*While the division was being held:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There being only one member on the side of the Noes, I declare that the Ayes have it.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** On 6 May 1980, I appointed a Committee of Inquiry into Education in South Australia, with the terms of reference of looking at education in South Australia, with reference to the influences of economic, demographic, technological and social changes, and at resource allocations, management of education, curriculum, and the desirability of developing a new system of school evaluation. I now table that report.

The Chairman of the committee was Dr J. P. Keeves, Director of the Australian Council for Education Research in Melbourne, and his committee included President of the Australian Society of Accountants, and a Director of Touche Ross Services (Mr P. D. Agars); former President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers (Mr J. F. Gregory); the Principal of Pembroke School (Mrs D. Medlin); the General Manager of Arnott Motteram Menz Pty Ltd (Mr W. J. Menz); and chartered accountant and President of the South Australian Association of State School Organisations (Mr I. S. Wilson).

The committee released its first report in February last year. Now this second and final report addresses the future of curriculum and evaluation in the school system. It also gives further consideration to some of the recommendations of the first report. As a result, it will prove tremendously significant for education throughout the 1980s and beyond. It is not a superficial report. Indeed, it is a frank report with well-argued cases for all of its more than 140 recommendations, and I sincerely thank the committee and its staff for their dedication and pragmatism in considering future directions for education in this State.

The State Government has accepted the report in principle and will support most of the recommendations to ensure that the quality of what is being taught, the standards and the management, of an already superior education system, are improved even further.

I am aware of the financial burdens on parents in education, and I am pleased that the Keeves Report has made positive and realistic suggestions for identifying sources of funds for improving school grants and the quality of education without suggesting further burdens on the taxpayer and the Government at a time of economic stringency. Moreover, the readjustment of priorities will improve the efficiency and quality of education rather than reduce it, as some self-interested groups might claim. Many of the recommendations have already been accepted by the Government and work on their implementation has begun. A special team will be set up by the Director-General of Education to examine ways of putting the recommendations into action as quickly and as smoothly as possible.

The report highlights changes in curriculum and resource allocations, and in particular emphasises the lack of co-ordination in the past to plan for the consequences of enrolment declines. It also highlights the need for greater efforts in all education sectors to teach subjects related to the technological change. Greater emphasis should also be placed on the evaluation of students, schools, the curriculum and teachers on a regular basis, and the report advocates State-wide testing of students in areas of essential skills to monitor standards. I am sure that all people with an interest in education will welcome this wide-ranging analysis of education, which will go a long way to setting standards not only for South Australia but the rest of Australia.

#### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. D. O. Tonkin)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Stamp Duties Act, 1923-1981—Regulations—Credit and Rental Stamp Duty.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972-1981—Regulations—Sick Leave.
- ii. Shop Trading Hours Act, 1977-1980—Regulations—Floor Tiles.
- iii. Motor Fuel Distribution Act, 1973-1981—Regulations—Marine Motor Spirit Sales.

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

*By Command—*

- i. Norwood District By-election, 16 February 1980—Statistical Return of Voting.

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Classification of Publications Act, 1973-1978—Regulations—Penalties.
- ii. Education Act, 1972-1981—Regulations—Recreation Leave Loading.
- iii. Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926-1981—Rules of Court—Local Court Rules—Various.
- iv. National Companies and Securities Commission—Report, 1980-1981.

v. South Australian College of Advanced Education—Statutes and By-laws.

vi. Supreme Court Act, 1935-1981—Rules of Court—Arrestment of Prisoners.

vii. University of Adelaide—Report and Legislation, 1980.

viii. Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926-1981—Regulations—Fees.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

i. Architects Act, 1939-1981—Regulations—Subscriptions.

ii. Police Regulation Act, 1952-1981—Regulations—Various.

iii. Various (Amendment).

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

i. Fisheries Act, 1971-1980—Regulations—Zone S Abalone.

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

*By Command—*

i. Australian Agricultural Council—Resolutions of the 112th (Special) Meeting held in Melbourne on 4 September 1981.

*Pursuant to Statute—*

i. Metropolitan Milk Supply Act, 1946-1980—Regulations—Milk Prices.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

i. Botanic Gardens—Report, 1980-81.

ii. Building Act, 1970-1976—Regulations—Building Work Fees.

iii. Coast Protection Board—Report, 1979-80.

Environmental Protection Council—

iv. Report, 1979-80.

v. Report, 1980-81.

Local Government Act, 1934-1981—Regulations—

vi. Parking.

vii. Parking (Amendment).

viii. North Haven Trust—Report, 1980-81.

ix. Outback Areas Community Development Trust Act, 1978—Regulations—Licensing.

Planning and Development Act, 1966-1981—Regulations—

x. Riverland Planning Area Development Plan.

xi. Metropolitan Development Plan Corporation of Hindmarsh Planning Regulations—Zoning.

xii. Murray Mallee Planning Area Development Plan.

xiii. Recreation Grounds (Regulations) Act, 1931-1978—Regulations—Whyalla Recreation Grounds.

xiv. City of Adelaide—By-law No. 8—Rundle Mall.

xv. City of Burnside—By-law No. 32—City of Burnside Library.

xvi. City of Port Adelaide—By-law No. 28—Playgrounds.

xvii. City of West Torrens—By-law No. 57—Bicycle Track Traffic.

Town of Thebarton—By-laws—

xviii. No. 9—Bees.

xix. No. 11—Fires.

xx. No. 12—Flags and Flagpoles.

xxi. No. 13—Garbage Bins.

xxii. No. 14—Gas.

xxiii. No. 16—Horses and Cattle.

xxiv. No. 18—Inflammable Undergrowth.

xxv. No. 21—Nuisances.

xxvi. No. 22—Public Health.

xxvii. No. 26—Parklands and Reserves.

xxviii. No. 27—Restaurants and Fish Shops.

xxix. No. 29—Streets and Footways.

xxx. No. 36—Zoning.

xxxi. No. 37—Building Alignments.

xxxii. No. 38—Building Alignments.

xxxiii. No. 39—Heights of Fences, Hedges and Hoardings.

xxxiv. No. 40—Control of Dogs.

xxxv. No. 42—Weights and Measures.

xxxvi. No. 43—Heavy Loads.

xxxvii. No. 44—Child Minding Centres.

xxxviii. No. 45—Rubbish Tips.

ixl. No. 46—Lodging Houses.

xl. No. 48—Poultry and other Birds.

xli. No. 49—Playgrounds.

xlii. No. 51—Street Traders.

xliiii. By-law to repeal certain Model By-laws.

District Council of Light—By-laws—

xliv. No. 29—Dogs.

xlv. No. 30—Traffic.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. M. M. Wilson)—  
*Pursuant to Statute—*

- I. Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1981—Regulations—Sales Tax on Number Plates.
  - II. Police Offences Act, 1953-1981—Regulations—Traffic Infringement Notices.
- Road Traffic Act, 1961-1981—Regulations—
- III. Blood Analysis Hospitals.
  - IV. Carrying of Dangerous Substances (Amendment).
  - V. Emission Control.
  - VI. Parking of Vehicles.
  - VII. Trailers.

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

- Pursuant to Statute—*
- I. Racing Act, 1976-1980—Rules of Trotting—Amalgamation of Races.
  - II. Mobile Barrier Starts.
  - III. South Australian Dog Racing Control Board—Report, 1980-81.
  - IV. South Australian Trotting Control Board—Report, 1980-81.

By the Minister of Health (Hon. J. L. Adamson)—

- Pursuant to Statute—*
- I. Builders Licensing Board—Report, 1980-81.
- Building Societies Act, 1975-1981—Regulations—
- II. Investment Funds.
  - III. Loan Limits.
  - IV. Building Societies—Registrar of—Report, 1980-81.
  - V. Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1935-1980—Regulations—Notification of Abortions.
- Health Act, 1935-1980—Regulations—Swimming Pools.
- Hospitals Act, 1934-1971—Regulations—Inpatients Hospital Charges.
- Licensing Act, 1967-1981—Regulations—Licence Fees.
- Real Property Act, 1886-1980—Regulations—Solicitors and Land Brokers Charges.
- Credit Unions, Registrar of—Report, 1980-81.
- South Australian Health Commission Act, 1975-1981—Regulations—Inpatients Hospital Charges.
- Trade Standards Act, 1979—Regulations—
- XII. Treatment of Apparel.
  - XIII. Flotation Aid Toys.

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

- Pursuant to Statute—*
- I. River Murray Commission—Report 1981.
  - II. Sewerage Act, 1929-1981—Regulations—Plumbers Fees (Amendment).
  - III. Waterworks Act, 1932-1981—Regulations—Plumbers Fees (Amendment).

## NO CONFIDENCE MOTION: STATE OF ECONOMY

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move the following motion:

That, in view of the Premier's failure to protect the interests of the people of South Australia against the harmful interest rate and economic policies of the Federal Government, his failure to maintain the State's financial strength as a base for future economic growth and security, and his failure to take action to remove incompetent and ineffective Ministers from the Administration, this House has no confidence in the Premier and calls on him to resign forthwith, and that such suspension remain in force no later than 5 p.m.

Agreement has been reached with the Government to allow this suspension. Proper notice about conveying the motion was given in accordance with the Government's request, and I understand that there is no opposition to the suspension.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer):** The only comment I wish to make is that I am grateful to the Leader of the Opposition for having clarified the position in relation to no-confidence motions. During the last sittings of the House I believe there was some doubt and uncertainty as to the courtesies in this regard, and I am very pleased (and indeed I congratulate the Leader) that the Leader has complied with those requirements on this occasion.

Motion carried.

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

That, in view of the Premier's failure to protect the interests of the people of South Australia against the harmful interest rate and economic policies of the Federal Government, his failure to maintain the State's financial strength as a base for future economic growth and security, and his failure to take action to remove incompetent and ineffective Ministers from the Administration, this House has no confidence in the Premier and calls on him to resign forthwith, and that such suspension remain in force no later than 5 p.m.

This Government has been in office now for 2½ years. In that time the South Australian economy has gone steadily downhill, and our unemployment has reached levels not experienced since the depression. Our work force has grown by less than a third of the expected level. Our building industry is constructing fewer houses now than two years ago; fewer motor vehicles are being bought, and over 2 000 business bankruptcies have occurred. All the key indicators show that our performance is poor.

In the community there is considerable pessimism and concern, which anyone who is prepared to listen to it will acknowledge. Unfortunately, such pessimism and concern are dismissed by this Government as being some sort of doom and gloom not relating to the facts, and the kind of self-satisfaction shown by the Premier a moment ago in accepting this motion is an example of the way in which this Government has ignored the very real and underlying concern in the community. We are not asking the Government to accept what the Opposition says about this; we are asking it to listen to those in the community—the businessmen and the ordinary men and women of South Australia expressing their concerns and trying to do something about their problems. South Australians are looking for leadership in this time of economic disarray. They want to know that the Government is capable of planning the economic development of our State so that they and their children can be assured of work and security.

This Government has completely failed to live up to any expectations held in it by its supporters. It is renowned for its vacillation, its indecisive drifting from one all-day Cabinet meeting to the next. The responsibility for this failure of decision and this lack of nerve and planning rests fairly and squarely with the Premier himself. In this matter of concern let us look at three areas of conspicuous failure. The Premier has failed nationally, and as a result South Australia has had no impact on the key Federal Government decisions that affect us. He has been unable to gain the respect or co-operation of other State Governments, and as a result opportunities have been lost and our competitive position has been eroded.

Secondly, he has failed in the administration of his own portfolios. The State Treasury continues to grapple with his financial incompetence. State development is a mish mash of competing initiatives between his own department (the State development area, whether it is a department, a section or a division) and that of the Minister of Industrial Affairs. He has repeatedly shown that he lacks understanding and sometimes even knowledge of major policies that his own officers are pursuing. Finally, these failures have made it impossible for him to show the leadership in Cabinet that this State needs of a Premier in these difficult economic times.

The office of Premier in this State has become synonymous with pomposity, boasting, false confidence and inaction. We have a Premier who is increasingly finding the details of the job too hard. Those are grave charges to be levied at the representative of the State, the Leader of the Government. Let us flesh them out and deal with them. I think that nowhere is the ineffectual and compromised nature of the present leadership of the State more apparent than in

the Premier's dealings with the Federal Government, particularly over the crucial issues of financial and economic policy. Admittedly, the past one or two months has seen a rather belated and, I would suggest, synthetic attempt by the Premier to show some spine towards the Prime Minister.

We have had some stirring headlines. On 25 January, the *Advertiser* reported the Premier's calling on the Federal Government to reform our talks. The headline on 1 February stated:

Campaign against Fraser Government stepped up: Tonkin demands changes.

In between we have seen a succession of what are called 'strongly-worded letters', and even the Minister of Education has trotted off to Canberra to soften them up. I am not saying that we should not reform the format of the Premiers' Conference; nor am I suggesting that we should not be aggressively demanding that the Federal Government reconsiders its attitude to high interest rates and other economic issues. Let us consider what qualifications this Premier has to conduct such a campaign: what his credibility is in respect of it. His chief credential was laid out for us all to see on page 11 of the *Advertiser* on 3 October 1980. There, in a full-page advertisement, he announced that he and his Government were content to go along with and (no more than that) to actively support the policies of Mr Fraser and the Federal Government. I remind the House of what the Premier said in those advertisements. We have heard it before, but let us listen to those words in the context of this debate and the attitude that the Premier is taking at the national level. The advertisement said:

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

How does that line up with what the Premier has been saying in the past two or three weeks? How much credibility does that give his so-called campaign against Mr Fraser's Government? This sycophantic nonsense has totally compromised our bargaining position at the Federal level, but he expects the people of South Australia to believe that he is actually capable of putting demands on the Federal Government. The Premier expects us to believe that that Government will actually listen to him. What credibility can he have?

It is not only the Premier's unqualified endorsement of the Prime Minister that has weakened South Australia's bargaining power in Canberra. I remind the House that some other Premiers, particularly those of Liberal persuasion, have spoken out consistently and strongly for their own States against the Fraser Government's policies and have benefited as a result. It is not only that: our position has been damaged even more seriously, I would suggest, and more fundamentally, by the Premier's financial incompetence. As a result of this Government's financial mismanagement, we now go to Canberra virtually as a mendicant State. We bargain not from a position of financial strength but as a State with a growing Budget deficit, with increasing transfers from capital works funds and an increasing resort to running down our reserves.

Over the past two financial years the Tonkin Government has plunged South Australia into the red. In 1980-81, a planned deficit of \$1 500 000 blew out to \$8 100 000, and it was held at that level only by slashing a record \$37 300 000 from capital works spending to prop up the Budget. This year, a further deficit is planned, and the Premier will set a new record when \$44 000 000 is diverted from capital works spending. So, over two years \$81 000 000 is to be ripped out of capital spending to pay for the Premier's financial incompetence in managing his Revenue Budget.

No other State in Australia has contemplated a similar transfer of funds. Indeed, a number of other States are doing just the opposite. They are ploughing money into capital spending to build up community assets and to provide a basis for development and growth. This action is a far cry from what the Premier believed when he was in Opposition. In October 1977, in the Budget debate, he said:

It is apparent that we must maintain a maximum level of works activity in the interests of employment and economic activity.

It is a far cry from what the Deputy Premier said in February 1979, when in Opposition, in response to a much smaller transfer of only \$5 000 000 by former Premier Dunstan. He said:

This is a very poor economic policy. It will have a very adverse effect on the future of South Australia in that our Loan allocation in the future could be reduced.

That was the Deputy Premier talking when in Opposition. He sat in Cabinet and supported the Treasurer in this \$80 000 000 transfer. Indeed, it conflicts with the advice of the Premier's own Industrial Development Council. In its strategy report released last year, it stated that it believed that public works programmes can, if properly planned, provide a solution to temporary unemployment problems as well as create an environment conducive to the future of the private sector. We on this side of the House endorse that proposition. In Government, we carry out such a policy. That is not the case with this Government. Its philosophy, its attitude even, sees it ripping off \$81 000 000 in the current economic climate.

The House can judge for itself the effect of that action on employment and economic activity in South Australia in 1982, and on our Loan allocation in future years. It is little wonder that one of the Premier's senior colleagues in another place called the 1981-82 Tonkin Budget a 'sad document'. The Federal Government, and indeed the other States, must treat with absolute contempt South Australia's cries for a bigger share of available Loan funds. They point to what we are doing here in our own Budget, what sort of priority this Government is giving to Loan works in its own Budget, and ask this question: why do they want more from us if they cannot even see it as a priority within their own financial arrangements? It is not much of a position to bargain with in the Loan Council.

But the State's financial malaise goes well beyond what is apparent in the Budget documents. Let us look at this official Treasury report entitled *Public Finances, Recent Trends in South Australia and 1981-82 Outlook*. That is a very comprehensive document, invaluable in assessing what has been happening over the past two to three years. It was tabled by the Deputy Premier on 10 December. We find that there has been a massive run-down in the State's cash and investment holdings. At page 68 we read that between 1979-80 and 1980-81, the years in which the Tonkin Government has been in power, there was a strong turn-around from accumulation to run-down, in the level of cash and investment holdings. Throughout the 1970s, according to this official Treasury document, the then Labor Government built up the State's cash reserves. But in 1980-81 we find the run-down amounted to \$57 000 000. In 1981-82 it is estimated that \$82 000 000 will be used up.

So, our bargaining power, our financial credibility, has been totally eroded by this incompetent management of the Treasury. The Premier's campaign, as he calls it, is totally compromised before it even starts. It is worth considering what this campaign amounts to. What are the key issues as the Premier sees them, and what is our record? Quite rightly, he has identified the question of interest rates and taxation reform as being crucial, and I would agree with him in that.

It is worth recalling that the interest rate spiral got under way immediately after the 1980 election. In fact, those increases were in the pipeline, undisclosed and unrevealed, until Mr Fraser, with the help of the South Australian Premier, got his election out of the way and was reinstalled in power. From that time, interest rates started climbing and they have climbed ever since. The continuous series of increases has hit all sections of the community, but their most immediate impact has been on homeowners, people trying to buy a home, and small business men needing overdraft facilities, all of those sections bound up in the economic development and wellbeing of this State.

So, what has been the Premier's response? Largely, it has taken the form of a letter-writing campaign by him and the Minister of Housing to their Federal counterparts—'strongly worded' letters, we are told, according to press reports. He has called for it to be on the agenda for the next Premiers' Conference; we will see what comes out of that. That is fine, and that action has won him a few headlines, but what is he doing in South Australia in the meantime? What is he doing for the hundreds of people in real trouble, experiencing real hardship and distress? He had an opportunity, as long ago as August, to join with the Opposition in denouncing the Federal Government's policies. Members will recall that on 18 August the Opposition announced its intention to move a motion in the House concerning the effect that interest rate rises were having on the people of South Australia. They will also remember that the Premier decided that he would take over the motion and move an ineffectual and meaningless form of words which expressed grave concern at the effects of continuing rises in interest rates and called on the Federal Government to take some action, unspecified. The Opposition motion was a detailed suggestion of action that could be taken, both by representations to the Federal Government directly by the Premier, at the direction of this Parliament, and by urging certain policies on the Federal Government, again directly with the full support of this Parliament.

In the course of it we also proposed a number of things that might be done at our own level here in South Australia, and every member on the Government side voted against that. Every member of the Government voted for what amounted to a meaningless slap on the wrist, lashing Mr Fraser with a feather, and we know how much notice he takes of that. Six months after that, the Premier expects us to believe he is capable of taking a campaign to Canberra to fight for low interest rates, and be listened to.

It is important to remember, too, that soon after that debate he flatly denied that any hardship existed in the community because of high interest rates. At a press conference in September last year he said he was reassured by lending institutions that very few cases of extreme hardship existed. In the *Advertiser* of 30 September, he said:

Obviously, there has been much more talk about hardship than really is the case. There have been remarkably few cases of hardship from the latest rise in home loan interest rates.

So, after refusing to believe that there was a problem, he announced that there should be no new initiatives on interest rates. In keeping with that callous indifference, he continued to approve each rise in the interest rate requested by the building societies, giving the impression publicly that he had no power to do otherwise, and not sitting down and devising with those societies a plan that could be substituted or replaced for the approvals that he simply gave as a matter of routine.

His housing Minister then introduced a scheme to assist homeowners who were unable to meet their housing repayments—a scheme that was kept secret. When we called for action that should be taken in this State, because of what was being done in other States to assist, we were told that

the Government had a scheme going from sometime back last year. Nobody knew about it. In fact, instructions had been issued to the Housing Trust, which was administering it, not to tell anyone about it, because there might be too many applications; they might get overwhelmed. They were just going to pick out people here and there whom they thought might be worthy recipients of the scheme.

This secret scheme apparently was going to assist eight South Australian couples immediately. It had the potential, the Minister hastened to add, to assist a further 50. There were about 160 000 loans outstanding in South Australia. The chances of getting assistance from the Government are about the same as winning the second division of X-Lotto. It is a joke. Where other State Governments have been able to take action, where Western Australia announced, as long ago as September, a \$40 000 000 plan to assist home buyers hit by rising interest repayments, where Victoria introduced a scheme to ensure that mortgage repayments did not rise faster than did incomes, and had 2 000 applications because it actually publicised the scheme, this Government has done nothing. The Premier's stance on the issue of interest rates is one really of hypocrisy and deceit. He would have us believe he has been fighting this campaign, but he ignores the fact that he supported those monetary policies and that Federal action which resulted in the rise in interest rates.

There are positive alternatives, and we have proposed and argued them. They are simply treated with contempt. The Premier would have us believe that, in the light of this, he can go to Canberra and be taken seriously. Let us get down to the real facts. The campaign against the Prime Minister, this distancing the Government from the Prime Minister in this election year, is solely for local consumption. In fact, on the weekend we had an indication that outside of Australia it is totally unheard of.

If there is anyone who would know about a campaign against Malcolm Fraser, and who, indeed, would be happy with it, I think it would be Mr Andrew Peacock, member for Kooyong and former Minister for Foreign Affairs. On Friday he was here in Adelaide, at the airport. He was interviewed, and this would-be leader of the Federal Liberal Party, when asked for his views about opposition to the Prime Minister, said:

I am simply saying the same thing that two Liberal Premiers, Mr Thompson and Mr O'Connor, have already said today, which is that the Federal Government must act now.

No mention was made of the South Australian Premier, the senior Liberal Premier, as we are told, which certainly shows what problems the Liberal Premiers have at the moment. To be not even noticed by Andrew Peacock's P.R. machine makes the Premier the real featherweight of federalism.

Then there is the Premier's campaign for tax cuts. In the *Advertiser* on 1 February he claimed that the Liberal Party is a low-tax Party. That is a rather hollow boast.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BANNON:** I think it would be well for some members opposite to listen, because this will be about the only thing that the Government can boast of when it comes up to the election, and it is going to do it by deceit; it is going to say that it is a low-tax Party and that it has abolished the few taxes, taxes which were paid for by some of the people. But in return the Premier has savagely increased those taxes which are paid by us all.

The facts, once again, are in the official Treasury background paper. This year, this low-tax Premier has budgeted for an increase of 14.5 per cent in State taxes, the highest jump for five years. Last year he increased more than 60 State charges in key areas, including electricity, water bills, and public transport. He has made clear that he is keen to



get his hands on a State sales tax. So, this part of the challenge to Malcolm Fraser is half-hearted, to say the least, and again, compromised by the action being taken by the Premier.

What of the pay-roll tax area? Throughout the last part of 1981 we kept being told that a review of exemption levels was imminent. He put it off time and again until now it is to be in July. That is a far cry from his demands in Opposition to increase the exemption beyond the rate of inflation. On 7 November 1978, Premier Dunstan moved to increase the exemption level to bring it into line with that applying in Victoria. That is something we had done consistently while in Government throughout the 1970s. The then Opposition Leader, now Premier, said it was not enough. But as Premier, given the chance to put his policies into practice, he has allowed us to lag some \$40 000 behind the Victorian level.

What was his response to my questions to him during the Estimates Committees about how many extra companies would now be liable for pay-roll tax for the first time? He admitted that an additional 280 businesses employing more than 2 000 people would now be liable for tax. He went on to say that it did not really matter for these firms, because all of them would be able to claim the pay-roll tax paid to his Government as a tax deduction for the purposes of Commonwealth income tax collection. What hypocrisy! He is prepared to campaign for tax cuts at the Federal level, but only so long as Canberra ultimately picks up the bill for him at the local level.

Members will recall the performance of the Premier at the time of the release of the Grants Commission report. For cheap short-term political gain, instead of grappling with the real issues raised by that report, which put at jeopardy our receipts from the Commonwealth Government, he tried to attack a former Government for destroying the State's bargaining position over financial arrangements connected with the transfer to the Commonwealth of non-metropolitan railways, something that was not even relevant as an issue, something in which the Federal Government had tried and failed, as far back as 1976, to find a loop hole. Indeed, one Minister said that they had been taken to the cleaners over the issue but there was nothing that they could do about it. So, some five or six years later we have the Premier running, asking Mr Fraser, inviting him to raise the issue again, and perhaps try to renegotiate it. Of course, he did not. That is not to say that there are not occasions on which the Premier quite rightly should go interstate to put South Australia's view. However, if there are no headlines involved or if the Premier does not understand the issues, he seems to be content to stay at home. One of the classic examples of that kind of thing over the past few weeks occurred with the Premier's deafening silence after Mr Bjelke-Petersen said that there was no way in which oil from the Queensland side of the Cooper Basin should be piped through South Australia to Stony Point. That was well publicised.

The *Financial Review* of 11 December carried the headline 'Joe rules out South Australian connection for oil from Jackson.' Mr Bjelke-Petersen and his Minister of Mines and Energy laid it on the line and were quoted as saying that there was no way in which Jackson oil would go through South Australia. That is an extraordinarily short-sighted policy, which would disadvantage not only South Australia but also Australia nationally if that was taken as the final word on the issue. There was silence from the Premier about that situation—not a word! I felt it necessary to make representations to the Queensland Government on behalf of the people of South Australia in the absence of action from the Government. What was the Premier's response to my attempt to persuade the Queensland Government to

open its mind about this issue? This man, who is always telling the House how he wants to stand up for South Australia, actually apologised to Mr Bjelke-Petersen. He owed an apology all right—not to Mr Petersen but to me and to the people of South Australia for his lack of action in the matter.

This is even better—the Premier had the Queensland Premier telex a statement to the Adelaide media attacking me. The matter was drawn to his attention and he asked the Queensland Premier to help him out by getting stuck into me. That shows what faith the Premier has in his own powers!

The Premier then claimed (and this was the most extraordinary turn of events) that he had already been to see Mr Bjelke-Petersen about oil in the Cooper Basin a year before, even though the strike at the Jackson No. 1 well was not made until December 1981. In view of Mr Bjelke-Petersen's statements I suggest that, if the Premier was talking about the strike that had not then occurred, his representations had absolutely nil effect. I would have thought that his representations to Mr Bjelke-Petersen, at the very least, could have been to the effect that, if something is discovered, an open mind should be kept about how best the product can be processed and developed.

If those were the representations that the Premier made (and I suggest that that is what he should have done), how was it that Mr Bjelke-Petersen came out with such an upbeat, chauvinistic statement, to the effect that in no way will the oil go through South Australia. So much for the representations that were made a year before! It is absolute nonsense! That was an incredible performance, which did not for one moment disguise the Premier's failure to act decisively in the interests of the State once the dimensions of the Jackson plight had become apparent.

In this last month we have had another alarming example of the Premier's incompetence. It is particularly concerning, because it shows that he is ignorant of vital financial arrangements for which he, as Treasurer, is responsible. All members of the House will be aware of the recent events surrounding the Federal Government's action against financial arrangements that are known as leverage leases. When the Federal Treasurer announced last year that taxation legislation would be amended to end such deals (an attack on actions that were being taken by the New South Wales Government, faced with the constrictions of Loan Council, to build a power station at Eraring), it was apparent to most people that this action had implications for all of the States, including South Australia. It had implications for Mr Bjelke-Petersen, Mr Thompson in Victoria, and for the Western Australian Government. The States that had been particularly hard-hit by a contraction of funds through the Loan Council were affected, and the Premier explained that that was the case in regard to South Australia. So, throughout December most of the Premiers indicated very strongly how the Federal Government's action would affect their State. There was silence from South Australia. Most State Treasurers released details of projects that might be affected, but the South Australian Treasurer took no such action. On 21 December, under the headline 'Funding clamp not to hit South Australia', the Premier was reported as follows:

A Federal Government clamp-down on Government borrowing outside the Loan Council would not hit South Australia.

He went on to say that South Australia was well adapted to State Government borrowing being subject to Loan Council approval. That was music to the ears of Treasurer Howard and Prime Minister Fraser. They had support from the South Australian Government for their actions.

This was the Premier's considered statement: it did not affect us; we were well adapted. It is a clear enough



indication that the Premier was not concerned about leverage leasing. I, for one, was not satisfied with that response, and on 4 January issued a statement pointing out that the Premier's attitude was extraordinarily short-sighted. I said that this option might well be something that South Australia would need in the future, and indeed the information I had at that time was that South Australia was in fact already using leverage leasing deals.

There was nothing clandestine about my information; it did not come from leaked documents: it came from information available to every member of the House. In view of this, the Premier's statement at the end of last year was an amazing admission of ignorance. Perhaps he should have spoken to his Minister of Transport about the use of leverage leasing by the STA, or to his Deputy about the use of the scheme by ETSA. He could have read *Hansard* at page 83, where in Estimate Committee B on 6 October the member for Albert Park asked the Minister of Transport:

Can the Minister explain in greater detail what is leverage leasing and the advantages that the STA sees in using leverage leasing?

The Minister told the committee that the arrangements had been fully discussed with Treasury officers (discussions of which the Premier was apparently unaware) and asked the STA Chairman, Mr Jim Rump, to explain more fully. Mr Rump told the committee that leverage leasing was 'a system introduced in New South Wales by Neville Wran's Government as a means of financing public transport operations. It quickly caught on in other States and is an effective and efficient way of financing public transport.' So, according to the Premier, this did not affect us. If the Premier missed that exchange and did not know about those discussions, perhaps he might have taken the trouble to read the official Treasury report tabled in this House, to which I have already referred. It was tabled 10 full days before his statement on 21 December. On page 64 there is a section, headed Further Comment on Financing of Capital Works and Equipment, which reads as follows:

All Governments in Australia have in recent years been using more varied techniques for financing capital works and equipment. Of particular relevance in the present context are leasing arrangements. The Electricity Trust of South Australia leased equipment to the value of \$9.3 million in 1980-81, and the State Transport Authority to the value of \$15.2 million [both by way of so-called leverage leasing arrangements—the things the Federal Government wants to stop]. The Electricity Trust of South Australia and the State Transport Authority can be expected to arrange further amounts of around \$7.4 million and \$8.5 million respectively in 1981-82. It seems likely that, for various reasons, the use of more varied techniques of the kind referred to above will continue and, indeed, become more common.

Apparently, that is what does not affect South Australia. The only conclusion I can come to is that the Premier simply did not know what was going on. It was clear to me that something had to be done and that the end of these deals would have considerable effect on our overall financial arrangements. As I said in a statement to the *News* on 7 January:

The Premier, Mr Tonkin, must stand up for South Australia's right to draw on private finance when he meets the Prime Minister, Mr Fraser, later this month. South Australia may need to use leasing deals to finance future State projects. Mr Tonkin is being extraordinarily short-sighted if he believes the Federal clamp on funding outside of the Loan Council will not affect South Australia.

A week later, apparently, the Premier was finally briefed, and he lumbered into the fray. The *Advertiser* on 13 January reported the Premier saying that he was prepared to take up the issue at the Premiers' Conference to be held on the 19th. The *News* on 19 January announced that the Premier 'would fight the Federal Government over South Australia's right to use private finance for State projects'. Good Lord! Almost a month behind the rest of Australia the Premier and Treasurer of South Australia catches on. But what

chance have we got when our Premier who has the job of putting forward our State's point of view has so clearly and publicly displayed his incompetence?

So this is the sum total of the Premier's credibility and influence interstate: a sycophantic endorsement of the Prime Minister and his policies (changed around just lately with a cosmetic attempt to suggest the opposite); the State's financial strength eroded by two years of incompetent management; the State's bargaining position at the Loan Council weakened by two years of massive transfers of capital funds, not to mention the effect that the failure to spend those capital funds where they should have been spent has virtually destroyed our building and construction industry; and a Premier ignorant of key financial arrangements entered into by his own Treasury.

The Premier's failure nationally, and indeed his failure to manage the South Australian economy properly, have left him totally compromised and too weak, effectively to control his own Cabinet. In that context I turn to the third point that I made at the beginning.

At the end of last year we had the prime example of this. It was clear to everyone in this House that the member for Victoria, the Chief Secretary, could not continue as a member of Cabinet. It was a matter not of personality but of public policy and public confidence. The evidence of inefficiency and incompetence was such that action had to be taken. Increasingly we have seen other Ministers having to take over the sensitive areas of the Chief Secretary's portfolio. The Football Park lights issue had to be given to the Minister of Transport to take over. The remand centre is now being handled by the Minister of Industrial Affairs, and the inquiry into prisons has been taken over by the Attorney-General, as was the inquiry into the Police Force. The Minister of Agriculture has become the *de facto* Minister of Fisheries, and so it goes on. The Chief Secretary remains, and no doubt the catalogue of projects, ill-conceived legislation and delays will grow longer, despite the hurried attempt over the past two or three days, in the face of possible censure in this Parliament, to indicate, in the absence of what should have taken place, that the Chief Secretary was actually doing something in his portfolio. Because the Premier was too weak to act, too ineffectual to take charge, the malaise that affects this portfolio will deepen. His problem is that his lack of performance in his own area, in his own leadership, has been hopelessly compromised in dealing in a hard manner and directly with those of his colleagues who simply are not performing.

Again, the Chief Secretary stands out in this area; we have argued this in the House. The problems surrounding the administration of his portfolios (we concede that there are some difficult areas there) are symptomatic of this Government's style. The attention that has been focused on the Chief Secretary could be focused on a number of other Ministers, and again we have had the same problem—the Premier's inability to deal with them, either by removing those Ministers from the Ministry (he has absolute power in that respect) or putting them in some other area where they might do a better job.

One could go through the catalogue but I need only mention Ministers such as the Minister of Education, who has presided over disasters in that area, alienating not only teachers and parents but also anyone concerned with the quality of our education in South Australia. I could mention the ineffectual activities of the Minister of Environment, and the botching by the Minister of Agriculture of the wood chip and pulp mill plant project which will cost the State dearly. I could mention the Minister of Health's aggressive approach in slashing hospital services and the giving away of the hospitals agreement to which we had the Commonwealth bound. I refer also to the demonstration

in another place by the Hon. Murray Hill of the contempt in which this Government holds local government, despite all that it has said about it. So the list goes on.

Changes are needed and fresh blood is needed, but the Premier does nothing: he sits inactively. All these problems are bearing down on the Premier, and he must find something to do or say about them. What has been his response? It has been to try to shift the blame on to others. It has culminated, of course, in the recent campaign against the Federal Government because of his own financial problems. When Labor was in Government we said (and we say it now) that many of the problems of the State in financial matters do derive from the policies of the Federal Government—policies that we have never supported, unlike the Premier and his Cabinet. But, when the Premier talks about Federal-State talks becoming little more than avenues for political grandstanding, we can only assume that his comments are based on the experience of his own performance. It has even led one of his own senior back-benchers to publicly rebuke him. Soon after his dramatic announcement that he would seek a new deal in Canberra, the Hon. Mr DeGaris told the *Advertiser* that the Premier himself had to take his share of the blame. Indeed, that is true. The truth is that, after being so gullible and so deluded as to back Malcolm Fraser, the Premier has now realised that there are some considerable and fundamental problems in our Federal structure which his predecessors in the office of Premier have struggled to overcome and which he had overlooked. He was only too ready in Opposition to claim that the State Government was totally irresponsible. It is worth recalling what he said in his Budget speech in September 1978, as follows:

The people of South Australia are growing sick and tired of the Government's continual blaming of the Federal Government for almost everything.

One has merely to read the papers of the past few weeks. The Premier also said previously:

Why is South Australia's financial position so much worse than that of other States? The answer must be because of the State Government's poor administration . . .

Let the Premier remember those words. He also said:

Finally, when will the State Government stop blaming someone else and whingeing about it, accept the situation that funds are short, and prepare positive plans to help South Australia? When will it stop whingeing and start doing something for South Australia?

We throw those words right back to the person who uttered them: the Premier of South Australia. How about his stopping whingeing and getting on with the job for South Australia? He would have us believe that now things are different. The truth is that in 1978 a Labor Government in South Australia was under attack by a Federal Liberal Government which was intent on trying to break agreements which had given benefits to South Australia.

This Government is now finding out the hard facts of life. As a classic example, I refer to what happened this morning, when the Minister of Agriculture realised that he was not going to get a deal with the Federal Government for financial help for Riverland peach and pear growers—not a cent of assistance. He was told that he would have to wait and he might get something if the I.A.C. looked at it in some weeks or months time. What are the fruit growers going to do with their rotting fruit? This Minister asked for assistance from this Government federally that endorses his policies. He got nothing—not a cent. He has had that bitter experience, as have many other Ministers in the course of time.

South Australia is now facing one of the most critical periods in its history. It is a time when we will have to make decisions and formulate plans that will set the direction of our State throughout the next decade. We must act

against the background of considerable problems; I do not think anyone has attempted to hide this. While we are all aware that this State has great possibilities, we must make a realistic assessment of the opportunities that are open to us. As we enter 1982, the key job-creating industries in the manufacturing sector, which have guaranteed our prosperity for more than two decades, are facing major restructuring.

On the other hand, we are well placed to take advantage of resource development, despite the Bjelke-Petersens of this world. Indeed, the exploitation of the Cooper Basin is already producing tangible returns to the State. But, the benefits will come only with careful planning; they will not fall into our laps. Nationally, we face a Federal Government intent on forcing its 'new Federalism' on to the States, regardless of its effect on our ability to provide the services that the community expects and the infrastructure that industry needs to develop. That new Federalism policy was once claimed with pride by the Premier as being a product of his own authorship in part. We have a Federal Government determined to bind the States to its economic philosophies and high interest rate policy, regardless of the hardship that this causes.

This is a time in the history of our State which needs a Government and a Premier capable of facing up to the difficult decisions that are before us and making those decisions. It needs a Government and a Premier that will make a hard-headed assessment of the realities of the State's position and not simply mouth empty clichés, empty rhetoric, about what a great place this is. Let us get down to the nitty gritty, let us analyse our strengths and our weaknesses, and make them real to the people of South Australia and to those interstate and overseas to whom we are trying to sell our services and facilities.

The Government is incapable of that realistic assessment. It needs a Premier who can put South Australia's case to the Federal Government and to other Premiers with determination, vigour and, most importantly, with credibility. Alongside that ability to act, South Australia needs a Government with a vision necessary to galvanise the whole community, to take them into their confidence, and to work towards economic growth and security on a co-operative basis. Unfortunately, in 1982 we have a compromise Government and Premier, who is not capable of any of those actions, of that vision, of that co-operative activity. The Premier has failed, and he should resign.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer):** I must say that I have rather mixed feelings about this no-confidence motion this afternoon. I am amazed on the one hand and gratified on the other, because certainly, as we would expect, the Opposition has demonstrated once again that it is the most unscrupulous and most unprincipled Opposition in South Australia's Parliamentary history. There is no question that the misrepresentation of facts by the Leader of the Opposition, which is obviously supported by his colleagues, bears out that fact quite well. It has shown, too, quite unmistakably, that it is bankrupt in performance and policy, and that it is extravagant only in personal attack and polemic. Certainly, I could find very little that was not a personal attack in that speech. It is to be expected, but today we have before us a motion that is so vague, so broad and basically so ill-founded as to be laughable. Let us consider this matter carefully, because it is most significant. It is what has not been said this afternoon that is important. The Opposition has done a complete turn-about, a complete switch away, from its much publicised and promised attack on the Chief Secretary, and the handling of the prison system, something promised to us by the shadow spokesman at great length, and reinforced by the Leader of the Opposition. He said, 'We are going to get into the Chief Secretary

and move a motion of no confidence in him.' What it comes down to is that this attempt, ironically, I suppose, at a no-confidence motion represents a tacit motion of confidence in the Chief Secretary.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Well may members opposite laugh, but that is what they have done. It is also an admission by the Opposition that the policies and plans recently approved and announced by the Government for the very significant upgrading and future management of the State's prisons have Opposition endorsement. One is always impressed by the enormous courtesy shown by the Opposition when things are not going well and when things are being said that they do not want to hear. This is the only conclusion that can be drawn from this rather puzzling switch in no-confidence motions which has become apparent today. I can think of no other. The only conclusion to be drawn from this rather sudden turn-around is that Caucus had to sit down and realise its tactics this morning—perhaps at the battle breakfast that it was having. Who knows? There is clear evidence of the very real progress made by this Government and the Chief Secretary in the area of prisons. The Opposition has been forced to accept that more progress has been made in this matter in the past 2½ years that this Government has been in office than was ever made by the former Government in nearly 10 years.

I repeat that in the light of these significant advances even the Opposition could not be seen to be continuing with any credibility on that main thrust of attack. Patently, such criticisms and statements as have been made in the past and which were promised have now been shown to be without foundation. They could have had no credibility. I congratulate the Opposition for finally recognising the truth of the matter, although it has not stopped them in their personal criticism of the Chief Secretary and their personal attacks on members on this side of the House.

**Mr Keneally:** Will he be there until the election?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am grateful for their endorsements.

**Mr Keneally:** Will he be there until election day?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Stuart will assist the conduct of this debate if he is silent.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** This attitude highlights the enormous significance of the abilities of and the general attitudes towards Parliamentary process by members on either side of the House. I suppose a no-confidence motion in the Premier was the next best prospect, and that could be seen. Again, the reasons given in the motion for expressing such no confidence are totally without foundation. I was surprised, too, that such a move should be taken. I thought the Opposition might have been better advised to have stuck to Question Time. But, then I remembered the succession of hallucinations expressed by some sections of the Labor Party recently and given some prominence by some sections of the media, suggesting that the Liberal Party was not a united Party, was not a Liberal Party and that various people, named and unnamed, implied and otherwise, sitting almost anywhere on this side at any one time, according to the imagination of the Labor Party spokesmen, were trying to stir up some sort of trouble. That is totally laughable. It is quite obvious, on reflection now, that the Labor Party is in an even more serious position than I thought. They actually believe their own hallucinations and they hope to drive some sort of wedge between the front bench and back bench of the Parliamentary Liberal Party. All I can say to that is, 'some hope!' As members on this side will willingly testify, if this is the only hope that the Opposition has, they had better give up hope now.

Nevertheless, I am grateful for the opportunity now being given to speak on the financial strengths of South Australia

and the management techniques adopted so successfully by this Government. As for the implied criticism of members of my Cabinet being incompetent and ineffective, I can only say that the Labor Party, by its switch from its no-confidence motion in the Chief Secretary, which it has regularly promised, to this rather wishy-washy and generalised motion gives the lie to the inference the Opposition makes in that motion. I can add very little to their vindication of the Chief Secretary. To be valid, from the implied comment that has been made, we must assume that the Ministers have been incompetent and ineffective. But, my answer to that is, 'In whose opinion is that so?'

Frankly, the opinions expressed by the Opposition for purely political and mischievous reasons do not concern members of this House in any way, shape or form. Had the Opposition gone ahead with their motion of no-confidence in the Chief Secretary as it promised, we would have had an opportunity to bring up the facts and to say how foolish and ill-advised such a motion would be. However, the Opposition has chosen not to do so and has vindicated the Government's handling of the present position. There are so many vague imputations in the motion that leave so many questions unanswered.

The Leader of the Opposition referred to some inability of this Government, and particularly of me as Leader, to make decisions as to Ministerial portfolio. I cannot remember who first promoted the idea of a Cabinet reshuffle on this side of the House, but I rather think that it was an official press release from the office of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, where he so kindly set down what he thought the Government ought to do. It caused quite a degree of concern and, in fact, mirth amongst members of the Parliamentary press corps.

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

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** He had a few hallucinatory episodes while he was acting Leader. No-one said that there was going to be any change in the Cabinet in the new year, although it was widely promoted by the Opposition and taken up by some less well-informed members of the media. I had made no reference to any reshuffle in the new year. Only the Deputy Leader did that. Now, of course, because it did not happen, he is either very cross or is capitalising on the fact that something that he said was going to happen did not happen. Therefore, there is something terribly wrong. I rather think that those matters do not concern him. The Deputy Leader would do better to look around him and see what is happening in his own Party.

In criticising the Ministry (and that is as far as we have gone), is the Opposition suggesting for a minute that the Minister of Transport has been found wanting in the very week that work has seriously begun on the north-eastern busway, a magnificent transport system which will be totally and absolutely welcomed, not only by my colleagues, the members for Todd and Newland, but by the people whom they represent? Is he criticising the Minister of Transport? I do not know. He has not made it very clear. Is he criticising the Deputy Premier? Is the Deputy Premier, according to the Opposition, at fault because of the tremendous job that he has done in attracting enormous and massive investment in South Australia's resource development? We know that the Opposition does not particularly care for the uranium policy and development of this Government. That is not all members of the Opposition. I hasten to exclude those members opposite that I know perfectly well would love to be getting on with the job.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** Just less than half.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Just less than half may be, but is that the reason why they are suggesting some form of incompetence on the part of the whole Cabinet? I do not know. Is the Opposition suggesting that the Water

Resources Minister has failed in some way because of the enormous work that he has done and is continuing to do in the Murray—water resources, and so on?

I could go on listing the achievements of individual Ministers, but their records speak for themselves. I suggest that this Government is indeed fortunate to have a top-class team, a team that is a great deal better than Governments in the past. Each Minister has my complete confidence. The Minister of Public Works, to whom the Leader referred earlier as being responsible for the remand centre, is indeed responsible for building that centre. Perhaps the Leader should go back and see how these things are organised.

He talks about the police inquiry and says that the Attorney-General has the running of it. Who else should have the running of it? He should talk to his colleagues, perhaps those behind him, who have a slightly closer knowledge of the law. He talks about the Minister of Agriculture somehow dictating the fisheries policy. I do not know; I have not noticed it, Mr Speaker. The Minister of Agriculture gets well and truly on with his job in primary production, but there is no way that he dictates fisheries policies to this Government; let me say that. So, each Minister has made a major contribution to the revival of this State in the past two-and-a-half years.

Let us turn to the economic position of the State and its financial management. From the outset, let me put the position quite clearly. Contrary to the repeated gloomy pronouncements, and (I suspect) the hopes, of the Leader of the Opposition, South Australia is doing well. We have faced up to the shortages and difficulties which we have, the shortages and difficulties which the Leader of the Opposition so recently said that we had and should be prepared to front up to. The point is that we have fronted up to them from the day that we took office, because we were forced to front up to them.

I am proud to say that the State is now embarking on a new era of prosperity and development not experienced since the boom years of the 1960s. That is the clear fact of the matter. The situation has not been achieved by accident or by good fortune. It is the result of some 29 months of tough economic management based upon commonsense principles, the sort of commonsense principles that are forgotten by honourable members opposite. In other words, you cannot spend more than you earn.

This applies to State Governments. They cannot spend money that they do not have. The State's economic future lies largely with private enterprise.

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

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Of course, I realise that the member for Baudin is still a committed Keynesian, but no-one else really is. During the 1970s these principles were not recognised by successive Labor Governments. The results of that decade, a decade of economic stagnation, provide concrete evidence of what Labor policies mean in cold, hard economic facts. While the private enterprise States of Western Australia and Queensland were enjoying boom years, South Australia under a Labor Administration, need I say, dedicated to bigger government at the expense of the private sector, languished on the sidelines, but now those days are behind us.

My Government has made enormous gains in restoring the flow of investment dollars into this State, encouraging business establishment and expansion, attracting oil and gas and mineral exploration, and boosting business confidence. It is imperative that we do not lose the impetus which has been built up over the past two-and-a-half years. South Australia is on the move again and we intend to keep it moving. The people of South Australia have every reason

to feel confident and optimistic about their future and the future of their children.

Before I outline the economic indicators which demonstrate clearly the steady economic improvement and growth in this State, I would like to summarise briefly the national and international economic climate which impacts on South Australia. The stagnation in most of the advanced economies, except for Japan, is expected to continue well into 1982, with increasing unemployment in the United States, West Germany, France and Britain. Australia's export prices and volume of export sales are being affected by weak international markets. At the same time as inflation rates now seem to be falling in competing countries, the Australian inflation rates and increases in wage costs (and I emphasise the increase in wage costs) appear set to go above O.E.C.D. average levels in 1982. The published information that we have on wage levels now does not yet include the many large settlements that we have seen in recent months. The December quarter's inflation rate upsurge largely reflected decisions made in the Federal budgetary context, with health scheme changes, sales tax increases, and State charges raised to compensate for reduced Federal sourced funds in real terms.

While on that matter, I find it quite extraordinary that the Opposition in this State should be hammering away at the effects of increased charges, calling it hidden taxation of some kind, in some way pretending or suggesting that charges did not ever go up while it was in office, when members opposite know perfectly well that they did, and ignoring the massive increases in State charges now taking place in New South Wales under a man whom we have been told is the Leader's idol, the example for everyone to follow. Yet Mr Wran, the Premier of New South Wales, is increasing State charges at a rate far in excess of that adopted in South Australia. Industrial power rates, we are told, are up 33 per cent, yet the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has the gall to make public statements about the increases put into effect by the Electricity Trust of South Australia.

Despite the sombre international outlook, the O.E.C.D. and most other economic forecasters looking at Australia expect a slower but a still reasonable growth in the gross domestic product in 1982. This growth will be supported by continued high investment in long-term resource projects, and it will result in fairly strong consumer demand. For South Australia we have a good chance of sharing in the benefits of these two strong areas of development project investment and strong consumer demand.

Let me now demonstrate how South Australia is already beginning to benefit from the firm and decisive economic policies my Government adopted from the time it came into office in 1979. Our existing strong industrial and commercial base has been strengthened and encouraged. We are adding further resource development which will bring guaranteed increases in growth and prosperity, and it is in this area that South Australia is outstripping every State.

We have only to look at the figures. Before I do that just let me refer to the Opposition's propensity for using key economic indicators to predict its doom and gloom. Members opposite use the indicators they want to use which tell their story, and which help them, without going back into the past to see where the basis for those indicators began. Then they only half use another lot of indicators and only half tell the story, the story that suits them. There are, of course, the indicators which they do not bother to use, which they keep right away from, because they do not suit their story at all. It is, one could say, a blatantly dishonest use of statistics.

Exploration licences and the resultant expenditure in South Australia have boomed since this Government came

into office. On-shore mineral exploration licences have increased from 123, as at June 1979, to 369, as at June 1981. The number of companies involved in mineral exploration has doubled to 70, and 420 000 square kilometres was involved in exploration last financial year, compared to 145 000 in 1979. Expenditure for exploration in this area has risen from \$7 200 000 in 1978 to \$31 100 000 in 1980, and we find the same picture of growth and optimism quite irrefutable in the area of petroleum exploration licences. When this Government came into office, except for the Cooper Basin virtually no other petroleum exploration was being undertaken. Expenditure committed to petroleum exploration over the next six years is \$330 000 000. Half of this amount is being spent on off-shore petroleum exploration. Even the expenditure that Santos is contemplating over the next 12 months in the development of the Cooper Basin field and all its pipeline activities and the Stony Point development has gone up by some five times. It will be spending \$1 300 000 a day in this coming year on the development of that facility.

A large proportion of that money will come back into the South Australian community and will provide that very security—and I mean security of employment for more people, and prosperity, which Tom Playford always used to call 'the need to have some money in your pocket'. It will supply that for an increasing number of South Australians. Business in South Australia has a great confidence, particularly in exploration; this level, resulting in high levels of expenditure, is creating hundreds of new job opportunities.

When this Government came to office only one drilling rig was operating in South Australia. During the past two years this has increased to a record level. There are now 12 on-shore rigs working in the Cooper Basin region; there will be more arriving within the next few months. This year rigs are likely to drill more than 100 000 metres, at a cost of some \$35 000 000. This growth in mining activity is beginning to reflect in increased committed investment in major manufacturing and mining projects. In October 1979, soon after the Government came to office, only \$300 000 000 was committed for major manufacturing and mining investment for the following three years. That figure has leaped dramatically to \$2 910 000 000 as at June 1981, an increase of some 870 per cent. This is money which we must remember is being spent by investors in the future of South Australia; it is money that was not being spent previously, and it will mean thousands of new jobs in South Australian industry, jobs that simply would not have been there if this Government had not gone out of its way to encourage private investment in the future growth of South Australia.

Before the Leader gets terribly excited, I might say that these figures do not include Roxby Downs—no investment in the Roxby Downs project, currently categorised by the Federal Department of Industry and Commerce as being in its feasibility study stage, which it is. These figures make a nonsense of persistent Opposition claims that resource development will not mean jobs; further, they make a nonsense of Opposition claims that the Government, to use the words of the Opposition, is unloading everything on to one big project in the future, that the single answer to South Australia's economic future involves tying South Australia into the nuclear industry.

The Government is talking about straight-out exploration and investment projects and not, at this stage, about Roxby Downs. Can members imagine the envy and the pride that would have been promoted by the Labor Government of the 1970s if it had been able to point to figures anything like these? We would not have heard the end of it. Indeed, as an Opposition in those days we would have been very pleased for South Australia, too, and we would have given credit where credit was due. Yet, the Opposition Leader

here seriously, I believe, claims that we have done nothing for resource development and the existing industrial base of this State except to encourage the development of Roxby Downs, something that is not even included in those most amazing and encouraging figures.

It is no wonder that the Leader of the Opposition chooses to ignore those figures when looking at the financial and economic state of South Australia; they do not suit his argument. But I am afraid that he cannot change them to make them suit his specious argument, and the sooner he stops deluding himself and the divided forces behind him and to his left, the sooner we might be able to generate a reasonable and sensible economic debate in this State.

Let me now turn to the manufacturing, retailing and service industries. A special study of development projects has been undertaken in terms of capital expenditure announced by these industries during the past 2½ years. The list itself is impressive. It now accounts for more than \$850 000 000 of new capital investment, which is the latest figure we have available, and the study is not exhaustive. As I have said many times before simply there are development projects which, for commercial reasons, are not made public in the early stages, but this commitment so far has an impact, a potential impact on employment, of well over 3 000 jobs; that is, 3 000 new jobs for the South Australian community. It involves more than 85 organisations which have either been established in South Australia in the past 2½ years or have extended their activities in this State. Again, these figures would have been the envy of every Labor Government of the 1970s, and the fact remains that the Labor Governments of the 1970s were not able to achieve them. I do not know whether it is jealousy, or whether it is just plain Party politics being put above the benefit of the State.

**Mr Lewis:** Perhaps it is ignorance.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Perhaps it is ignorance, but why do not members of the Labor Party rejoice with other South Australians that such progress has been able to be made? Nothing that the Labor Party did in 10 years can be compared with what this Government has achieved, actually achieved (not simply announced but actually achieved) in just 2½ years. The Government's record of job creation is a complete reversal, too, a mirror image of the trends that it inherited. During the last two years of Labor Government (I have said this many times in this House and I will say it again many times), 20 600 jobs were lost in the private sector. That is the equivalent of twice the work force employed by G.M.H. and Mitsubishi in this State. However, during the 2½ years since my Government came to office the number of new jobs created totalled 22 100 as at December 1981.

Let me repeat the figures: in the last two years of Labor 20 600 jobs were lost; in the 2½ years we have been in office 22 100 jobs have been created. No one can take away that achievement of the Government. Total full-time and part-time employment in South Australia as at December 1981 stands at 569 500, the highest level for the five years since January 1977. Let us see members opposite turn that one around.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** It means more people—

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am very interested to hear that, because Opposition members have been telling us, in a rather dishonest way, that the number of people in South Australia is declining.

**The Hon. D. J. Hopgood:** We never said that.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I think the Leader of the Opposition was caught out in that bending of the truth.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am sorry if members opposite do not like it, but that is true. It is the highest level for

the five years since January 1977, and the result of Labor's economic mismanagement and the tragic loss of jobs was a dramatic rise of 6 800 people on the unemployment queue and countless thousands of people then moving to more prosperous States.

Again, this Government has reversed those disastrous trends inherited in the late 1970s, and although unemployment is, as I totally agree, still unacceptably high, the Government has dramatically slowed the rate of increasing unemployment—something better than has been done in other States. We have every reason to be pleased with our achievements to date in that regard.

Our population, since the subject has been mentioned, has in fact increased during 1980-81 by the highest rate for three years. Why have we not heard that from the Leader of the Opposition? That is one of the statistics that is an economic indicator that he would rather keep under the hat a bit. The number of people choosing to live in South Australia is on the increase for the first time since 1977. All I can ask is, 'Where is the basis for the continued doom and gloom that is preached by the Opposition?' I am not denying (and no-one would deny) that severe problems still face South Australia. That is part of the challenge that we all have to face. There will always be some economic indicators that will show that we are lagging behind other States in certain respects. I do not deny that full economic recovery will require further prudent management and tough decision making; it will.

The point is that there must be prudent management, tough decision making and a total co-operative effort by all members of the community. I believe that the Development Strategies Report highlighted that very fact. Although the Opposition has done the best it can to pour cold water on that document, it has been well accepted in other, more enlightened and balanced circles and it offers a tremendous hope for the future of this State. The signs of revival (whatever the Opposition says) cannot be denied. Those indicators are the ones it does not suit the Opposition to use.

Let us consider other economic indicators. The latest available figures show that retail sales in South Australia increased at a greater rate than in any other State. Last year increases in retail sales outstripped sales in New South Wales and Victoria, and were only marginally below the national average. Are these grounds for gloom and despair? I do not believe so. I believe that that shows a very healthy trend. Although motor vehicle registrations in South Australia were behind registrations in most other States on a population share basis last year, the December quarter showed a marked improvement in registrations for South Australia. That was our best quarterly performance for the year, and it is moving up, because the motor car industry is, without a doubt, beginning to strengthen with the stability that has come from the decisions now made and conveyed to the industry. It should be noted also that total registrations across Australia in 1980-81 were nearly 606 000, just below the record level of 1976. That level of sales provides enormous hope for the car industry in South Australia and gives every reason for returning confidence.

I would like to take this opportunity to assure the House of the continuing confidence being expressed by both G.M.H. and Mitsubishi in their future in South Australia. Mitsubishi has made quite clear that it has no intention of leaving South Australia, in spite of some of the reports stirred up by members opposite. In the past few days G.M.H. has scotched an unfounded rumour, which I understand just happened to find its way to the surface from the Leader's office, about the continued operations of its Woodville plant. There is no question but that the Woodville plant's operations

will continue in the foreseeable future, and suggestions to the contrary are destructive, ridiculous and mischievous.

The I.A.C. recommendations adopted by the Federal Government assisted G.M.H.'s operations in this State. Car panel pressing at G.M.H. will continue at an increased rate. It will soon be supplying world markets; and other contracts are in prospect. The plastics plant at G.M.H. is operating at full capacity and, indeed, some way will have to be found to increase its output and capacity. Yet before Christmas the Opposition claimed (as honourable members might recall) that the Woodville plant was in jeopardy.

At the same time I remember that the Opposition bleated about the possible closure of B.H.P. at Whyalla. According to the Leader, B.H.P. would pull out of Whyalla. In fact, B.H.P. spent \$81 000 000 the previous year, and I may say that some of the executives of B.H.P. are rather looking forward to their next meeting with the Leader of the Opposition, because they would like to tell him a thing or two. Both stories were completely unfounded, and yet they created distress and undermined confidence in South Australian industry at the worst possible time. Why the Opposition should peddle such destructive and demonstrably ill-based nonsense is totally beyond me.

I can only suggest (and indeed I offer the services of senior officers) that the Leader of the Opposition consult senior officers of my department. Why does not the Leader go directly to the companies concerned to check his information? Perhaps he received the information in perfectly good faith. I do not know. However, I suggest that he check the reliability of information that he is being fed before he causes any more unnecessary alarm in the work force.

I am very pleased indeed to have this opportunity to refute another of the Opposition's frequently stated distortions of the truth. Responsible financial management has been a cornerstone of this Government's administration, and we can be proud of that. Major reforms have been introduced to not only improve the budgeting systems within Government but at the same time to provide Parliament with greater opportunity to review and question Government programmes. The introduction of programme performance budgeting and the establishment of Estimates Committees within Parliament have greatly improved accountability to Parliament. No other Government in Australia has done more in this respect, and this action is receiving attention and favourable comment from economic and financial experts throughout the world.

We are committed to sound financial management, a truth open for all to see, backed up by action. I find it incomprehensible that the Opposition continually accuses the Government of financial mismanagement when it knows that these accusations are not borne out by the facts. Of course, the State budgetary situation has been difficult. It has been my job, as Treasurer, to ensure that difficult and financial decisions are taken and implemented to minimise the impact of those difficulties. This is the job that we all have to do, a responsibility that we all have to face up to. We inherited a situation from the previous Government, and I do not intend to go into that now, other than to say that the Labor decade resulted in a massive build-up of debt. That debt must be repaid, and that is something that members opposite just do not seem to understand. Those debts must be repaid at increasing interest rates.

Projects such as Monarto and the Land Commission still hang around our necks like financial millstones; even though we have been able to pay off the debts to a large extent, it has cost us capital that we could well put into other areas. Misguided investments in the Frozen Food Factory and in other non-viable ventures through the South Australian Development Corporation have all resulted in losses that this Government has had to come to terms with and



to write off. The Monarto project alone will probably result in a net loss of \$10 000 000, after sales revenue is taken into account.

All right, so there was a small credit balance in one account when this Government came to office, but those funds are a drop in the ocean compared to the massive debts and losses that had been run up. This Government has resolved the situation through sound and careful financial management. The Fraser Government took some six years to return the Federal Budget to balance, or to a small surplus position, after the wild spending of the Whitlam Labor Government years. I believe that we have done an excellent job in holding the line while paying off the debts of the Dunstan decade, a task that has been nearly completed in 2½ years.

Labor Governments are Governments of higher taxation and bigger spending. They believe in bigger government, an economy dominated by taxing and increased Government interference, and this approach has been confirmed again by the A.L.P. conference and by the attitude adopted by the N.S.W. Premier. We reject this approach, as I am sure do all thinking South Australians. Governments do not create wealth—they like to spend it, some of them far more than others. If governments become too big and too dominant in the economy, private enterprise will retreat and employment opportunities will diminish, resulting in a lowering of the prosperity and security for which we are striving for all South Australians.

Yes, this Government has reduced State taxation, and we believe that that was something that the people of this State wanted, demanded, and, in fact, deserved. Despite a tight budgetary climate, we were convinced that State taxation was too high and had to be reduced to restore incentive to the community. We could not leave those State taxes on when they were off in other States. We were just not competitive. We had to regain that competitive edge.

Death and gift duties were abolished, land tax on private homes was abolished and a substantial stamp duty rebate was provided for first home buyers. Payroll tax incentives were introduced to promote employment, particularly for young people. Despite these tax cuts and the tight financial situation, we have maintained our very high level of public services and at the same time presided over the largest welfare housing programme in South Australia's history, something of which we can be very proud and something which the Opposition chooses to ignore.

This year the South Australian Housing Trust has a \$100 000 000 building programme. These budgetary moves clearly demonstrate our priorities to help people in need. Our high degree of success in managing the State's finances has occurred in a climate of ruthless cuts in funds to the States from the Commonwealth. Let me tell members of the Opposition that there is nothing artificial about the approaches that are made at Premier's Conferences or to the Prime Minister and the Federal Treasurer about South Australia's needs. The thing that I find quite remarkable is that the Leader of the Opposition in his recent speech seems to set himself up—I suspect that the member for Hartley will see the nonsense of this—as a better operator than his colleagues, Mr Lowe from Tasmania (I should say, former colleague—he was deposed by the socialist left) or Mr Wran in New South Wales. He, apparently, is going to walk into the Premier's Conference and succeed where experts like Mr Wran, Mr Bjelke-Petersen and Sir Charles Court have failed. He does not really know very much as yet. The facts of life may become apparent to him one day but I doubt that they will as Premier.

The Federal Government budgetary situation has resulted in the States being forced to carry more than their share of the load. Since 1978-79, Commonwealth payments to

South Australia for Loan purposes have fallen dramatically behind the inflation rate. I think that this is something we ought to look at very carefully. The present increase in total funds available to us when compared with the c.p.i. inflation rate for the last three years and estimated for the financial year are as follows: 1978-79, increase in total funds from the Commonwealth—2.2 per cent, c.p.i. 8.2 per cent; increase in total funds in 1979-80—4.2 per cent, inflation rate (c.p.i.) 10.1 per cent 1980-81—9.5 per cent, and even that did not make the c.p.i. rate of 9.4 per cent; 1981-82— increase in total funds 5.4 per cent, as opposed to 10.9 per cent c.p.i. (just about half).

The effect of the trend when compounded clearly indicates the diminished funds available to us to provide services for South Australia. I estimate that if the real value of total funds, revenue and loan, had been maintained since 1977-78 South Australia would have received an additional \$256 000 000 this financial year—an additional \$256 000 000 that we would have had for our Budget this year. The other States have been in the same position. Fortunately we have been in a strong position, having adopted those sound management techniques right from the outset. I have found strong evidence that the former Premier, the member for Hartley, had come to that conclusion soon after he took office, and was beginning to move in that direction, too. We have been particularly successful *vis a vis* the other States, bearing in mind those restrictions.

South Australia's total share of funds for all purposes from the Commonwealth was 11.2 per cent during 1978-79, and it has been steadily eroded. It may not sound much, but when it is related to the large sums involved it has meant South Australia will receive \$124 000 000 less than it otherwise would have received. I am referring to the funds from all sources. You cannot overlook that situation when analysing the State Budget. One thing comes through quite clearly in all these criticisms and all the things that have been said by the Opposition today: no positive suggestion has been made by the Opposition as to what it would do in the same circumstances. The only thing we have to go on is the performance of the Wran Government, a Government which is now in diabolical trouble. So far, the Leader has not put forward any alternative plans or Budget strategies which take into account the financial facts of life that we have had to face up to.

I refer briefly to infrastructure borrowings, the fault not of the Commonwealth but of the previous Labor Government. Because we did not have major projects ready to get off the ground, we could not get infrastructure approval from Loan Councils. While the other States had their projects ready to go, because they had not discouraged private enterprise, South Australia had very little to go for in this regard. The comparative figures are quite worrying. South Australia's share will now continue to increase under the development policies of this Government. Without major development projects South Australia would not attract infrastructure Loan funds, and this was the situation when the Labor Party was in office. If South Australia is to keep moving along the road to recovery in economic growth and security, obviously it has no option but to stay with the Liberal Government.

I have outlined the major contributing factors relating to South Australia's budgetary situation, Commonwealth cut-backs, the inherited massive Labor debt and a smaller share of Australia-wide infrastructure borrowing. This Government has very carefully steered through these problems, and I am confident that the public realise the sound financial management principles applied by the Government. The Opposition has not been game enough to outline specific plans and policies. We can only wonder how it would have responded to the financial pressures affecting all States. I



repeat that I find it difficult to know on what basis the present Leader of the Opposition thinks he could succeed at Premiers' Conferences when his colleagues from the Labor States—far senior colleagues—have been unable to succeed.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** He can't even keep his own house in order.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Yes, he is having trouble keeping his own house in order. We started on responsible financial management long before the New South Wales Government admitted that it had astronomical problems. The reduction in public sector employment carried out without a single retrenchment is saving South Australian taxpayers something like \$50 000 000 in wages each year. It has not been an easy thing to achieve but it has been done. It has been achieved without any drop in the standard of the South Australian Public Service. While my Government has pruned the Public Sector by something like 4 000 jobs, it is with some alarm and disbelief that I see that the Labor Party is intent on going back to those excessive days of the 1970s, reactivating the waste of the Dunstan years, something from which even Mr Wran has now resiled. Let me quote from the Labor Party's policy:

The public expenditure policies of a Labor Government will increase public sector spending to maintain services in real terms per head of population.

There is very little doubt that the days of waste would return. One of the things that the Government has had to do in the past 2½ years is dismantle some of the expensive public schemes established by the previous Administration, and I have already been through some of those. But without prompt action by this Government that expense would have increased the interest bills and high cost production techniques built up. We have taken that action. Let us look at another Labor Party policy:

A State Labor Government will consider the establishment of small pilot projects to evaluate the social and economic benefits of enterprises organised under work management, and co-operatives.

That sounds pretty familiar to me, because those pilot schemes have been tried before, and certainly we know that they do nothing but cost taxpayers money and turn investment away. Then we read:

A Labor Government will move to establish a State daily newspaper independent of commercial control, along the lines of the A.B.C.

The cost of that operation from taxpayers' pockets will be felt in every household in this State. The Labor Party's policy documents are littered with such promises which would guarantee an enormous increase in the size of the public sector—a huge additional financial burden on the taxpayers of South Australia. I might say that taxation is the key answer which the Leader of the Opposition is afraid to quote, the key answer to the policies that are being put forward by the State Opposition. Labor's policy also states:

The taxation policies of a State Labor Government will be guided by the following principles: ability to pay, efficiency, administrative simplicity, and the need to provide sufficient revenue growth to finance improved Government services.

How is that revenue growth going to be achieved? Let me quote again from the font of all wisdom, the State Labor Party policy paper, which states:

A State Labor Government will . . . where possible regulate its financial position by raising tax rates rather than cutting public expenditure programmes.

It is there in black and white, and the people of South Australia will judge it for what it says. Nothing could be clearer than that. A Labor Government would 'regulate its financial position by raising tax rates rather than cutting public expenditure programmes'.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** They are going to make electricity cheaper.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** They are also going to cut State charges; they have said so. How, I do not know, unless they are going to make massive increases in the levels of State taxation. That single sentence which is quoted in the Labor Party's policy sets out the clear differences between the philosophy of this Government and the beliefs of the Opposition. I challenge the Opposition to ask the people of South Australia. Let them put it to the people of South Australia in the daily press. We have had a certain amount of activity about reduced taxation in the daily press just lately. Let them ask the people of South Australia whether they want increased taxation. Let them ask the people and see what the result is. I know what the result will be, and it will be expressed at the next poll.

We have already proved by massive cuts in State taxation that we stand by our belief to introduce lower taxes. We are prepared to stand by our commitment that lower taxation provides incentives to the community, to the work force and to potential investors. I do not have to say it, because it has been said for me already except it has been misinterpreted: I have made strong representations on that score to the Commonwealth Government, and I will continue to do so. Two years ago this Government abolished land tax on the principal place of residence.

*Mr Trainer interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** What is Labor's attitude to that? Again, let me quote from A.L.P. policy, in case the member for Ascot Park is not familiar with it. It states:

A State Labor Government will maintain progressive taxation on unimproved land values.

That is pretty clear and unequivocal. Labor's opposition to the original legislation removing the burden of land tax from the average householder is quite well known. I am sure that it will be remembered. It means that a future Labor Government would reintroduce land tax and other taxation measures not outlined in the policies, and they could easily be there in contemplation.

We have also redirected investment dollars from other States into South Australia, and we are only just starting. For the Opposition to claim, as it has done, that there has been no economic revival in South Australia is a nonsense. It can be demonstrated to be nonsense. For the Opposition to claim that its policies will make the people of South Australia better off is equally ridiculous. Our policies are working, and we and the taxpayers of South Australia have every reason to be pleased and satisfied at what has been achieved, given the difficulties and comparing our position with that of other States. I am sick and tired of hearing the Opposition continually, and wrongly, talking down our State. The Public Buildings Department will, in fact, be calling construction tenders estimated to cost a total of \$100 000 000 over the next 12 months. So much for the Leader's remarks about the non-availability of capital works because of a lack of capital funds. I will let the honourable Deputy Premier go through those projects, estimated to cost \$100 000 000, later on.

The Government is deeply concerned with the effects of higher interest rates on home buyers in South Australia, and many initiatives have been taken. Again, the Deputy Premier will deal with those matters, too. We have been assiduous in our approaches to the Federal Government seeking some form of relief for home buyers, small businesses and people on the land who are being very seriously disadvantaged by the present interest rate level. Again, the Leader saw fit to misrepresent the situation. I did not say that there was no hardship. I simply reported what financial institutions were saying to me. I know that there is great hardship, but I am only grateful that so few people are seriously at the stage of losing their homes because they are being forced out and sold up because, hardship aside,

it is that ultimate of being forced to sell one's house that really hurts and disadvantages people. The Government has taken direct and innovative action to boost welfare housing. The Housing Trust capital works programme this financial year will be a record, as I have already said. We have done everything we can to assist home buyers. I might say that I was the only State Premier to list interest rates as a separate agenda item for the Premiers' Conference that is to come. We will do everything we can.

Labor in South Australia would perhaps follow the so-called success of the New South Wales Wran Labor Party. New South Wales is now described as the 'insolvent State' disappearing financially under heavy Government expenditure and suffocating debt. This trend, apparent in New South Wales, is common to all Labor Governments, following the policies dictated by the Labor machine, and South Australia could expect nothing less under that same administration in this State. Why should it? It is those calamitous Wran policies that the Opposition has been studying and advocating for South Australia. I repeat that South Australia is doing well. We do have a plan. It is a plan that we are sticking to, and we are not going to be put off by the pathetic bleatings and ideological suggestions of an Opposition devoid of positive ideas. The people of South Australia have a genuine reason to feel a growing pride and confidence in this State.

I must say that I am grateful to the Opposition for the opportunity that it has presented to me today to put the record straight about financial management and economic development. The Opposition has begun the new Parliamentary year by putting before this House a motion without substance, a motion based, I suspect, on hallucination, but it has given me a chance to say quite emphatically that there are clear and unmistakable signs of genuine economic recovery. The indicators are there; only the Opposition chooses to ignore them. It has given me a chance, too, to underline the fine achievements of every member of the current Ministry. South Australia is on the brink of a new era of development and prosperity, and not even the carping criticism and wishful negative thinking of the Opposition can change that.

**Mr Millhouse:** Do you seriously mean every member of Cabinet?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** This is a sad motion put forward by an Opposition not only divided but even sniped at by the member for Mitcham on its strength—

**Mr Millhouse:** Come on, just answer the question.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:**—and bereft of ideas.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I totally and absolutely reject the motion.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Adelaide):** There is one thing that is certain following the reply of the Premier, if one could call it that today, and that is that this is a one-term Government. Of that there can be no question. The Premier failed on every account to answer the allegations made by the Leader of the Opposition. There has been a clear and utter indictment of the performance of this Government outlined here today with no rebuttal whatsoever. In fact, I would go so far as to say that the Premier had that speech ready for some occasion such as a Chamber of Manufactures dinner or something of that nature, because he was under the impression (and I suppose one can understand that) that a vote of no-confidence would be moved against the Chief Secretary here today.

Of course, when that did not occur, I imagine that the Premier had to run to the cupboard to get out some speech that had been prepared for some other occasion. Otherwise, he would clearly have done much better than he did in his

reply to my Leader. The Premier can huff and puff and sort out figures to his own credit if he wants to. He can turn figures around and use them in their wrong context, but, whatever he does, he cannot deny the indisputable fact that we are heading towards having 50 000 people unemployed in this State. The figure is still increasing. I am prepared to say that when the figures come out on Thursday I would not be surprised if we have not then gone beyond 50 000. In fact, I contemplate a rise of some 3 000 or 4 000, which will put us in excess of 8 per cent of the work force, which will be a shame. But, I do not want to deal with the economic circumstances of the State, because my Leader has done that quite creditably. He laid the case for the Opposition, which no-one could dispute. The factual situation outlined by him was completely unanswered by the Premier.

I want to deal with some things that have been happening in the Liberal Party. The Premier accused the Opposition of being in some turmoil and difficulty and of experiencing some division. I put that to rest immediately. There are no divisions on this side of the House. The Leader is in no difficulty. In fact, he is much more stable than any Leader in Australia. There can be no question that he is gathering strength day by day not only in relation to his Party comrades but also out in the work force, where it matters most.

Rather than decrying the Chief Secretary's performance and efforts over the past couple of years, I give him some credit, because I do not believe that one can blame him for all the mistakes and blunders that have occurred in his portfolio. One could say the same about the Minister of Education, who has not been a success, either, in his portfolio. In fact, he has been a complete failure. If one talks to parents and teachers, there is no question about that.

But, I do not hold either of those two people directly responsible for their performances, because they cannot do any better. That is the simple fact of the matter. I hold the Premier responsible. Surely he ought to be in charge of the Cabinet and who ought to be changing the portfolios. He has the complete and utter right under his Party's conditions. He has a dictatorship: he can move people in and out of portfolios. He has failed South Australians in that regard.

It is no good the Premier, the Deputy Premier or any Government member trying to fend off the position that was going to occur some time in January in relation to portfolio changes. There is no question about what was going to happen then. Before this session resumed there was to be a change in portfolios, and something happened on the way to the circus. I wonder what it was. Was it that the Chief Secretary dug his toes in and said, 'I am not going to be shifted'? That is one of the stories circulating around Adelaide.

Other stories are also circulating, but I do not know whether they are true. I will certainly give the Chief Secretary the opportunity to respond to them at some stage if he likes. One suggestion is that he would stand down from his portfolio if his son could be assured of preselection for the seat of Victoria. That is rife around Adelaide and rife in this House, and it has been said here not by me but by members of his own Party.

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I have been accused of starting the rumours; that is what the Premier said a moment ago. What did the Premier say to Grant Nihill? The fact is that the Premier did decide to have a reshuffle. He told Grant Nihill in an interview for the *Advertiser* that a reshuffle was imminent. Earlier, he indicated this to Tony Baker of the *News* and, I am told, to a television journalist. One must try to understand why that did not happen. Journalists, politicians, and the public (indeed almost everyone in South

Australia) believed that a new front bench would be sitting when we came back at the beginning of this session.

One must try to understand what happened within Liberal Party circles to prevent that. If the Chief Secretary was able to dig in his toes and stop the axe falling, good on him. But, there is no question that the back bench of the Liberal Party and its Ministers wanted some changes to their present portfolios. No-one can dispute that point. But what happened? We have seen a further backing off by the Premier, who is not using his strength and position in Cabinet to decide who would occupy which portfolios. He backed off and did not have the gumption to proceed in those circumstances. I believe the rumours that were circulating around the corridors here, in the press, and amongst the public, that there was to be a change. As I said, the plan came unstuck.

I now turn to opinion polls. Every such poll over the past 12 months, including the Liberal's own Gardner polls, showed that the Tonkin Government cannot survive. I do not need to concern myself with polls. The non-popularity of this Government is shown in the real world, wherever one wants to go. It does not matter to whom one speaks: this Government is in a bad state of decline. In other words, it is on the skids. The Morgan Gallup poll published in the *Bulletin* in December showed the A.L.P. on 47 per cent and the Liberals on 36 per cent, which is a fairly wide margin. On anyone's additions, it is 11 per cent. It certainly means that the Government has a long way to go even to have a chance of surviving at the next election. I was told that the last Gardner poll was disastrous for the Government, and that its distribution has been restricted. If that is not the case, I challenge the Premier to release that poll now so that his back-benchers can see for themselves exactly what is in it.

We also now have the lowest rating Premier in Australia; he now has a disapproval rating equal to his approval rate. His standing in marginal seats is even lower than for the State as a whole. As I said, it is a fact that this Government is in a decline from which it cannot rescue itself. Irrespective of the huffing and puffing that the State might have to put up with, its big advertising programme that is about to be undertaken in relation to its performance and other political humbug that we have to listen to, the Government is in that state of decline, and cannot return from it. Another poll published in the *Advertiser* last year showed that nationally the Premier is rated by only 1 per cent of Australians as the most effective Premier. That is humiliating for a State that for years had a Premier who rated as the most respected political leader in the nation.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** They caught up with him.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** No-one caught up with him, because he is still a very popular personality throughout Australia. Wherever one goes people say, 'What is Dunstan doing these days? He was a great Premier and a great Australian.' It is no good the Minister of Education trying to decry the efforts of a man like Dunstan, because the public will not accept it. I might tell a story one day in this House about something which happened in Whyalla a few weeks ago and which I would not have believed had I not seen it with my own eyes. Unfortunately, I do not have time to do so in this debate. I will certainly tell members the story at a later time.

I can recall Bob Hawke visiting Adelaide last November. He made the comment that the difficulty and the trouble about South Australia was that we did not have a Premier who would stand up and fight the Prime Minister. If one needs any further evidence of that, it has happened continually while this Premier has been in office. He supports completely, almost invariably, everything that is done by the Prime Minister and the Liberal Party federally. It is only recently, because he has been advised quite strongly

to change tack, that he has changed tack, because it is survival now; it is survival for this Government. This is election year, or very close to an election year, anyway, and it now means survival or failure. That is why the Premier has at last decided to criticise the Federal Government. So, it is not surprising that his deputy last year told a meeting of the Budget Review Committee that there was no point in making longer-term decisions, because the Government would not be re-elected, anyway. The statement was made in front of senior public servants and earned a rebuke from another Minister, the Attorney-General, who was present.

I knew that the Deputy Premier would try to laugh that off as being a non fact, but he knows very well that what I am saying is true. One notices the article in the *Age* where he refused to comment when asked to do so by that good journalist, Mr English. The Deputy Premier refused to comment, which leads me further to believe and to be convinced that there is no question that those words were uttered by the Deputy Premier. Let us look at what the article in the *Age* said. The article by the senior South Australian journalist, David English, confirmed the accuracy of the statements that I made about the Deputy Premier's outburst, and I would like to quote from it. It said:

The South Australian Premier, Mr Tonkin, is under increasing pressure from within his own Party to reshuffle his Cabinet and improve his performance.

That is not Jack Wright. It is not someone on this side of the House or some uninformed person uttering those words. It is one of the most informed journalists making that point, and he goes on to make some more, as follows:

Some sections of South Australian business, the main power that launched the Liberals to office two years ago through heavy election support, have also been critical of the Tonkin Government.

I find that wherever I go, wherever I mix with business people, leaders of the community, people who make decisions on behalf of the community, opinion makers within the community, all invariably criticise and condemn the performance of this Government. In fact, I can hardly get anyone to say that the Government is performing as it was expected to perform by the business community of this State. I quote further:

The Deputy Premier has refused to comment on his alleged criticisms, saying that any comment would improperly give the claims credence, but other sources in the Liberal Party have confirmed the outburst by the Deputy Premier. They said it was not disloyalty but frustration that caused it.

That was not some Labor back-bencher who said that. It was Liberal Party sources who confirmed that the Deputy Premier had said what I said he had said. The quote continues:

Liberal Party sources also claim that there was an attempted back-bench revolt against Mr Tonkin in October. A small group of back-benchers approached both Mr Goldsworthy, the Deputy Premier, and the Health Minister, Mrs Adamson, about a move to topple the Premier.

I am still quoting from the paper, the *Age*. I recommend it as reading for the back-bench. I continue with the quote:

However, both of those declined and the move therefore faded away. Back-benchers say the Premier is too scared to sack his henchmen from portfolios.

I am only quoting what a leading journalist is saying about the Premier and about the state of the Liberal Party in South Australia. It is all right for the Liberals to get up and accuse my Leader of not having loyalty and accuse us of having divisions within our Party, but when it comes back they do not like it.

**An honourable member:** You made it up.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I did not make it up at all. I am quoting from David English, who I believe is a very thorough journalist who has a very high reputation.

**Mr Mathwin:** An unbiased man, too.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I would be very careful about accusing Mr English of not treating this thing correctly, because he may just decide to name people if members opposite start criticising him too publicly. The quote continues:

Mr Tonkin's personal stakes and those of his Government are not good. Mr Tonkin's reluctance to reshuffle his Cabinet in an attempt to lift the Government's standing is exemplified by the case of the Chief Secretary, Mr Rodda, who, despite a disastrous two years as Minister, one Royal Commission into prisons and a still unfinished investigation of the claims of police corruption, is still holding office.

I believe that the Chief Secretary is holding office because he dug his toes in, because he stood up for himself and told the Premier to go and jump in the lake. The Premier jumped in and he is still in. It is pretty evident that the Chief Secretary is now going to survive probably until the end of this session. I would think the new moves, if the courage redevelops within the Premier, will probably come after this session has concluded. That was the Melbourne *Age* which, as I said earlier, should be on the compulsory list for reading of back-benchers. If members do not have copies of the article, I will certainly see that they get it on request.

However, members on this side did not need the *Age* to confirm the Deputy Premier's lack of confidence in his Leader. The Public Service was buzzing with the story following the Budget review incident. I heard it in three or four quarters. Quite obviously, David English must also have heard it, started to check, the facts came together and then he wrote the article for the *Age*. I am sure the Deputy Premier has seen the *Age* article. If he has not, I will put him on my mailing list and he can also get it.

At the moment the Government is mounting a last ditch rescue plan designed to prop up the Premier's image. I am told that Rex Jory has told the Premier that he has to appear to be standing up to Malcolm Fraser, even if the transcript of the last Premier's Conference showed that South Australia's Premier was the only State Leader to sit back and cop everything dished out to him by Malcolm Fraser. So, suddenly we have had front page articles in the *Advertiser* about the Premier's being unhappy regarding the Federal Government's new tax cut proposals.

I want to talk about electricity charges. Several weeks ago, I released to the media the electricity accounts of one family which was concerned because there has been a 56.3 per cent increase in its power bill over a two-year period. We know that this Government has been consistently using back-door taxation. It has been sneaking up State charges time and time again, on the one hand trying to blare out the publicity saying that it is a low-taxation Government. We will produce evidence before the next election that it is the highest taxation Government that this State has ever seen—not the lowest but the highest, without any question.

This steep increase between the September 1979 quarter and the September 1981 quarter occurred even though electricity consumption by the family had increased by only 4.3 per cent over the same period. I pointed out that such a tiny increase in usage would hardly be equated with more than a 50 per cent jump in the bill. During the same period average weekly earnings have risen by only 25.2 per cent in South Australia, less than half the rate of the increase in the bills. That is what this Government is about. That is how this Government gets its revenue. It is taxing, in most circumstances, anyway, twice as much as the average weekly earnings have gone up in the period. If that is honest government and honest taxation, let this Government live or die by it. I suggest that it will die by it.

I have also pointed out that the big increase in mid-1981 had not even been announced by the Tonkin Government. The Government receives 5 per cent of all ETSA revenue,

and this year the Premier expects to receive about \$15 000 000 from the levy, a 61 per cent increase compared to the figure in the last year of the Labor Government. The 61 per cent increase almost balances with the account that I produced showing that a person had suffered a 56 per cent increase in electricity charges. In my release I pointed out that the big increase in 1981 had not even been announced by the Government. The Deputy Premier's spokesman said that that had always been the case. He told the *Advertiser* that ETSA set and announced its tariffs. That is baloney. When Hugh Hudson was Minister he announced ETSA's rises and even had the guts to do it during an election period. The Labor Government never ran away from its taxes and charges, because it qualified to the people of South Australia what the revenue was being raised for and what the community was to get out of taxation rises and increases. This Government puts them on, and then hides behind them. The effects of this release were quite amazing. There was an extraordinary sequel to my reference to the journalist of this family's account. The Government engaged in what appeared to be a witch hunt to identify the family that had complained to me. Opposition staff were rung by a senior ETSA official wanting a copy of the accounts. When asked why, the ETSA official said that it was because he did not believe the accounts were true, implying that I was in fact a liar.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** This is ETSA.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** Yes. In fact, photocopies of the accounts with the family's name removed were given to a number of journalists in order to authenticate my story, and I still have those accounts. The family wanted their name removed in order to avoid repercussions. It was pointed out to the ETSA official that, whilst they were welcome to have the press statement, permission would be needed from the family before the actual accounts were given to ETSA, as the Government might still be able to identify the people, even with the name and address removed. The official accepted this as the proper and courteous approach, to check with the family, but when the family said 'No', the ETSA official turned nasty. He said that the Government did not believe the figures and that, if the accounts were not turned over, the Deputy Premier's office would issue a statement attacking me.

There was quite obviously collusion between ETSA and the Deputy Premier's office, and although the Deputy Premier just interjected by saying that it was an ETSA representative who was talking to us, it is clear that there was collusion between the Deputy Premier's office and ETSA, because when I refused to give the official the accounts he said that the Deputy Premier's office would put out a statement attacking me. So far that statement has not come; that is interesting. Again, it was a case of the Government getting public servants to do its political dirty work. I do not blame the official.

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

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** There is no rebuttal about it. I am looking for the rebuttal concerning the accounts. I do not care how much the Deputy Premier attacks me; that is quite incidental. I am attacking increases in State charges, and so far there has been no rebuttal. As I have said, it is a case of the Government getting public servants to do its political dirty work. I do not blame the official. His manner indicated that he was under a lot of pressure from the Deputy Premier's office.

Meanwhile, a senior journalist, who had checked and authenticated the accounts before running the story, was also rung up by ETSA and asked to supply the copies, through the back door. What an extraordinary incident, where the manager of ETSA would ring the journalist who was provided with the documents in the first place in order

to authenticate them and ask the journalist to give them to him. It is unbelievable and extraordinary, to say the least. I have no doubt that that would have been on the instructions of the Minister.

Those accounts were correct, and since then we have had a flood of people ringing up and telling us the same story, telling us about the Premier's back-door taxes. The Premier might not care less, but a letter I received yesterday indicated that another family, too, had an increase of slightly more than 50 per cent in its electricity bills during the same two-year period. Another constituent who phoned my electorate secretary said that his family, which consumed a lot of electricity, and which was therefore on a higher tariff level, had a 29.5 per cent increase in the bill, even though there had been a 5.8 per cent decrease in usage. There is no escape from the allegations I have made about these electricity charges; no escape whatsoever. I have the accounts, in the case of the three families, to authenticate exactly what I have been saying. The Government has quite clearly sneaked charges on.

There is no question that the authentication of those documents is available, without the names of the people being shown on any one, and there is no question that those increases have occurred, unannounced by this Government; it was left to the ETSA officials to announce them. The Government hides behind its own increases.

I know that time is getting very short, but I have one more point to make concerning bankruptcies. The Premier has been noticeably quiet about this, but South Australia, under his management, has reached yet another milestone. According to the latest *Commonwealth Gazette*, last month South Australia achieved the dubious distinction of registering some 2 000 business bankruptcies since January 1980. So much for business confidence! But perhaps that is why business leaders in this town are quite openly saying that the Premier has got to go. The motion by my Leader today calls on this Government to resign because it is no longer competent to run the affairs of the State. I support that motion to the hilt. All members on this side will clearly support it and we expect the Government to resign immediately.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier):** I was told, I think on good authority, that the Labor Party members all had breakfast together this morning; someone called it a combat breakfast. All I can say is that they were eating magic mushrooms and they have a severe case of indigestion. To use the words of the Premier, I have never heard such a lot of hallucination in the time I have been in this place.

**An honourable member:** A battle breakfast.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** A battle breakfast; it was magic mushrooms, nothing less. Members opposite are talking nonsense. It was one of the duller afternoons that I have experienced until the Deputy Leader got up, but, the further he went, the more I was intrigued by the way in which his mind works. He was talking nonsense, and I spell that with a capital 'N'; it was absolute, patent nonsense.

Let us get the facts straight, before I deal with the Labor Party's alternative. Let me put to rest the absurd suggestion that I said at the Budget Review Committee that the Liberal Party would lose the next election. The Leader could not even read the report in the *Age*. He read into that that Mr English had rung me and that I had refused to speak to him—a completely erroneous conclusion. English at no time attempted to speak to me. Mr English highlighted the fact that the allegation was so absurd that I declined to comment. I said that I would not dignify the nonsense with an answer.

We know that the Deputy Leader addressed the conference of the Young Labor movement. I do not know whether that is called a congress or a conference, but it managed to muster 30 from the breadth and length of this land to go to the conference. If one wants to make an impact on impressionable young minds, one can find a way to do it. I was interested to see what the boss of the Young Labor movement thought about the wealth tax, but that is another question. He took Mr Hayden to task almost daily. He had to make some impact, so what better way than to make up a story?

I find that hard to credit, but the only credible alternative was that a public servant who appeared before the Budget Review Committee was hallucinating. Either the Deputy Leader or a senior public servant was hallucinating. The Deputy Leader persisted in his story, so I checked with my Parliamentary colleagues on the Budget Review Committee and with the senior public servants who are in regular attendance; they enjoyed the joke as much as I did. The suggestion is patently absurd and completely false.

One of the problems today has been that the Leader and his Deputy continued to make other statements that were equally absurd and false. For instance, the Deputy Leader does not even know that ETSA is not part of the Public Service, its employees are not public servants, it is a statutory authority, and there is no statutory requirement for ETSA to tell me anything. The Deputy Leader had no doubt, he said, that the General Manager of ETSA had telephoned on my instructions. Again, that is a complete fabrication—an absolute and complete fabrication. Obviously, ETSA was disturbed about what the Deputy Leader was saying, so it thought it had better make inquiries, quite independently of any inquiries that I was making.

People in ETSA were worried about the false impression that the Labor Party was seeking to create, because rises in South Australia for electricity charges have been more modest than have increases interstate. I suggest that the Deputy Leader should consult Mr Wran and the Victorian Government in regard to electricity tariffs. He conveniently forgot to say that it was the Labor Party that brought in the tax on ETSA in the first instance. In 1973, the Labor Party introduced a surcharge because the then Premier, Mr Dunstan, was having trouble with his deficit, and he said so in the House; he brought in a 3 per cent surcharge on ETSA turnover. Subsequently, in the next year, he thought he was on to a good thing and raised the surcharge to 5 per cent, and it has stayed at that level ever since. The Deputy Leader said that the Government did not announce tariff increases, as the Hon. Hugh Hudson had done. That is a complete fabrication. On only one occasion did the Hon. Hugh Hudson announce tariff increases, and that was when a special levy was raised by ETSA to pay for the Northern Power Station.

I have more faith in the public of South Australia than has the Opposition. If the Deputy Leader believes that the public is so gullible as to swallow what he says, even when he has to make up falsehoods to try to build a story, he is wrong. I have a much higher opinion of the intelligence of people in the community. If the Labor Party's performance today and if what we have heard is the best that members opposite can do, I suggest they do not have any more battle breakfasts. The last time the Labor Party heavies had a breakfast was with a fellow called Khemlani, and we know where that got them! One would think that they would steer clear of breakfasts after that lot. Perhaps they should give it a miss.

**Mr Langley:** We did not have a breakfast.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** If not, that is in keeping with what we have heard this afternoon. The honourable member opposite said he was not there—it is a

good thing he missed it. This motion is a wide-ranging and scatter-shot motion. Members opposite hope that by this motion they will hurt someone. I vaguely recall three or four very weak no-confidence motions, but this takes the prize. The previous motions were so weak that I cannot remember who was involved, let alone what they were about. I am reminded that we have had no-confidence motions in the Chief Secretary, the Minister of Education, and the Minister of Health, linked with water resources. Those motions were so pathetic that I cannot remember what they were about.

No-one who has witnessed this charade this afternoon will remember tomorrow what it has been about. This is the weakest afternoon of debating and effort that I have heard since I have been in this place, bar none from the Opposition, of course.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Let us consider what the Leader said. The Deputy Leader said nothing, but the Leader made a few allegations. I have asked this question in the House previously and I still have not received a response—what is the Labor Party offering except criticism of this State, criticism of the efforts of people to get this State going, and criticism of the Federal Government? What is the Labor Party's alternative plan? One must search the records.

*Mr Langley interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Unley is not assisting the debate.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** One must search through the public record to find what the Labor Party is offering. We know precisely what the A.L.P. has offered publicly, through the press and in this House. I have recited the Labor Party plan to the House previously, and I will not belabour the point, but I will quickly refresh the Leader's memory. The Labor Party's economic plan to save the State includes increasing Government spending, reducing State taxes and charges, including electricity (after its having introduced the surcharge because the Labor Government was broke in the affluent days), putting more people on the Government pay-roll, giving them fewer working hours, and balancing the Budget.

That is official Labor Party basic strategy. We even have a later, up-to-date edition, entitled 'Labor's plan to bring the State back.' It is a report of the annual corroboree, the annual conference. I will recite, for the benefit of members and any others who care to listen, the Labor Party's plan. The Labor Party will shrivel up, because it knows that its plan is absurd nonsense in the hard times being experienced in this State. No-one denies that we are crawling out of the Labor trough. This plan is the A.L.P. recipe for recovery. It states:

A State Labor Government will:

Work towards a minimum of four weeks annual leave plus payment equal to at least one week's pay based on the aggregate weekly earnings of the employee.

Provide for increased leisure time for employees in a manner appropriate to particular industries with no loss of pay. This provision envisages, either

- (i) a four, four and a half or five day working week; or
- (ii) a nine day working fortnight; or
- (iii) a 35 hour week; or

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** My colleague calls himself a small business man and I can understand his mirth. Members opposite are the friends of small business! It continues:

- (iv) increased leisure time by a reduced working year according to the circumstances of an industry, and any other method agreeable to unions and employers.

I will not read the whole plan because time is pressing and it is a bit long-winded—and ineffective. It continues:

A State Labor Government will:

Intervene before the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission to support the trade union movement—in its legitimate attempts to put into effect Labor's Australian and State policies.

Provide preference to unionists.

We all know what that means—no union, no job!

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** That is how it worked before. The plan goes on:

Legislate to provide workers with proper and adequate superannuation schemes with provision that the workers will participate in the management of the schemes and be provided with all information relevant to the management and investment of the funds of the scheme . . .

(a) ensure that long service is on the basis of three months leave after 10 years employment, with pro rata leave entitlements after five years, and

(b) ensure long service leave for casual workers . . .

provide for paid study leave for approved trade union courses for a minimum of 10 days per year for trade union members.

Minimum periods of six months notice should be given to employees to be retrenched. Severance pay for retrenched workers should be based on a minimum of four weeks pay in respect of each year of employment.

This is the recipe for recovery. It continues:

In no case should a person get an amount in severance pay exceeding that he/she would have received if he/she had remained in the employment of that employer until the normal retiring age.

Let me skip through this. It is all here:

Labor declares that industrial democracy is an essential element in the need to establish democratic rights for the working people. A State Labor Government therefore will implement reforms in the employment relationship so that the working people are no longer the objects of economic and work circumstances decided by other people. Labor will legislate—

The business community will love this. I wonder whether they have read it.

**Mr Millhouse:** Get on with it.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** We do not want to run out of time. It says:

Labor will legislate to ensure that the working people, through their unions, will have an effective say in decisions that affect their work and lives in the work place. Industrial democracy will be achieved through: gains made by union members in their work places and industries; and legislation, awards and negotiated agreements providing union members with rights and conditions in relation to specified matters—

bad luck if you are not in the union—

agreement that the industrial relations system is based upon the trade unions as the legal representatives of employees.

If you are not in the union, you have no legal rights. It continues:

Where employees are members of trade unions, the shop stewards or job delegates are the local union representatives of the work force; only accredited union representatives shall represent union members in forms of industrial democracy; provisions which ensure that union members and their representatives shall have the right to all information relative to the operation of the enterprise or industry; provision of appropriate educational facilities and educational opportunities for trade unions, employees and management.

This is the economic package to fix the State's ills! Members opposite do not like it; they want to shrivel away from it, but it is in black and white. Further:

Paid education leave should be provided to enable union members to undertake such education courses. Provision should be made to prevent termination of forms of industrial democracy without the agreement of the unions and their members; provision to ensure that economic gains resulting from the introduction of industrial democracy are directed to the betterment of union members. The policy of union involvement means that no discussions should take place between the Government, the Public Service, Unit for Industrial Democracy or other similar body and employers until the appropriate unions have been notified and involved [you cannot move a muscle without the union]. No specific industrial democracy programme should



take place in the work site without the agreement of the unions. A State Labor Government should play a leading role in demonstrating the importance of this principle by instituting such a policy in the public sector and ensuring that the Unit for Industrial Democracy acts in accord with this principle in both the public and private sectors. A State Labor Government will introduce facilitative legislation where necessary to provide for the principles enumerated above.

I wish they had had a bit more publicity. Let the public know what the alternative is. Let the public know what they are being promised. I hope they read this lot; I hope they get the chance. It continues:

... which would include amendments to a number of Acts, the principal Acts being the Companies Act, Public Service Act, Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act and Acts which establish statutory authorities.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Is the Leader ashamed of this? If the business community will buy this from the Labor Party when he says that they are disaffected with us, I shall be very surprised. So it goes on, page after page of the same stuff:

Preference to unionists will be extended by councils to all officers, staff and wages employees... undertake to redress the present imbalance in the distribution of resources by giving the highest priority to the redistribution of income, wealth and power... evaluate the following promotional programmes: a free computer booking service—

so that they can travel. Then we go on to the State-run press. That got some publicity, and I will not spend any more time on it. If that is the official document for the recovery of this State, Lord help us. If members of the public get a chance to peruse this and come to terms with it, no way will they buy it, because as I said earlier they have had to deal with a whole series of fabrications. I do not believe that people are gullible enough to believe those fabrications, let alone swallow what is in this. The facts have been put by the Premier in relation to developments that have occurred in the areas for which I am particularly responsible to the Government, and they have been significant indeed. I will not go through those again, because the Premier has enumerated them.

However, I have a number of significant pages here of the good news—material supplied to me by my colleague the Minister of Industrial Affairs, indicating the very significant growth occurring in that sector. He has highlighted a number of the more significant ones, but there are about 10 pages, and I would be quite happy to give the Leader of the Opposition a copy of these projects. This is an indication that it is not all doom and gloom and not all pessimism as the Leader continually tells the public. I am quite sure my colleague the Minister of Industrial Affairs will be only too happy to make this available to the Leader, because it outlines a very significant increase in activity in the areas for which he, too, is responsible. We have had a significant announcement regarding the Adelaide Airport (and full credit to the Minister of Transport) involving \$7 500 000; Adelaide and Wallaroo Fertilizers, \$14 100 000; Adelaide Brighton Cement, \$14 000 000; Australian National, \$72 000 000; Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited (which the Premier mentioned, when all the Labor Party can do is cry doom and gloom in Whyalla) involving extremely significant expenditures, that company making a significant contribution, and more recently in the rail-rolling mill it has opened at Whyalla. I had the pleasure of going through that facility recently to see what contribution and what increased activity is involved there for that part of the South Australian community. Eglo Engineering—and so the list goes on.

This Party is a united Party despite the desperate attempts of members opposite to paint us in other colours. We know perfectly well the problems that the Leader is having. We

know that he is whistling in the dark to keep his courage up, and we know perfectly well the debate that goes on behind the scenes. We know we have a back-bencher, a former Cabinet Minister, who publicly accuses his Leader of treachery and, being about as strong as orange-flower water. We do not get that in the Liberal Party. Members opposite have to resort to fabrications, because this is a united Party. This South Australian Cabinet would be the most harmonious and effective Cabinet in the land, and that is very largely due to the efforts of the Premier. To suggest that I, for one, or any other member of Cabinet, or indeed of the back bench, would seek to undermine the Premier is patently absurd.

**Mr Keneally:** I'm sorry Roger—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Stuart is fully aware that in the House a member is referred to by his title, be it an official title or his electorate title. The honourable Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I refute entirely as a complete fabrication the little story which the Deputy Leader told to his Young Labor Congress. I was interested in his reaction to the suggestions in relation to wealth tax, but it has bobbed up in the State Labor platform, I notice. We completely reject any suggestion that there is any division at all in this Party in the Cabinet, the rank and file of this Party, and certainly in the Parliamentary Party. Everyone in this Party rejects that statement for what it is—completely absurd.

Just so that we can get something out of what I think has been a waste of Parliamentary time in the Opposition's moving this cynical motion, I move:

Delete all words after 'that' and insert the following:

In view of the Premier's unceasing activities in the interests of the people of South Australia, his careful husbanding and building of the State's resources for future economic growth and security, and the achievements of his Cabinet for the benefit of all South Australians, this House expresses its complete confidence in the Premier and his Government.

The House divided on the amendment:

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

Noes (21)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Millhouse, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried.

The House divided on the motion as amended:

**The SPEAKER:** With the concurrence of the members of the House, no-one having left the Chamber, I intend to lock the doors and take the count immediately.

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

Noes (21)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Millhouse, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.



### LAND AND BUSINESS AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

### SEEDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

*At 5.7 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

**The SPEAKER:** Call on the business of the day.

### EXPLOSIVES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 3 December. Page 2321.)

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell):** This short Bill was introduced prior to our recent break. On first examination it appears to be a minor measure, occupying only one page. Nevertheless, small though it may be, it should not be exempted from the principles that ought to apply when new or amending legislation is before the House. First, we should ask ourselves whether it is necessary, and, secondly, if we find that it is, we should ensure, by examining the Bill's contents, that it does what it purports to do satisfactorily. Possibly the third test we should apply is whether the legislation, on its face, needs alteration or amendment during its passage through the House.

On the question whether the Bill is necessary, one can conclude fairly easily and quite sensibly that it is. Fireworks are now available on a fairly restricted basis to persons holding a permit for entertainment purposes. All members would agree with that. Clearly, they have done so in the past because that is the present legislative position. In his second reading speech, the Minister pointed out that, when a permit is given, present safety guidelines are issued to applicants.

Of course, the problem therein is that they are just that, namely, guidelines and not really enforceable rules or regulations. The Bill sets out to provide for a regulatory power for that very purpose to be added to the existing powers that are contained in the parent Act.

Clearly, at a public performance of fireworks the possibility of accident and hazard through carelessness or misuse is always present. I recall a fireworks demonstration that I attended some years ago which was meant to be of only a semi-public nature, in that it involved a number of families getting together to pool a fairly large quantity of fireworks. The owner of the house at which this semi-public demonstration was to be held was a careful person and had placed all the fireworks in a fairly large wooden box with a wooden lid, so that prior to the performance commencing there would be no hazard to anyone, including the numbers of children who were present.

In order to keep the kids happy they were issued with some sparklers, which most people considered to be fairly innocuous. They were ignited and the children were waving them around. I can tell the House that within about 30 seconds it was the most spectacular fireworks demonstration that I have ever seen, as one kiddie dropped the sparkler on top of the wooden box with the wooden lid and some of the sparks got through the crack in the wooden lid. Then,

for about 15 minutes, there was a tremendous fireworks demonstration which was entirely unrehearsed and somewhat disorganised.

There were persons going in all directions, the children crying and yelling, and so on. I do not wish to introduce an undue note of levity, because the whole purpose of the Bill before us is to try to provide for more safety in these matters, where accidents could have resulted in injury. Fortunately, there was no injury, although I still know one lady present at that performance who ever since has been extremely afraid even of sparklers, let alone going to another fireworks demonstration. I do not think I blame her because there were things like catherine wheels and sky rockets whizzing around past people's heads before we could get the box under somewhat more control. It was certainly a great demonstration of the explosive power of fireworks.

If we look at the provisions presently applying in respect of supplying fireworks to provide entertainment, I think possibly that looks towards explaining why we may need to have the additional regulatory power that is proposed. At the moment, a permit to purchase explosives shall be issued only to a person who is believed by the issuing officer to be a fit and proper person and who is apparently over the age of 18 years.

There is not a terribly great amount of restriction on the class of person to whom a permit can be issued. That is, of course, all the more reason, I suggest, to have the additional power that we are presently considering. There is already in existence a subregulation requiring the person who has received the permit to comply with the terms of the permit and the regulations.

In this case there would be somewhat more stringent control on future permit holders concerning the way in which they handle fireworks for entertainment purposes. As I said earlier, the Bill is short, and contains two main amendments. The first amendment, which members see from time to time, corrects a grammatical error that has been detected. In clause 2 (a) the House is asked to strike out from certain paragraphs in section 52 'for regulating' and substitute 'regulating'. A quick examination of that section indicates that that is a sensible grammatical change, and it is not necessary for me to speak further on this matter to convince members of its correctness. In the second amendment the House is asked to insert after paragraph XXIII the following paragraph:

Regulating and controlling the use of fireworks and other explosives for, or in connection with, entertainment.

The preamble to that section begins as follows:

The Governor may make regulations for all or any of the following purposes . . .

That appears to be a neat way of incorporating in the parent Act, with the approval of the House, the additional safety requirement advanced by the Minister and, on behalf of the Opposition, I support that action being taken. I support the Bill.

**Mr SLATER (Gilles):** I rise to speak briefly to the Bill. I fully support the Bill, which will provide the Government with the power to make regulations to exercise control over the display of fireworks for the purpose of public entertainment. Members may recall that some years ago I was a strong advocate of the prohibition for sale of fireworks to individuals. In regard to the celebration of Guy Fawkes' Day, I was a strong advocate of the prohibition of the sale of fireworks to individuals.

I recall the problems associated with that day and the use of fireworks by irresponsible people who, by their actions, used to cause much discomfort and concern to the community at large. At that time there were also a number of injuries to eyes and other bodily injuries; in addition, havoc

was caused to household pets and the like. I believe that the community at large has benefited considerably by the discontinuance of the Guy Fawkes' Day celebration. At that time the Government took the necessary action to allow continued use of fireworks by organisations that wished to provide public fireworks displays, and they were given the opportunity of having public displays. Guidelines were set up, doubtless for safety reasons, and the member for Mitchell has explained the subsequent situation.

This Bill is a step in the right direction because it provides certain additional safety factors that can be enforced on persons organising public displays. There have been one or two accidents in regard to these public displays, and the Minister mentioned them in the second reading explanation. One incident involved an injury at Loxton and a fire at Glenelg following a fireworks display. I believe that the use of fireworks should be controlled to the extent that the regulations should be enforceable in some way and, consequently, reducing the dangers in regard to fire and bodily injury to those persons who might attend these public displays. That should be the prime consideration in this matter.

Only recently a number of members of this House and I attended an athletics meeting at Olympic Park where at the conclusion of the athletics events there was a fireworks display. It was a particularly hot day, over 40°C, and, even though the display was conducted and organised, I suppose on a professional basis, the thought occurred to me that on such a day there could have been a fire hazard, because, of course, large sky rockets do not always remain in the area, depending on the prevailing conditions, winds, and so on, and they may be carried some distance away.

I believe that the situation should be as this Bill proposes, namely, that anyone who obtains a permit to conduct a public display should take every precaution possible, and that the regulations should provide certain safety measures that will eliminate risk of bodily injury and enforce safety provisions in regard to fires. I believe that this is a move in the right direction, and I support the Bill.

**Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham):** This Bill does not have my support. I suppose it is predictable that all the socialists in the Labor Party would support it, because they are in favour of control for control's sake. But it is a bit of an irony when we get a Liberal Government, so called, which is trying to unfetter government and people, simply bringing in more controls, which is all that this Bill does, and it is not necessary for one moment to control these things.

The member for Gilles said that he was at a sports meeting the other day. I was there, and there was absolutely no problem whatever about the fireworks display after the athletics meeting, nor is there ever a problem. We have displays down at Wayville and at other places which are properly conducted. I have never heard of any problem at all.

The funny little explanation that the Minister gave as his speech mentioned a couple of fires that could have taken place as a result of fireworks. Of course, one cannot mollycoddle everyone all the time and, whether there are regulations or not, accidents are sure to happen from time to time. What is the justification for imposing on the people of this State yet one more set of regulations controlling what they do—and the Liberals call themselves liberal, which means freedom? They do not know what the word means.

The member for Gilles has provoked me into making this speech by what he said. I was a very strong opponent of the abolition of Guy Fawkes' Day. I could see no harm in it. I had had a lot of fun with fireworks when I was a child and we had a display, and I had a lot of fun with my own children when they were younger, when we had a fireworks

display on 5 November. I could see no possible reason to cut that out. It was with the stroke of a pen, and the Labor Government got away with it easily and, of course, it was in line with their republican ethos, the breaking of yet one more link with the United Kingdom. The Labor Party was happy to do it, because they are a mob of republicans; we all know that. I do not think they even bother any more to conceal that.

I thought that this crowd when they came to office might have done something about things like that, for instance, the printing of O.H.M.S. on envelopes, Guy Fawkes' Day, and so on, but not a word of it. They are content to accept it. Although they did not grizzle about the abolition of Guy Fawkes' Day, they grizzled and moaned about a lot of things the Labor Government did during 10 years, but they have done nothing to undo what the Labor Party did when it was in office. They are going further in many ways, and this funny little Bill, this annoying little Bill, is just one example of that, the imposition of yet one more control, without any necessity at all. Heaven knows, there is control now on the sale of fireworks; is that not enough?

Does the Government think that by mollycoddling people there will never be any fires or accidents with fireworks? It will probably create a job for another civil servant, despite the fact that it are trying to cut them down.

**Mr Keneally:** Do you think that they are closet socialists?

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** I do not know whether they are closet socialists or not. I know that they are quite content to follow the system that the Labor Party, which is a socialist Party, laid down, and are happy to do what public servants tell them. I suppose that some damn public servant told them that they ought to bring in this Bill; that is why we have it here. It will not have my support; indeed, it has my total opposition.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier):** We have just been subjected to another testy, irritable speech from the member for Mitcham, for which he is now becoming renowned.

**Mr Millhouse:** I thought I was renowned for never being in the House.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The member for Mitcham has made history today. He has spent the whole afternoon in the precincts of this Chamber.

**Mr Millhouse:** What a boring afternoon it was, too.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I will not buy a fight with him on that; I am in accord with him. It is a pity that he is getting so irascible, irritable and testy with his increasing years. We have been subjected to another one of his petty tirades this afternoon. In all these matters it is a question of balance and what is reasonable, and of where it is reasonable to set guidelines or, indeed, to set regulations which are stronger than guidelines, and of where it is unreasonable.

The member for Mitcham thought that it was unreasonable to do away with Guy Fawkes' day. As a youngster I used to have a lot of fun on Guy Fawkes' day. However, the member for Mitcham should go to the Royal Adelaide Hospital or the Children's Hospital and listen to the people advocating the abolition of Guy Fawkes' day; he might then have a different perspective on it. It is a question of balance and of whether the honourable member gets up here on the spur of the moment and makes an irritable, testy speech from a hunch to see whether he is noticed, or whether he has a good, hard look at all the evidence that could be available if he sought it out. I suspect that he has not troubled to seek out the evidence.

There is evidence that injury does occur, even now. I am not suggesting that the vast majority of fireworks displays are not well run. As the Minister who has to authorise

fireworks displays, a number of applications come before me weekly. Last week I did not authorise a fireworks display which was in an area somewhere towards the honourable member's district, because in my view there was a fire hazard, and I do not think that the council would have permitted it. I do not believe that this is going to lead to a great—

**Mr Millhouse:** How many more public servants will we have as a result of this?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The answer to that would be 'Nought'. The public servant who did come to me in the first instance would resent the references to him by the member for Mitcham. It was put to me by someone—

**Mr Millhouse:** I knew that it was a Public Service thing, to make their life a bit easier.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** It is not to make the life of a public servant any easier.

**Mr Millhouse:** Four-fifths of the things that come in here are simply to suit the Public Service; you know that.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** It is not to suit the Public Service. Again, the member for Mitcham is the odd man out. This Bill will have the unanimous support of the House, bar him. To an increasing extent, the member for Mitcham is sticking out like a sore thumb in this place; he is the odd man out. I make no apology for introducing this Bill because, on balance, I believe that it is warranted. I believe that there will be no more than one or two regulations required to give teeth to the guidelines already existing, which are available to people, but which there is no compulsion to follow. It will mean that those guidelines will become mandatory. So much for the member for Mitcham. We know he has been marked present. We see that he is here; he has achieved his purpose and has been noticed. If he sees fit to come more often, I hope that his temper might improve. His temper is really not improving.

**Mr McRae:** He said it was mellowing.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am glad that this Bill has the support of the vast majority of members of this House.

Question—'That the Bill be read a second time'—declared carried.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** Divide!

*While the division was being held:*

**The SPEAKER:** There being only one member on the side of the Noes, I declare that the Ayes have it.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Regulations.'

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The second part of this clause refers to the matters about which we have just had an outburst from the member for Mitcham. It provides for the regulatory power in regard to fireworks and other explosives. Have any regulations been prepared in advance in respect of the power that we propose to insert?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I have not seen regulations if they have been prepared, but it has been put to me that the guidelines that currently exist for the benefit of people who want to put on a fireworks display will simply be turned into regulations. Instead of guidelines, which people can follow if they desire, there will be mandatory regulations. I suspect that the majority of fireworks displays are being conducted successfully at the moment because people are choosing to follow these guidelines, but on occasions they do not, and I think that all that is proposed is that these guidelines will become regulations.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** From inquiries I have made, I understand that, on occasion, at public displays of fireworks

a departmental inspector is sometimes present and observes. I take it that there is not to be any great change in that practice, despite the claims by the member for Mitcham that there will be an army of public servants to back it up, and so on.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** No. The Government has a real interest in the safety of children. I guess that the member for Mitcham had an interest in the safety of his children on occasion.

**Mr Millhouse:** I was confident of the by-laws.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Well, unfortunately, accidents do occur and some parents may not be as careful as he was. I do not know that, but the fact is that statistically a lot of accidents have occurred and still occur, and despite the honourable member's dire predictions of tyranny overtaking the community, all that is proposed, as explained to me, is that these guidelines will be given some teeth.

**Mr Millhouse:** One more set of regulations; that's all it is.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Well, the work has already been done.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I point out that the Opposition did not take the view that the member for Mitcham took. It seems to us that, as the Minister has said, there is the safety of the public at large and children specifically involved. It seems that this is a reasonable approach without being over-regulatory. It simply provides for a power. We have had the assurance from the Minister that the scale of inspection that now takes place will continue at about that level. I have never had any complaint about over-zealousness at these functions, and I have had the odd complaint about dangers.

The member for Mitcham put forward some very curious logic. From what he said, we cannot molly-coddle people, and so on. I found that most surprising, considering one of the careers that he followed, that in the services. If we took his logic to its normal conclusion, we could argue: why not give children hand grenades as long as they have the pins in them? We cannot molly-coddle people! What a stupid approach to the matter. We are dealing with incendiary and explosive material and I do not think there is any reason for the kind of outburst that the honourable member made. I am quite happy with the Opposition's position on this and we supported the Bill regarding that matter.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** I have obviously touched the member for Mitchell and other members of the Labor Party on a raw spot. We have just heard the most utter nonsense from the member for Mitchell that I have ever heard. Normally he is quite sensible in his views, although I do not always agree with him, but to say what he has said is absurd. The fact is that we have Tweedle Dum on this side and Tweedle Dee on the other, and there is little to distinguish between the Labor Party and the Liberal Party in their actions in Government. This is a prime example of it.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 December. Page 2320.)

**Mr McRAE (Playford):** I trust that you have had a relaxing break over Christmas, Mr Deputy Speaker. I will now proceed to deal with this brief Bill. It makes three disparate amendments.

**Mr Millhouse:** All of which are supported by the Labor Party, I suppose.

**Mr McRAE:** All of which are supported by the Labor Party but for good reason, and I will be spelling that out briefly. The first amendment deals with the situation of the person who holds more than one office in the Parliament and who at the moment has no right to gain a superannuation benefit even though that person is quite willing to meet the full 11½ per cent levy. So, the view of the Opposition is that, if a member holds two offices and is in receipt of an additional emolument in respect of each, provided, as this Bill provides, that he pays the full levy, there is no reason why he should not receive the benefit.

The second amendment is clearly needed. That deals with a situation that was never intended by the various draftsmen of this Act. The plain fact is that a widow of a member who has computed part of the pension can in certain circumstances receive a pension which is much larger than that intended by the draftsman.

Now I come to the third and most complex amendment, which deals with the situation of members of Parliament who have had periods of service in another Parliament of the Commonwealth or in the Federal Parliament. This is the third time that this problem has been before this House over the past two or three years. The Opposition is satisfied with the principle of the matter. First, it seems to us only fair that a person who has served in another Parliament in the Commonwealth of Australia, provided that the person involved is prepared to meet the levy in the normal way as though he had served that period in this House and to meet the other requirements of the trustees, should receive his benefit. The difficulty in the past has been that the drafting has been criticised by the trustees. The Opposition supports on this occasion both the principle and also the drafting.

I end my remarks by saying one thing very clearly. The Opposition will not be able to maintain its support of the third provision unless, before this matter reaches its final stages in the other place, we have, in respect of one or two members of this Parliament whom this matter concerns, an undertaking from the trustees. I quite understand that the Premier cannot give the undertaking; it is not his statutory duty or even his right to do so. Provided that the honourable gentlemen in question do provide the sum of money required, we have requested that the trustees will provide a letter of intent indicating that, on payment of the specified sum, those gentlemen will beyond doubt become entitled. The reason that I stress that as part of the Opposition's attitude is that for reasons which are quite clear to us there needs in this part of the Bill to be a discretionary clause. I could imagine that one could draft a mandatory clause but it would be terribly difficult and would lead to unforeseen difficulties. Provided that situation is reached, then the Opposition will support this Bill through all stages in both Houses. At this stage I merely support the Bill here.

**Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham):** Tweedle Dum and Tweedle Dee are speaking again.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I would suggest to the honourable member that he refer to other honourable members by their district and title.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** I was not referring necessarily to the member for Playford. I was referring to the Labor Party and the Liberal Party, and those were the organisations which I referred to as Tweedle Dum and Tweedle Dee. Particularly on a subject such as this they always speak with the one voice and certainly, as I believe to be the case here, if it means a bit more for them. That is what I understand this Bill will mean.

I cannot be absolutely certain how much it will mean, because whoever wrote the Premier's speech for this debate was careful not to say how much this would cost the fund, and how much extra benefit members would get. There is no mention of that in the speech; I have had a look. Of course, it was a short speech, anyway, because this is one of the Bills which it is hoped will go through quietly without any publicity, and it will be done before anybody in the public knows about it.

This Bill has been sitting here quietly on the Notice Paper and, on a quiet day, when there has been a no-confidence motion, which both Parties devoutly hope will get some publicity (although, heaven knows it didn't deserve any, the way it was debated), it is hoped that this will slip through without anybody noticing. In all fairness, I must say that this Bill is not quite as disgraceful as many. In my view, it will mean that former members of Parliament are taking just a bit more out of the public purse.

**Mr McRae:** Less.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** Rot! You cannot tell me that. I will not be prepared to accept that until I see the figures. As I said, the Premier was careful not to put any figures in his speech. You cannot tell me, Mr Deputy Speaker, that that amendment with regard to double emoluments is meant just to clarify the position, and not to make sure that a bloke gets some of everything, rather than just the highest of the extra emoluments. Of course, this will mean a net increase in superannuation payments to ex-members of Parliament. We would not be doing this if that was not the position; there is no doubt at all about that!

That particular amendment is an amendment to section 17 of the Act, the scandalous amendment in 1978 which greatly increased the Parliamentary superannuation of the Hon. Mr Dunstan and others, and would have increased my superannuation so much that I would have done better then on my Parliamentary superannuation than on my Parliamentary salary. That was the effect of it. I was so indignant about that, that I had a clause inserted so that I could renounce the benefit of it. I was interested to see a calculation in the paper the other day by a journalist showing that I had knocked back \$278 000 as a result of that. I do not know whether it was as much as that, but the fact is that I would have got more on Parliamentary superannuation than I receive by way of salary as a member of Parliament. I think that is scandalous. If I had not kicked up about that it would have gone through without anybody noticing it.

Members of Parliament often deplore the fact that they are not very well regarded. I think that there was a poll of middle management executives last week which I noticed put politicians amongst homosexuals—I forget who else was there—and the least popular people, the people they would least like to meet. I just wonder where a homosexual politician would fit in—he would be even lower, I suppose. I think that one of the reasons why politicians are so poorly regarded is that we are always putting our sticky little fingers into the honey jar for a bit more; that is the problem. The Federal crowd have been doing it, and doing it to very great advantage. I have here, because it just happened to be on my desk, something from the *Australian* of last October. I will read just a few paragraphs. You may say it is not relevant to us, but the principle is relevant to us, and this Bill is right on target. The article states:

The row over pensions for Federal judges is only the latest step along the path which is taking the law makers above the laws that they create. While politicians' salaries are scrutinised by the public there are other greater rewards attached to jobs in and associated with Government. Retirement benefits are high on the list. The distinction between the common man and politically successful man has never been more clearly drawn than in the present session of Federal Parliament.

The same could well be true of us. Friends of mine who are professional men have told me, and they are quite right, that they could not possibly afford to take out superannuation or subscribe to a retirement plan that would bring in even a fraction of what members receive in this place on their incomes. Their incomes are far higher than mine, yet they could not possibly afford such a scheme. No-one could afford it unless he was a member of Parliament or a public servant. It is quite wrong that we should feather our nests in this way.

I suggest that members on both sides of this Chamber should be quiet about this. I remind the Labor Party, the Liberal Party, the member for Semaphore, and the member for Flinders that about a fortnight ago I wrote to the Premier and to the Leader of the Opposition, with copies to the member for Semaphore and the member for Flinders, suggesting that all members should join together this time, go to the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal and oppose any increase. Do you think that I have received a reply from any member? I have not received a reply from one member. I spoke to the Leader about this matter this afternoon, because he usually gets his correspondence up to date on the first sitting day, so I cannot say that he has not replied to letters. He said that the matter is going through the committee processes of the Labor Party or something. We will see what they do.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I seem to have attracted the antagonism of members of the House, as I usually do on this topic. I would be glad to receive your protection, Sir, so that I can continue my speech.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I point out to the House that the member for Mitcham does not need any assistance.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** The Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal has got itself into a bit of a fix, of course. Normally, it tidies up the whole matter in January when we are not sitting. It was a bit tardy this year; we have not yet had the public hearings and Parliament is sitting again. It will be interesting to see how we get on when that happens. I have made that invitation to both Parties and to my colleagues the member for Semaphore and the member for Flinders to join Lance Milne and myself, the Australian Democrats, in opposing a rise. I will say no more about it, but I would be glad to receive replies to my invitation in due course.

I am not pretending that this Bill will enormously increase Parliamentary superannuation. However, you can bet your bottom dollar that its real point is to make sure that no-one goes wanting, and that if a little bit more can be taken by any member, it will be taken. I am against that. In my view Parliamentary superannuation and, indeed, Public Service superannuation (which is far more serious, because there are more of them) are becoming and will become such a burden on the community that within a couple of decades they will be insupportable. We should be setting an example by reducing the benefits of Parliamentary superannuation—not building them up.

Any responsible person and anyone who is in a responsible position would know that what I have said about superannuation is absolutely correct. Present-day politicians are no doubt hoping that they will be gone and will not have to take any responsibility in a few decades when the crash comes. Whether that is true or not, I suggest that we all have a responsibility to the future as well as to lining our own pockets.

**Mr Keneally:** What do you make in the legal profession? How much do you make as a Q.C. outside this place?

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** When I get a brief, which is not often—

*Mr Keneally interjecting:*

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** When I get a brief, I charge the scale fee which is allowed by the Master on taxation. No more than that.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** If they want to, honourable members can find out, because there is no secrecy about it at all. The fee on brief for a day in the Supreme Court is \$670. For a refresher it is \$446 for one day.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** There is no secret about that, nor has there ever been. That is a figure fixed by an independent authority. We do not fix it ourselves, and that is the difference between the position of a barrister and that of a member of Parliament.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** I can tell members that I work damn hard to earn a fee like that. It is a very difficult thing to get, and I do not get many of them either, I can assure honourable members. Of course, that is irrelevant to this Bill.

**The Hon. D. O. Tonkin:** Do you make submissions to the independent authority suggesting that there should be no increase in legal fees?

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** I leave that to others in the law.

**Mr Lynn Arnold:** In 40 days a year he earns as much as a back-bencher.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** Would that I had 40 days a year in court. I am a poor struggling barrister without many briefs. Of course, honourable members are only teasing me over this matter to distract attention from what I have said about this Bill and about Parliamentary superannuation and Parliamentary salaries in general. If members of Parliament want to improve their image with the public, then they have to put their money where their mouth is, and set an example of restraint, and not all the time getting just a bit more, and then complaining about others wanting to do the same thing. I will not take any more time. I am opposed to this Bill, for what it is worth, but it will not be worth anything because the Labor Party and the Liberal Party have already got together on it.

This is one of those matters about which I have said, as a rule, there is absolute unanimity. Normally, these Bills go through, if it is not for someone like me, in 10 minutes in both Chambers. I have seen it happen in the same day just to get rid of it. There is agreement. Why should it be held up because, after all, members say, 'We are all agreed about it. Push it through, suspend Standing Orders and get the damn thing through.' That is not my view of the way Parliament should operate, nor is it my view that this Bill should pass. I am opposed to it.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer):** Unfortunately, this time I think that the member for Mitcham has not done his homework and has missed his mark totally and completely. In so doing, he has provided the Chamber with a certain amount of insight into his approach to things, and he has provided a certain amount of amusement, and I must thank him for that. First, let me say that he seems to believe for some reason or other that this Bill will provide extra payments to everyone. He has imputed motives to every other honourable member in this Chamber, and he must be honest and say that he did impute such motives, and that imputation is just not based on fact. This Bill will not provide extra to anyone. Therefore, I am pleased to give the honourable member the total figures that he has asked for about the extra. It will be absolutely zero.

Having disposed of that, I think I have disposed of most of his diatribe to the House. I have no doubt that his words will be taken down and, whether they are well based or not, he will undoubtedly get a column inch somewhere; I am sure that is all he wants. I am obliged to say that he has not aroused the antagonism of members. Far from it, there is a certain amount of surprise at his lack of understanding, and whether that lack was deliberate or whether he has just not done his homework, I do not know.

Let me reassure the honourable member that he has not the antagonism of members, although there may be some jealousy. After all, he has castigated me for not mentioning those additional costs in the second reading speech. I think I have reassured him on that. He has told us that his fees in court are set—and this is the difference—by an independent authority, considering all the facts. I am a little surprised that he has not gone on record as making a submission to that independent authority that legal fees and particularly fees paid to barristers should not be the subject of increases. He is so assiduous in some other spheres.

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

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am so pleased that the member for Mitcham is present, as I thought that he might not have come back after this afternoon. Before dinner we were discussing the matter of Parliamentary salaries and superannuation. Unfortunately, although the member for Mitcham took advantage of this opportunity to propound some of his wellknown theories on self-sacrifice in the Parliamentary sphere, it was quite noticeable (and I am sure that the Leader noticed this, too) what self-sacrifice there is when it came to legal fees. I found that it was very difficult to reconcile what he had to say. I have been thinking for the last hour and a half about this matter, and I thought to myself, 'Where is the basic difference between Parliamentary salaries which are settled by an industrial tribunal (which I think is a very good system, but which the member for Mitcham always seems to deprecate) and the acceptance of fees earned in a legal capacity, according to a determination of an independent authority?'

*Mr Bannon interjecting:*

**Mr Millhouse:** You are just identifying yourself with them, John.

**Mr Bannon:** I am afraid on this issue I have to.

**Mr Millhouse:** My word! The Party would boot you out if you didn't.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am enormously pleased with the Leader of the Opposition's support on this matter.

**Mr Millhouse:** You can always count on the Leader attacking me.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Here is the perfect member for Mitcham—

**Mr Millhouse:** Absolutely!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The 'beyond reproach' member for Mitcham, the community conscience, who has said that he will approach the tribunal concerning Parliamentary salaries to submit that there should be no increase in Parliamentary salaries, that Parliamentarians should, after all, set an example. However, when it comes to the legal profession, where he says he does not have too many briefs (I suppose it depends on where he is, but by the same token he must be doing some work, because he is very rarely here), he says that he is not going to make any submission to the independent authority that sets the fees for barristers. I am surprised about this. We have to bear in mind the disclosure of the fee which is normally payable and which is set by an industrial tribunal. He was very coy about that. I would have thought that he was making a good deal more out of the law than he does as a member of Parliament at

present. That is just an impression I get and I could be wrong, but I suspect that his coyness in disclosing the amount of fees that he gets arises from the fact that he is making a little more out of the law than he is making out of Parliament. He is waving his beard, but I am not sure what that means.

**Mr Millhouse:** No, I am not.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** You are not what?

**Mr Millhouse:** Making any more out of the law than out of Parliament.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** He is making equally as much out of the law as he is making out of Parliament. I would like to think that he would adopt an even-handed attitude. I would like to think that on the one hand he would approach the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal with a strong request that we should all band together and suggest that we forgo what are reasonable increases—

**Mr Millhouse:** I have done that—

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Yes, you have done it many times in the past. You write to me every year. When one considers the amount that it costs to forgo that increase in salary and to donate it to charity—all tax deductible—for six months, one can only wonder what sort of a gesture that is. Nevertheless, I am surprised that there are no representations made by the member for Mitcham to the industrial authority (which makes it so much more respectable) that sets barristers' fees. We have all enjoyed the debate this afternoon and this evening. The member for Mitcham has revealed to us facets of his character that were not apparent previously.

**Mr Millhouse:** Heavens, I thought you knew me like a book.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** No, the honourable member has revealed them publicly. There is not a member of this House who does not believe that he knows the honourable member's character privately. Let me once again give an assurance to the member for Mitcham, who so readily and, I suspect, in the spirit of where angels fear to tread, jumped on to the band waggon in the debate on this issue, that he is barking up the wrong tree. This Bill is entirely a matter of correcting anomalies and those anomalies, when corrected, will cost the taxpayer no more. The self-appointed public conscience of South Australia has been exercised in vain. I give you the assurance, Mr Speaker, that there will be no additional expenditure incurred. I am surprised that the honourable member did not take the time to look at the Bill carefully and to make the inquiries that may have stopped him from making the statements he did. It does not often happen that we catch him like this. I admit that he is very circumspect as a rule in the comments he makes, but I am amused that he should fall so easily into a trap which is normally fallen into by a first-year member of this Parliament.

The House divided on the second reading.

*While the division was being held:*

**The SPEAKER:** There being only one member on the side of the Noes, I declare that the Ayes have it.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** I am indebted to the Premier for the remarks he made earlier, to which I cannot refer (as I realise), but I am also glad that I cut short the very pleasant dinner I was having. I blamed the Premier for my having to be back here to line up against the Liberal Party and the Labor Party.

**Mr Mathwin:** It is the first time this year.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** It is the first time this year, but the fourth time today that I have done it. The Labor Party and the Liberal Party grow more alike as the days pass.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member must confine his remarks to the clause.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** Yes. I really wanted to ask a question. In what event, or events, does the proclamation of this Bill depend, presuming that it is passed in another place, and that is almost a conclusive presumption after what I have heard in this place?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The member for Mitcham is obviously fighting a very valiant and doughty rear-guard action.

*Mr Hemmings interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Does the honourable member want to get the Bill through?

**Mr Hemmings:** To get rid of him—

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I accept that the member for Mitcham will vanish from the Chamber and from this unaccustomed situation tonight in which we find that he is back here after dinner.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The member for Unley is anxious to finish this matter—and so be it. The Bill, when it becomes an Act after having passed this place, will be proclaimed as soon as is convenient with the other Bills that come up at the time.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** The Premier obviously does not know, and the draftsman has gone, so the Premier cannot ask him the answer to the question. If it were as simple as that, there would be no need for the clause. This clause puts the operation of the Bill on proclamation. There must be some reason for that rather than its simply coming into effect on assent. I want to know why it is on proclamation. My question is pretty direct and clear. What is the answer, if the honourable gentleman knows?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Because, as the honourable gentleman should know, that is so often the normal case. That is what is done in this case. If the honourable member were here a little more frequently, he would know that. Perhaps he has forgotten. Perhaps he has not been here through the Committee stage of a Bill for some time. The honourable member should know that this is a perfectly normal procedure. I do not know what the honourable and gallant—

**Mr Millhouse:** Learned.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** —and learned gentleman is complaining about.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** If we were in another place, I would use a word beginning with 'b' to describe what the Premier is doing, but I will not use that word here—I will not even try to use it, out of deference to your exalted position, Mr Chairman.

**Mr Becker:** This won't get you to the Supreme Court.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** But I can always win Mitcham, as both Parties know to their cost.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** I may have to appeal to you, Mr Chairman, for your protection.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I assure the honourable member for Mitcham that I will ensure that he is heard.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** Thank you, Mr Chairman. The Premier well knows that the norm is for a Bill to come into operation on its assent by the Governor. It is not unusual now, but it is the exception, for a Bill to come into operation on proclamation. Normally, that occurs so that regulations can be drawn, or something of that sort. Why, here, does it not come into operation when the Royal Assent is given? Why does it have to be on proclamation?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am not particularly fussed whether it comes into operation at the time of the Royal Assent or when it is proclaimed. It just so happens that it is going to be proclaimed this time, and there is very little that the member can do about it.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (3 to 5) and title passed.

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

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

As it comes out of Committee, the Bill does, in fact, simply correct anomalies. It simply makes quite clear the present working of the superannuation provisions.

**Mr Millhouse:** It makes sure no-one goes without, doesn't it?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Well, I do not think that there was any suggestion that anyone should go without. The Bill simply makes quite clear the present situation. I had intended to stand to perhaps say that the member for Mitcham, in acting as he has done for the past little while, has, in fact, been indulging in a certain amount of leg pulling for the rest of the Chamber, and I must say that we have adopted it in that spirit. Nevertheless, this Bill is quite important, inasmuch as it puts beyond doubt the actual practices that now apply. I am sure the member understands that. I may say that, if he were to approach me and ask for some similar consideration in respect of the setting of fees for legal practitioners, I would be delighted to oblige.

**Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham):** I regret that the Bill has been improved not at all by the Committee through which it has just passed. Therefore, I am as unalterably opposed to it as I was at the second reading stage. I tried my best to find out the answer to a simple question that I asked three times as to why the jolly thing comes into operation on proclamation, not on the Royal Assent. It was obvious that the Premier did not know. I made a little compact with myself when I asked those questions three times. I will not say what I called myself but I said to myself that, if the fellow can give me a proper answer to the question, I will not call for a division. I tried three times to get an answer to the question but he could not give me a proper answer. If he had given me a proper answer I would have gone on and tried to get some information on the more difficult clauses of the Bill, but it was obviously hopeless to ask him, because he failed at the simplest stage.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member knows that, in respect of the third reading, the debate will relate to the Bill as it has come from the Committee.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** Yes.

**The SPEAKER:** I ask the honourable member to continue the debate in respect of the normal procedure.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** With respect, Mr Speaker, of course. The answer is that, because the Bill is no better now than when it went into Committee, I am opposed to each and every clause, and I propose therefore to oppose the third reading.

**The SPEAKER:** If the honourable Premier speaks, he closes the debate.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** That is something to be thankful for, I should think, Mr Speaker. I am very surprised indeed that, if the member for Mitcham feels so strongly about this Bill, he did not oppose every clause and divide upon it. As he has not done that, I suppose he is unlikely to divide on the third reading. I am sure we can count on a speedy passage of the Bill from here on.

The House divided on the third reading.

*While the division was being held:*



**The SPEAKER:** Order! It is apparent from the movement of the House that there will be only one person on the side of the Noes. The motion therefore passes in the affirmative. Bill read a third time and passed.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DISTRICT COUNCIL OF VICTOR HARBOR

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment and Planning):** I seek leave to make a Ministerial statement pursuant to section 45B of the Local Government Act concerning the appointment of an administrator for the District Council of Victor Harbor.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** On 17 December 1981, His Excellency the Governor issued a proclamation declaring the district council of Victor Harbor to be a defaulting council pursuant to section 45b of the Local Government Act, 1934-1981 and appointed Mr Russell William Arland to be the administrator of the affairs of the District Council of Victor Harbor. This report is presented to Parliament pursuant to section 45b of the Local Government Act.

In July 1980, at the local council elections, the sitting Mayor was defeated and three new councillors were elected. Subsequently, three sitting councillors resigned because of what they considered to be the nature of the campaign waged by the new Mayor and his supporters. At its simplest, the campaign for the 1980 elections was conducted on the familiar lines that those contesting seats claimed that sitting members were expanding services too much and a platform of reducing expenditure was advanced. However, the campaign was intense between the factions involved, and from the start the District Clerk and staff were seen, rightly or wrongly, as being allied with the previous 'expansionist' majority.

At the 1981 elections, the Mayor was defeated and the present incumbent elected. His platform was directed at developing some harmony and co-operation between councillors and staff. It appeared that the council in 1981 comprised four 'reductionist' councillors and two others. Since July 1980 the council, staff and community have been divided in opinion and debate beyond anything that might be described as normal or usual within the district.

The Minister of Local Government's officers have been involved in discussions with both recent Mayors and councillors from both factions. The local newspaper featured lengthy articles on council divisions, and the Minister of Local Government received petitions and letters for and against the various points of view. The District Clerk instituted and withdrew legal proceedings against a councillor and the local newspaper, while two councillors instituted legal proceedings against the local newspaper and another councillor.

Compounding this situation, the council had its interim development control withdrawn partially by the State Planning Authority for consistent breaches of its delegated authority. In October-November 1981 the matter came to a head. First, the Minister of Local Government asked the Deputy Director, Department of Local Government, to assist, but he was unable to make any progress at a meeting with the district council to discuss management issues because of the bitter divisions in the council and the apparent determination of a majority of the councillors to dismiss the Clerk. Secondly, the Minister of Local Government received a deputation of the Mayor and two councillors, who discussed all relevant matters. Thirdly, following this, the Director, Department of Local Government, held a meeting with the Mayor and District Clerk (accompanied

by a representative of the Municipal Officers Association) to attempt to identify all the options available.

Fourthly, the Municipal Officers Association threatened to insert a clause into the award preventing the dismissal of the Clerk without the approval of the Industrial Commissioner. Fifthly, the District Clerk made it clear that he would not resign. Sixthly, at a subsequent meeting of the district council no councillor was prepared to move for the dismissal of the Clerk. Finally, this last meeting of council was the subject of detailed reporting in the next issue of the local newspaper.

There has been almost non-stop charge, counter charge, and division within the community. All attempts, both within the Department of Local Government and at Victor Harbor, to resolve the situation failed. Certain councillors had completely lost faith in the administration, while the Clerk and staff, for their part, were subject to a level of pressure and scrutiny that affected their ability to respond to council and community needs. The Local Government Act, section 45b (1), provides:

where in the opinion of the Minister,

(a) a council has refused or failed to carry out the duties or functions imposed upon . . . the council under this Act

the Minister may recommend to the Governor that the council be declared a defaulting council. The Governor may make such a declaration, which suspends the council and provides for the appointment of an administrator. The administrator is remunerated from the funds of the council at rates set by the Governor. The Act goes on to empower the Governor to vary or revoke the proclamation and sets out requirements for report to Parliament, and places a 12-month limit on the life of a proclamation. In a separate Part, at section 50, the Act states that the Mayor, aldermen and councillors of every municipality and the councillors of every district, shall constitute a council for ' . . . the good government of the municipality or district'.

The Government felt that the 'good government' of Victor Harbor was not being provided for in the circumstances. The Government believed that the appointment of an administrator skilled in local government matters and with high community standing was necessary, as a first step, to return 'good government' to the town and district, and to pave the way for the restoration of a balanced approach to local government in Victor Harbor. Mr Russell Arland, former Town Clerk of Adelaide, indicated his willingness to be appointed as administrator. Mr Arland has already demonstrated this capacity and is working hard, and with great community acceptance, to heal the divisions and to establish the basis for a return to sound local government in the near future. I further seek leave to table this report.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable Minister does not need to seek leave, as the paper, by the manner in which it was presented, was, in effect, tabled.

#### IMPRINT ACT (REPEAL) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 2 December. Page 2279.)

**Mr KENEALLY (Stuart):** The Opposition will be opposing this Bill, because we do not believe that the Government has given sufficient reason to the Parliament to warrant this action being taken. The Imprint Act is a very old piece of legislation. It was introduced in South Australia in 1863 and copied the British Act. There are Imprint Acts in each of the other States of Australia. Originally, the Imprint Act required, and still does of course, that printers should place their name and address on any publications that they pro-

duce. This has a very good basis in historical fact, because it was a requirement for publishers who might wish to publish seditious, pornographic or any similar material to have their name and address on it so they could be clearly identified. We all know that anyone who wants to print libellous, seditious or pornographic material is not very anxious to have their name and address appear on it. We also appreciate that such legislation is difficult to police.

I believe it is for that reason that this Government has decided, rather than update the Act and make it more relevant to today's needs, to abolish it. As I said earlier, the Act was first introduced in South Australia in 1863. It was amended in 1881, and then in 1935 the Statute Laws Revision Act requiring the name and place of business of the printer of any book or paper was assented to. In 1951 the penalty under the Act, which at that time was £5 for each sheet of publication, was amended to make it £100. Therefore, it is \$200 today, which is an insignificant penalty, and it is treated as such.

The Opposition believes that the efforts of the printing industry, to whose members I have spoken (as has the Minister), and the unions within that industry to have this Bill updated warrant more consideration than that given by the Government. In his second reading explanation the Minister, I believe, very cleverly suggested that this measure resulted from a request from the printing industry. That is not strictly true. The Minister said:

I have had several discussions with the Printing and Allied Trades Employers Federation of South Australia, which initiated the review of the Act, and that body supports the repeal.

That is a simple enough statement, and on the face of it it is fairly near to the truth. In fact, what has taken place is that the printing industry has been trying for some five years now to convince the Government—the Government that I supported when sitting opposite and the Government of which the Minister is a member now—to bring this Act up to date. Never at any time did the printing industry ask that this Act be repealed. It never asked for that at all.

However, it supports the repeal of this Act, because the printing industry believes that it is better to have no Act at all than to have an Act which is unenforceable or an Act that the Government is not willing to enforce because, as the Minister said, it is difficult to police except at a prohibitive cost. The Imprint Act is a horse-and-buggy Act trying to cope with the computer age. It has not kept pace with current technology. It is a very difficult Act for the printing industry to understand, unless it has access—and sometimes expensive access—to persons within the legal profession. For instance, the printing industry is never too sure, when the Act refers to a legal document in terms of property sales, whether it is in fact a legal document or an auctioneer's catalogue as well. I understand that a ruled exercise book commonly used within schools is required under the Imprint Act to have the name and address of the printer on it.

Another example quoted to me is that the label on a very small scent bottle is required under the Imprint Act to have the name and the address of the publisher on it. Of course, I do not know what size scent bottles you buy for your good wife, Mr Speaker, but the ones that I buy for my good wife, so she tells me, are always fairly small and, if the name and address is on the label, there will be little room left to print anything else on it. I understand that publishers' customers sometimes complain that the label does nothing else but provide free advertising for the publisher rather than publicising the product to which the label is attached.

There are problems, as the Opposition readily acknowledges. Amendments to the Act in 1951 sought to include in the Act a certain number of exemptions and, although

the Government has power by proclamation and regulation to include other publications in the exempt list, that opportunity has never been taken by any Government. That seems strange because, if there are problems that exist, the Government ought to take advantage of clause 4 (2) which provides;

The Governor may, by proclamation—

(a) exempt from this Act any books, papers, or class of books or papers specified in the proclamation;

(b) revoke or vary any proclamation in force under this section.

That is clear. It is within the power of the Government to exempt any publication that is proving to be awkward to the police, for example. That opportunity has not been taken.

Representations from the industry have been continuing for five years. I have not seen the submissions made to the Government, but I understand that they are comprehensive and designed to bring the Act up to date for modern and future technology. I would have hoped that the Government would give greater consideration to the many years of efforts by the industry rather than, as I believe it has done, taking the easy way out.

For instance, the printing industry, rather than putting its name and address on a publication, would rather print a logo that was easily recognisable. Cost is not an important consideration, because when there is a block and a printing of hundreds of thousands of copies, the cost of printing the name and address is insignificant in the total cost of a publication run. Therefore, although the cost is of little or no significance, the printing industry believed that there was advantage in being able to identify the publisher with a logo. As the Act stands, the industry could not do that.

During discussions with the Minister, the question apparently arose about the constitutionality of South Australian legislation in relation to publications from interstate being circulated in South Australia. Whilst it is quite clear that South Australian legislation does not apply to interstate publications, this question obviously conjured up so many difficulties that it was referred to the Attorney-General who, after due consideration, recommended that the Imprint Act be not amended but repealed, because it was the Attorney's view that the amendments would be much too difficult to write into the Act.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** Who told you that?

**Mr KENEALLY:** The information I have received is from the industry spokesmen who have given me permission to quote that information to the House.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** Talking to the office boys, were you?

**Mr KENEALLY:** I was talking to the spokesman for the Printing and Allied Trades Employees Federation of South Australia. In fact, I was speaking to the President; I was speaking to the same person as the Minister and his officers, and our Ministers and officers in Government, were speaking to. Therefore, the snide and rather clever remarks that the Minister of Education feels that he contributes to these discussions from time to time, as usual, have gone flat. The debates of the House can do without his interjections from the front bench, as I am sure we can do without them from the back-bench where he will be very shortly.

The industry spokesmen did not seek the repeal of the Act; they sought merely for it to be made more relevant to current day difficulties. They accept that there is a need for publishers to be identified. They accept that, if a publisher prints libellous material, those who are libelled ought to readily be able to identify the publisher so that suitable action can be taken. They also believe that, if there is legislation that would ensure that publishers identify themselves, it would be less likely that some of the more obnoxious types of publications that circulate from time to time would

be presented to the public in South Australia. We would all agree with that; I am sure that Government members would agree with that, together with members of the Opposition. However, having said that, we also know that those who wish to print such material make it damned certain that the identification of the publisher is very difficult.

If we could control the more obnoxious publications it would be an advantage to us all, not only to the members of the printing industry. I think that is what the Government should try to do. In washing its hands of a difficult situation, the Government has said to publishers in South Australia that they can go ahead and publish what they like without identifying themselves and, if the citizens of South Australia are unable to identify them, then that is just so much bad luck, because the Government cannot be of any assistance. I do not think that that is good enough.

Any publishing company producing a first-class article will want its name and address or its logo, if that is permissible, to be on that publication, because the publisher is proud of it and wants the publicity that such a good article provides. However, I have been informed that even the best publishers are required by very good customers to, at times, produce matter that is rather cheap, and in those cases they are unhappy about having their name and address on it. Therefore, if this Bill is passed and the Act is abolished there will be a situation in which good material will be identified but poor material will not be identified.

Other matters ought to be addressed by the Parliament in this debate. One concerns the publication of electoral material. We all know that the Electoral Act requires electoral material to show on it the authorising officer, and it would certainly be an advantage if the publisher of that material was also required to have his name and address on electoral material. If this Bill is passed that requirement will no longer prevail, although I acknowledge that, where there is an authorising officer to whom one can refer, in cases where people feel that they may have been libelled they can go to that authorising officer and request the name of the publisher.

One would expect that that information would be available, and, if it is not supplied on the first approach, then there are legal remedies for the person who believes that he has been libelled, to find out the name of the publisher. The same applies to the Packaging Act. There is no need, within the Packaging Act, for a publisher to put the name and address on a package which clearly identifies the company which has purchased the labels because, here again, access can be made to the company to find out the publisher.

The packaging matter is not a problem. The clause dealing with electoral matters could be of some concern and it is hoped that, if this matter goes through and if we find that people need to know the publisher of electoral material, that information is then made readily available to the inquirer through the provisions of the Electoral Act.

Under the existing provisions we know that many publishers evade the Act. There have been a number of examples where the Police Department has had to go to the offices of the Printing and Allied Trades Employees Federation of South Australia, seeking to find out the publisher of certain materials. This is very difficult because, unless the association knows who made the plate or, at least, unless it can identify the source of the paper, there is no way through normal channels of plate or paper (although fortuitously they can come upon the publisher), that they can identify the publisher of some material.

The union that covers the printing industry trades would like to see the current Act retained, but improved. The Opposition can see no reason why this Act ought to be repealed if it is at all possible for it to be brought up to date to make it relevant to current needs. Who amongst us

could claim that publishers of material in South Australia, whether it be books or what have you, with the appropriate exemptions, ought not to include in those publications the publisher's names?

In clause 4 of the original Imprint Act, 1951, these exemptions were included and there are many other exemptions that could have been included since that time and have not. In the original Act, clause 4 says:

(1) This Act shall not apply to—

- (a) any book or paper printed by order of either House of Parliament; or
- (b) an impression of any engraving;
- (c) any paper containing only the address, telephone number, business or profession of any person, and the articles in which he deals, or some one or more of these particulars;
- (d) any papers containing only information relating to proposed sales of property;
- (e) bank notes, bills of exchange, dividend warrants, promissory notes, or other securities for payment of money;
- (f) bills of lading;
- (g) policies of insurance;
- (h) deeds, powers of attorney, agreements, instruments relating to real property, and other forms for use in preparing legal documents;
- (i) stocks, shares, bonds, debentures, or other like securities and transfers and assignments thereof;
- (j) receipts for money or goods;
- (k) documents used in proceedings in courts such as writs, summonses, complaints, plaints, and warrants;
- (l) any other books or papers exempted from this Act by the Governor by proclamation.

A whole range of publications is already exempt. The Opposition's point is that those exemptions should be increased. We oppose this Bill because we do not believe that, in the short second reading explanation given by the Minister who is responsible for this Bill, the Government made a good enough case for repeal of the Act. We would be the first to agree that, if an Act is unnecessary and if it is impossible to police the provisions of an Act, it may well be that that Act should be repealed. However, the Opposition does not believe that the Chief Secretary has made that case in the second reading explanation, and I now invite him to do so, either in reply in the second reading stage or during the Committee stage.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary):** The honourable member should get a prize, because he never gives up trying. He should be commended for that. He stated that I did not give sufficient reasons in the second reading explanation for the repeal of this Act. I notice that the Attorney-General was brought out as the referee to make the decision, as is customary.

**Mr Keneally:** I believe it is appropriate that you refer to the Attorney-General.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** I believe that the honourable member said that the matter was referred to the Attorney-General. Perhaps I am a bit sensitive. However, this afternoon I heard the honourable member's colleague run through just about every Act in the Cabinet in which I had a hand—it was shot somewhere else. Perhaps I am a bit sensitive, but I am sure that the member for Stuart would not be surprised at that reaction. He worked during the Christmas break. Does he not go on holidays? I wish he would. The honourable member said that the Act came into being in 1863 and has been in its present form since 1951. I believe that the Hon. Colin Rowe, the then Attorney-General, commented on this Act. It seemed to have a fairly quiet passage at that time.

**Mr Keneally:** Sir Lyell McEwin was involved.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** Yes, he had something to do with it. I read in a rather rowdy publication the other day that it was because of the generosity of the member for Stuart that my predecessor, the Hon. Don Simmons, became

Minister. That honourable member was involved in the discussions with the Printing and Allied Trades Union in regard to this Bill. I have been chided for not getting off the ground and doing things. I notice that in 1977 the Hon. Peter Duncan was also involved in this matter, and the Labor Party did nothing then. There were a lot of discussions, but nothing happened. We considered this Act and we listened to representatives of the union (as the honourable member describes them) with great attention. Indeed, my staff did a lot of work with those representatives. We even took a submission to Cabinet to mark out the parameters that will be necessary to make the Act work. The honourable member referred to pornography. I do not believe that anyone would print pornography and want to have a mark on it.

**Mr Lewis:** They print it without identification.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** Indeed, that occurs in regard to a number of publications. The honourable member has already cited the list of exemptions and pointed out that there could be more exemptions. I believe the honourable member stated that the Attorney-General recommended this action, but that is quite unfair. The Attorney-General believed that the Act had been worthwhile over many years and we should consider including other measures, some of which the honourable member referred to.

On examination, we found that this was going to be a tremendous job. Further inspectors would be required and when one had got all these people, and had a good look at the matter, one would have great difficulty in making the Act work. That is because of the methods of printing today. There are such things as word processors and photo-copiers, and it is far easier to get a printing press today in this world of technology and further education. People are encouraged, and I think it is good that they do this, but it seemed impractical to update this Bill, because of the cost that would have been involved.

The general consensus of the Government was that we should seek to repeal the Act. A lot of research went into the matter and we had discussions with the industry. I did not find any objection. I was rather surprised that the industry agreed that the best thing to do would be to repeal the Act. The Government was unanimous in its decision. Let us be fair to the Attorney-General: several months (it may have been a year) of discussion took place and it was resolved that we would repeal the Act.

Hence, this short Bill is before the House. That is a short thumb-nail sketch, and I commend the member for Stuart for his diligence in going through all the actions and talking to all the people concerned. I am sure that, from his experience on committees during his Government's term, he would not be unfamiliar with the research done by his Government and it must have faced the same problems as we did. We did not wait like his Government did in 1977-78. We have operated in this short time.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Repeal.'

**Mr KENEALLY:** The reason that the Government has given for the repeal of this Act is, amongst other things, the difficulty in policing the Act and the prohibitive cost. Can the Minister give the Committee detailed information as to the possible cost of policing an up-to-date Act, or an Act that would be amended for up-to-date needs? Obviously, the Government has looked at this matter closely. The Minister has said that a number of inspectors would be needed.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** Judging by what we have been listening to tonight, the member is not aware that salaries and wages are a very big component of cost. When we look

at the bump, the printed matter, the demand by the public for reading matter, it is not an insignificant contribution in the case of this board or whatever bureaucracy would have been necessary to carry out the policing of the Act. Inspectors would have been required and there would have had to be checking. We did not go into any costing. I am sure that it will not take much of the member's fertile imagination to know what is involved in this.

We are not the biggest of States, but we have many bookshops and much reading matter. There is a lot of communication. We have talked about pornography, but of course there are classification boards. The Electoral Act was mentioned, and the requirements within the time of writ. I am sure we have all been in receipt of some exceedingly libellous but anonymous material from unknown sources. If there were a policeman or an inspector on every corner, we would not bring to heel the larrikin, the rascal, or the culprit responsible for its source. This is a thing we were fairly confronted with and on that background the decision was taken.

As to the costs, and whether we want 20 or 30 inspectors, we did not work that out. Backed up against the size of the task and the mammoth area of publication and printing involved, the matter was accepted by the industry. I appreciate the perspicacity of the honourable member in seeking this information. He is going to be a very great Minister when he gets the chance. I hope that what I have said will give the honourable member some perspective of the enormous task of setting up such a labyrinth, and it is a bit hard to pinpoint.

**Mr KENEALLY:** The Minister did refer, in answering my query, to the material that sometimes finds its way into the letterboxes of members of Parliament. I can tell him that I am not surprised if he finds a fair bit of libellous stuff in his letterbox as I have found some libellous stuff in mine—libelling the Minister, of course, but anything referring to me was mostly complimentary. I am not surprised about that.

The industry has supported this Bill because it has decided that it is better to have no Act at all than to have an Act that is unworkable. If we have an unworkable Act, the legitimate publishers are conforming to the requirements of the Imprint Act and the shonky, scurrilous publishers are not. So, we have an Act that applies to law abiding operators and of course, the non-law abiding publishers take no notice of it.

I asked the Minister whether he had taken out any figures in terms of cost in relation to policing the Act and he has told the Committee that he has not done so. He did mention the cost of wages. I believe that every person ought to be suitably paid for the task he does. This seems to me an example where the Government could be penny wise and pound foolish, because, if we have inspectors who can police an Act (and at some expense to the State, of course), then that policing can save the State many hundreds of thousands of dollars in legal costs that accrue to the State later as a result of actions taken through the court.

So, it would well be that a good policing force within the Minister's department, looking at breaches of the Imprint Act, is cheaper for the State than to repeal the Act and then have to make courts and officers available to those courts to handle the actions that might occur because there is no Imprint Act. I leave those thoughts with the Minister. Obviously, it is the Government's policy that this Act be repealed. The Opposition will oppose this clause.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**LONG SERVICE LEAVE (BUILDING INDUSTRY)  
ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 2 December. Page 2276.)

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** The Opposition generally supports the amendments to the principal Act, which is now almost six years old. I suppose one could describe it as being pioneering legislation when it was first introduced. I do not think I would be too immodest in saying that I was somewhat responsible for its introduction, although a lot of other people worked hard to achieve the introduction of this legislation, which had progressed a long way when I became Minister in 1975. The then Minister (Mr McKee), the building industry employees and officials of the unions had gone a long way toward getting this legislation together before I became Minister.

This legislation, which came into operation in 1976, has been one of the most important pieces of industrial legislation over the past few years. I believe, as does my Party, that it is the inherent right of all workers to receive long service leave. It is the fundamental right of all workers according to my Party's philosophies. I am not quite so sure that, seeing the raised eyebrows on the other side of the House, it is believed to be fundamentally correct by members on the other side, as it is by members on this side. Nevertheless, those are the beliefs of the Labor Party.

I would have liked to see this legislation go beyond the building industry. Had the Labor Party remained in Government, it would have hoped by now to have something moving in relation to casual workers in other industries, because many workers are not presently entitled to receive remuneration for long service leave credits. Having said that the Opposition generally supports the legislation, I think that there are still some matters that need be raised. I suppose one could describe the legislation as correcting the anomalies that have reared their heads over the past five or six years.

I suppose it is also true to say that in any new legislation one can never be exact in the first place, and that it is only through the attrition of time that one is able to establish, by trial and error, those fundamental mistakes made in the initial preparation of the legislation. As I have said, it is only through practice that one learns of these mistakes.

The matters being corrected in this legislation are long overdue. It was apparent to me 18 months ago that one of the major difficulties and anomalies in the administration of this Act was the fact that an employee could be placed in a situation whereby, at the time of taking long service leave, it was illegal under the Act, if that is the correct term, to pay an employee the rate of pay for the long service leave to which he was then entitled. In those circumstances, the beneficiary was being paid at the rate of pay when the notification came due by the board that his entitlement had accrued. To me that was a very bad state of affairs.

I complained bitterly to the board and its members. I had hoped that at that stage the board could see its way clear to correct that outstanding anomaly. There were circumstances where people were receiving hundreds and hundreds of dollars less than they were actually entitled to receive. The board, in its wisdom or otherwise, decided that it was best to wait until the Government was able and prepared to move amendments to the legislation. I understand that this Bill will overcome that anomaly.

In future, the rate of pay current at the time of taking the leave and not that at the time of notification of the leave will be paid to employees. That will overcome one of the major problems that has been the complaint relating

not only to the organisations which represent building workers in the industry but also to the anomalies concerning individuals. Unfortunately, I suppose that there will be no retrospectivity for them. They will not receive what I believe is a just and proper rate of pay at the time. I suppose that I could take some of the blame for that situation in a way, because, as I said, I was responsible for preparing the legislation. This anomaly was overlooked in the initial stages and I think it could easily have been corrected much earlier than it has. However, it is never too late to amend this or any other particular anomaly.

The other major and significant amendment is the unbinding of the Crown. In the past, the Crown has been bound by this Act, and so have all its employees, but more particularly those employed in the Public Buildings, Marine and Harbors and Engineering and Water Supply Departments. When I first looked at this amending Bill and read the Minister's speech, I noticed that the request had come from the Trades and Labor Council to unbind the Crown, and that was readily agreed to by the Minister. I must admit that I had some dubious doubts, particularly about the effect of unbinding the Crown, because I thought that a situation could develop where some employees might not be able to be covered.

The matter has now been explained to me, and I understand that in future any employee who has currently or previously worked for the Crown and who decides that he wants to work in private enterprise areas or has made that decision will be picked up by the computer. The service now given by the employee to a private employer will be recorded, because that employer will be paying into the fund for that employee. As I understand it, a credit will be paid into the fund for any service that has not been recorded in the past as work for the Crown, so that the employee will not bear a loss in any circumstances.

The other important factor that has been explained to me is that the situation would work vice versa; that is, any employee who has been out in the private enterprise arena and decides to come in and work for the Government will no longer be covered under the Building Workers Long Service Leave Act but will then come under the State Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Act, which provides better conditions for the employee than does the Building Workers Long Service Leave Act.

With that explanation it appears that there can be no loss either way. Evidently, the Government has inadvertently not been collecting from the employees who have been working in those areas and who were prescribed under this Act to be part of the Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Act. On the face of it, it seems to me that there is a protection both ways and, in those circumstances, the Opposition will not now oppose this clause. The other matter that is of the utmost importance concerns the administrative changes which will take some time to effect, one would think, with the checking and cross-checking to establish the *bona fides* of those people who may have transferred either from the Crown or back to the Crown, as provided for in the amendment, which states:

This Act shall come into operation on 1 July 1982.

This period will give the department the opportunity to have included the rights and privileges of those people who may be affected not only in that area but in any other administrative area. That is what this Bill is all about: it is an administrative Bill which is correcting, as I said earlier, those anomalies. With such a time lapse before the Bill comes into operation, I hope the department and the board will have the opportunity to correct any anomaly that may have occurred and pick up through the computer system anyone who has privileges and who is entitled to them.

The third point I want to make concerns the proposition of the Government's having the right to lend money out of the fund. The Bill provides:

(1) The board may, with the approval of the Minister and the Treasurer, lend moneys forming part of the fund to a person or body for any approved purpose upon such terms and conditions as may be approved by the Minister and the Treasurer.

(2) A loan under subsection (1) may be made free of interest.

(3) In subsection (1) 'approved purpose' means a purpose that the Minister is satisfied is for the benefit of the building industry or a part of the building industry.

That seems to be a pretty vague and wide provision. Section 17 gave the right for money to be invested, and provides:

(1) Moneys forming part of the fund may be invested or otherwise dealt with by the board in any manner for the time being approved of by the Treasurer.

(2) An approval of the Treasurer referred to in subsection (1) of this section may be expressed to relate to a particular investment or dealing or to investments or dealings of a class or kind.

On philosophical grounds I have no dispute about money from this fund or any other fund, provided it is managed correctly and sensibly being used for low-rental housing or for some benefit to the community. I believe in that. I believe that there must be very strong control in relation to how the money is used and at what interest. The Minister said in his second reading explanation:

In furtherance of the policy of this Government to assist industry it is proposed to utilise available money from the Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Fund to assist worthwhile projects in the building industry by the provision of interest-free or low-interest loans. At present the board has approximately \$5 950 000 invested with the State Bank and the South Australian Housing Trust. These funds have been utilised through those bodies to provide low-interest loans for new houses as well as assist in the provision of low-rental housing. Therefore, by making loans available to deserving projects in the building industry the board is reaffirming its support for all areas of that industry.

Certainly, the new provisions are much wider than the provisions of the previous legislation. It seems to me that provided the board, the Minister and the Treasurer can agree on certain conditions that is all that applies, because the Bill provides that loans can be made available to 'any person'; it is not specified that loans must go to a trust or to a bank: it specifies to 'any person'. I do not like that very much. Maybe there is an explanation for it, but quite clearly future Ministers or different people being included as a result of changes in the composition of the board could interpret that clause quite differently. If I were Minister I might have one idea, whereas the current Minister may have another idea as to how and to whom those moneys ought to be loaned. I am not subscribing to the view that the money should not be used provided there is a limit and a guaranteed reserve so that the fund cannot get into any difficulty.

With the present inflation spiral, there are large increases in wages, and if there were many retirements and people leaving the industry, or people changing their occupations, quite clearly there could be a very severe downturn in funds available. Therefore, the fund must be administered very strictly and astutely. There is some possibility of money being used for purposes to which I could not agree. When the Minister replies to the second reading debate I would like him to state the Government's intention in relation to the provisions of this clause. I would like explained to me exactly to what sort of persons this money would be made available and whether those persons must apply to any other board or any other instrumentality of Government other than the Long Service Leave Board. There are already provisos for people to come to the Government for loans, advances or grants.

For those reasons I am somewhat perturbed about the fact that the Minister's explanation does not go far enough. The provisions in my view give too much power to the Minister and to the Treasurer and should be looked at very

closely. At this stage I have not decided that it will be necessary to move amendments to that clause. I will wait until the Minister replies and gives some explanation as to the intention of the Government. As I said, if it is for community assistance by way of hospitals or community welfare housing, these sorts of things, then there would be no opposition as far as the Labor Party is concerned. However, if it is to give benefits and credits to particular companies or persons who would thereby benefit through housing or building contracts, then the Opposition will be opposing it strongly.

It is essential that the Minister gives a total explanation of how these moneys are to be dispersed, who he means by 'person', who will have the administering rights, and the intention of the Government in regard to the actual handing out of the money of the fund.

In the main this is an administrative improvement of legislation that has already been operating for some six years. There are some matters I will need to canvass. I have made the Minister aware of matters that have come belatedly to my attention. I know that I cannot talk about amendments at this stage, but I foreshadow that amendments will be necessary. I have not had time to discuss these matters with the Draftsman, but I understand that the Minister is happy to complete the second reading debate tonight and that we will then be given the opportunity to prepare the amendments tomorrow.

There will be three or four amendments but, generally speaking, the Opposition supports the Bill with the reservations I have made and having regard to the explanations that I would like to see from the Minister. It is proper that the Opposition and the people of South Australia have a clear and concise understanding of the proposals, particularly in relation to the money which will be in the fund and which the Minister now wants to lend in the fashion he has described in this legislation.

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

I thank the Deputy Leader for his remarks. I appreciate the effort that has been put in by so many people in coming up with these amendments. It has taken about 12 months, and a lot of time has been spent in making sure that the amendments were acceptable to the parties involved in the industry. In an area like this it is not always possible to get complete agreement, but the Deputy Leader's comments suggest that there has been a great deal of substantial agreement between the parties involved.

I take this opportunity to thank the old board which operated under this Act under the Chairmanship of Ian Milne, who personally took on this task to make sure that these amendments were passed as quickly as possible. I thank the new board, which has given assistance, particularly under the Chairmanship of Brian Cole, in formally improving these amendments and giving advice to the Government and taking on the task of administering this fund on behalf of the Government. Whilst doing this, it is appropriate that I acknowledge and thank Paul Bollen, who has acted as Secretary to the board for so many years.

The scheme has worked fairly well, but a number of areas needed tidying up. The board was in a somewhat embarrassing situation of having to make a lot of decisions, and at times making decisions that it perhaps did not have the power to make under the Act. It needed to do that to make sure that the whole fund and the operation of the previous Act did not fall into complete disarray. That is no reflection on the people involved. Whenever one introduces a new scheme, problems arise. I am sure that the previous Government and this Government realised the need for some flexibility in the powers of decision-making of the board.



I take up particularly the Deputy Leader's point about clause 7, which involves the power of the board and its right to lend moneys from the fund on conditions to either a person or a body. I understand that the word 'person' was inserted specifically to include classes of person that may not be a body corporate as such, and that such investment be in the interests of the industry. I am prepared to consider that point, and I highlight to the honourable member the two areas that were specifically considered when the amendment was drafted. The first was the potential to help fund the group apprenticeship training scheme. The old board, under the Chairmanship of Mr Ian Milne, indicated a willingness to help come up with the running funds for the scheme in the building industry. I believe we all agree that everyone has benefited from that training—the builders, the trade unions involved, the employees in the industry, and the industry as a whole.

The fact is that in 1981, the first year of the group apprenticeship training scheme, the undertaking was to take on 100 apprentices (in fact, 90 apprentices were taken on that year). That was a very bold step, and the M.B.A. and everyone involved should be commended. However, that action cost a great deal of money and the Government lent \$100 000 interest-free so that that scheme could get under way. Originally, we considered whether or not the fund would be the appropriate source, as the entire building industry would benefit from the scheme. We found that the old Act did not allow that course, and that is the area we have been considering. All of the members of the old board agreed with the proposal. The proposal has not come before the new board, because the power was not there. That is the type of scheme we are considering. I tend to agree with the honourable member that perhaps we should consider tightening up that clause so that we are quite definite about the area in which we are lending. I would be quite happy to consider an amendment to provide that only a group apprenticeship training scheme as approved by the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission should be involved.

I believe that the fund made a loan at normal commercial rates to the State Bank with a specific request that it be used for housing approvals. In other words, the total amount of funds in the State Bank was increased by, I think, \$1 000 000 for housing purposes. Again, that occurred because there would be a direct flow-on benefit to the entire industry. I do not believe that that case required approval under a clause such as this: that matter could be handled under the present Act.

I thank the honourable member for raising this point. I am prepared to tighten up that clause to make it quite specific to a group apprenticeship training scheme that has been formally approved by the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission, because that is the area we are considering.

It is not appropriate or necessary to go any further in regard to the remarks made by the Deputy Leader, but I thank the honourable member for the thought he has given to the Bill. I also thank the board members, both old and new, and the departmental staff who have put a lot of work into this matter, particularly the Deputy Director-General, Mr Max Johnson. I also thank the building trade unions and members of the Master Builders Association and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry who have co-operated so willingly over the past 12 months in regard to these amendments. The Bill is the result of fairly long and perhaps drawn out negotiations, but negotiations that have been very successful. I urge all members of the House to support the second reading of the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

## ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr ABBOTT (Spence):** I rise in this grievance debate on behalf of the Hindmarsh Corporation, its residents, and residents groups, including the many concerned ethnic communities who live in the area, to place on record the strongest possible objection to the site chosen at Port Road, Brompton, for Adelaide's new remand centre. The Hindmarsh council, on behalf of its ratepayers, specifically requests that I, as the local member, voice the council's opposition to this particular decision. Only this morning I received the following telegram, which was addressed to me at Parliament House:

It is understood the report of the Public Works Committee concerning the remand centre will be presented to Parliament this session. You are requested to place on record in Parliament the total opposition of the Hindmarsh council to the location of the proposed remand centre at Port Road, Brompton.

The telegram is signed 'Pens, Mayor of Hindmarsh'. I understand that copies of this telegram were sent to my colleague, the member for Peake, who, with me, was called for discussion with the officers of the Hindmarsh council late last week to consider the Opposition's attitude to this particular report. I understand that copies were also sent to the Leader of the Opposition, the Minister (Hon. D. C. Brown), and the member for Mitcham. The need for a remand centre to replace the facilities at Adelaide gaol is not contested in any way. It is the location and the small size of the chosen site to which objections are being taken. Without going into all the reasons and the details of the objections, I should like to highlight several of the major concerns.

First, it is generally considered that the size of the site is far too small—1.6 hectares compared with the 4.7 hectare site preferred by the previous Labor Government at Regency Park. There is very little room for expansion. The Brompton site will provide for a remandee population of about 186 with provision for expansion for another 62 inmates in the areas currently designed for staff parking. The provision for parking allows for 70 staff cars and 50 visitors' cars, making a total of 120 car park spaces. If future expansion becomes necessary, where will these cars be able to park? Any real expansion can only go higher, and that space available for car parking will be considerably reduced; it is totally inadequate. I understand that more than a third of the proposed site comprises a badly filled pug hole. According to the report that was tabled in the House today (I have not had the chance to study the whole of the report in any detail as yet), piling will need to be of the order of 12 metres in depth and difficulties may occur due to the presence of old car bodies, tyres, old refrigerators, trucks, and a variety of other metal products. Great concern has been expressed at the effect of regular and constant vehicle movements in and out each day from the remand centre on this major transport artery, the Port Road, and this will produce a continuous traffic bottleneck. I have had hundreds of letters from my constituents and residents from around the whole of the Hindmarsh area protesting at the Government's decision on this particular site. I would like to quote two of the letters that I have received. The first letter says:

Dear Sir,

I am a resident of Hindmarsh and am proud of the town as it could have a great future. Despite its problems, Hindmarsh is still



a fine place to live because of the convenience of nearby shops, schools, work and buses. With the help of our council and community groups we are going to make sure it remains a town we are proud to call home.

The Government's announcement last year that part of the M.A.T.S. Plan was to be scrapped was good news. It provides many opportunities to develop land earmarked for roadworks for the last 12 years. The Government's announcement in February this year that around 5 acres of prime development land adjacent to houses and the civic heart of Hindmarsh would be the site for a prisoner remand centre was bad news.

The council has told us that it will lose around \$6 000 per annum which other ratepayers will have to cover instead. Besides that, we residents want more houses in Hindmarsh. It has been estimated that over 40 houses could be built on the site—even more if they were flats. If the remand centre goes there, we are likely to lose residents from the area! The building would be so prominent it would give Hindmarsh another bad name.

You might not want to live here, but we do. As a town, Hindmarsh has suffered enough from Government decisions. Could you support us and voice your concern at the Government's choice? We don't want Hindmarsh to get a life sentence.

Yours faithfully,

Another letter from a constituent addressed to me says:

Dear Sir,

As residents in Ridleyton, with a small property in Brompton, we protest towards the plan to erect a prisoners remand centre at Port Road, Brompton. Are we not penalised enough with smog and fumes, which have ruined our health? We are unable to leave this suburb, because our houses are unsaleable. We have to look at fences which hide smelly rubbish heaps and neglected dwellings. But this remand centre on Port Road opposite a school on a very small piece of land is ridiculous. The police record on prison escapees is not very encouraging either. Given the chance in Brompton a fugitive can even take a bus or jump on a train or disappear into little streets in Bowden, where even a traffic offender is hard to catch. Why not tell Minister Dean Brown, if he wants a remand centre not far from the city, take that piece of land from the E. and W.S. Department on Port Road, Deviation Road and East Terrace, opposite the police barracks in exchange of land in Bowden which belongs to the Highways Department and is nothing more than an eyesore!

Yours faithfully,

That is typical of the letters with which I have been inundated. The teaching profession, and parents of students attending the Hindmarsh Primary School, have also expressed great fear about the remand centre being built so close to the school. Her Worship the Mayor of Hindmarsh declared that Hindmarsh is putting up with the great deal of bad treatment from the Government. Hindmarsh has been subject to decisions made outside the town with many bad effects on the town. This gloom has hung over Hindmarsh for almost two decades.

Hindmarsh has been bothered with the MATS plan, the Hindmarsh Boulevard and the north-south corridor, resulting in a substantial loss of rates to the township. The proposed building is the wrong building for the civic centre of the town of Hindmarsh and is inadequate for the future potential remand population. No family impact assessments were obtained from people living in the vicinity of the proposed development. That speaks for itself regarding this Government's policy in support of family.

The proposal has already caused an undesirable impact upon the community and residents are confused about the future of their homes. Hindmarsh council considers that this plan will be insufficient for the needs of a remand centre, and that a major facility of this sort is out of character with the business centre of Hindmarsh and is not suited to commercial, retail and administrative—

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

**Dr BILLARD (Newland):** I want to refer to the report of the Legislative Council Select Committee on uranium resources and, in particular, to the comments made in that report by the Hon. Lance Milne. I think that the comments he has made have quite a deal of significance because of his position in that House and because he holds the balance

of power. On reading through his section of the report one sees the following:

There is a vast difference between uranium and any other fuel. All other known fuels generate heat and burn away, leaving relatively harmless gases or ashes.

That statement is made by a man who has been through countless and protracted sittings of that Select Committee and who has had a great weight of evidence placed before him and that committee on this very subject, yet he comes up with that statement.

I know that I dealt with this subject in the Address in Reply debate in 1980, but considerably more information has become available since that time and I believe that, because of the importance of the Hon. Mr Milne in the uranium debate, and because of the importance of that statement, this matter bears further investigation.

I want to make three points. First, there is a great weight of evidence to suggest that coal power, which is the major alternative to nuclear power at present, is vastly more destructive of human life and has a great deal more potential damage which is yet to be explored and which scientists have not yet been able to define. I refer initially to a paper published in the journal *Chemistry in Canada*, in December 1979, and an article titled 'The Health Hazards of Not Going Nuclear', by Leo Yaffe. In that article Mr Yaffe lists the output of a 1 000 megawatt coal-fired power plant. Such a plant releases per day into the atmosphere 230 tonnes of sulphur dioxide, which is commonly termed acid rain; 48 tonnes of various nitrous oxides; 15 tonnes of fly ash; about 30 pounds of various heavy metals (and obviously, the exact amount would depend on where the coal comes from); and around three tonnes of carbon dioxide per tonne of coal.

Of course, there are other cancer causing substances and radioactivity from uranium, which is almost always an impurity in coal. In fact, it is well known that coal-fired power stations pour out more radioactivity and radioactive substances than do nuclear power stations. If we were to select where we would live, anyone who knew the facts would rather live next to a nuclear power station than a coal-fired power station.

The fact is that these wastes are simply pushed out into the atmosphere. They are not contained, kept in containers and buried for the next few hundred or thousands of years. They are simply pushed into the atmosphere. These facts have been known for some time and would surely have been presented before the Select Committee. I suggest that the statement of the Hon. Mr Milne that 'All other known fuels generate heat and burn away, leaving relatively harmless gases or ashes,' simply flies in the face of what are well known and documented facts.

The second point that I wish to make is that, although I believe that the major question when considering uranium mining is not the absolute question of whether uranium mining is safe, but the relative question of whether uranium mining is safer than are the alternatives, nevertheless, I believe that the debate in the media has centred on the first question: is uranium mining safe? I will illustrate that by referring to a pair of incidents that occurred last year. I have chosen to quote the *Advertiser*. I do not hold anything against the *Advertiser*, but that newspaper referred to the examples that I have selected.

On 18 April 1981, on the right-hand side of page 1 of the *Advertiser*, a small article appeared with the headline 'Fifteen dead after U.S. mine explosion'. That article described in about 6 or 7 column inches a coal mine disaster that occurred in the Colorado Rockies, in the United States, where 15 men were killed.

That is the space that was given to that mine disaster. Of course, those who watch those things would know that

disasters in coal mines happen with monotonous regularity around the world. In fact, there was another one later in the year in Japan. I can remember reading that 93 people were killed in one disaster. It was notable only that they all died at the one time.

In the next issue of the paper another article of about the same size appeared under the heading 'Nuclear scare in Japan'. That article referred to the spillage of radioactive water within a nuclear power station in Japan. Press coverage was given to that incident, bearing in mind that 15 people were not killed and that no-one was killed or known to be injured. On 20 April an article of about the same size was headed 'Nuclear scare in Japan'. Two days later, it was page 1 news under the heading 'Inquiry into nuclear leak'. The banner headline spread almost completely from one side of the page to the other and from the top of the front page to the bottom.

On 27 April, on page 2, an article of about 7 to 8 column inches in size appeared under the heading 'Nuclear plant reveals fourth spill'. On 28 April, on page 2, an article a half-page wide by a third-page deep appeared under the heading 'Radiation doses at danger level'. On page 4 a feature article appeared under the heading 'Tipping a contaminated bucket on Japan's nuclear plants'. All in all, five articles appeared on one accident in a nuclear plant. That accident did not cause any deaths, yet two days before, when 15 people died, that story received a small space on one side of a page.

I believe that the attention of the public at present is not focused on what are the true issues, which are the comparisons between the real alternatives of producing electricity. If we decide not to go nuclear, we are making a *de facto* decision that we will go for coal power.

The final point that I wish to make (and I made this point in the address that I gave two years ago) concerns the dangers that we face from the excessive burning of fossil fuel. At that stage I referred to a paper by Dr Barry Hunt from the C.S.I.R.O., who was studying the various models that scientists around the world had been using to try to predict what the effect would be as carbon dioxide was poured into the world's atmosphere. He predicted that it would raise the temperature of the atmosphere and eventually produce great climatic changes.

Since that time there have been a number of articles in the press. I refer honourable members to two articles that appeared in January, one in the *Age* and one in the *Australian*. Those two reports were from totally different sources and both referred to measurements that have now been made showing that the level of the oceans is actually rising. Previously it was just conjecture that this would happen. It has now been measured that since 1940 the sea level has increased 10 centimetres and that it is increasing at an average rate of 2½ millimetres a year. Obviously, it is rising at an increasing rate, and I believe that the dangers that we face from excessive burning of fossil fuels are greatly more significant—

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

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** I address my grievance tonight to on-the-spot fines. As honourable members would be aware, I have been most critical about this situation in the media since about 21 January 1982, particularly concerning the Government's failure to educate the travelling public in South Australia about what actions breach the Road Traffic Act. The list of offences that a motorist may commit under the Road Traffic Act covers nine pages in very small print.

**The Hon. D. O. Tonkin:** But they are not new offences.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I agree, but the fact is that these offences were not policed previously to the same extent that they are now being policed. It is all very well for the Premier to sit there smugly and pull faces, but the travelling public, South Australian motorists, are being ripped off by his Government, which has not at any stage tried to educate the people of South Australia about what offences they can commit.

**The Hon. D. O. Tonkin:** Give us some proof.

**Mr HAMILTON:** If the Premier can contain himself, I will give him proof. I would have thought that he had been here long enough to learn that he should contain himself. Under the Australian design rule, motor vehicles since 1972 have been bought off showroom floors in South Australia without exterior rear vision mirrors on both sides. I had a call last week from a motorist who was pulled up on the South-Eastern Freeway and given a \$40 fine for not having a rear vision mirror on both sides of his car. This person pointed out to the police officer that he bought the vehicle in 1972 out of a showroom and understood that the vehicle complied with the Australian design rule. Suddenly the Premier is quiet. The average motorist in South Australia wants to comply with the Road Traffic Act but is unaware of about 200 provisions under the Road Traffic Act.

The Premier and his Party, on my calculations, will take something like \$4 000 000 from the motorists in South Australia this year. I refer to some of the offences. I refer to louvres on the rear window of cars, for example. I understand that, if a vehicle is fitted with an exterior louvre, and that vehicle does not have a mirror on either side, one can be fined up to \$40. But what constitutes a rear window louvre? Is it an inside metal louvre, or is it one of those cloth sun protectors. I understand that if one's vision is impaired from within the vehicle and if one does not have a rear vision mirror on either side of the car a \$40 fine can be imposed. Another example concerns an over-inflated tyre for which one can be fined \$20. How does the average motorist know whether his tyres are over-inflated? If he goes into a service station is he assured that the tyre pump gauges are correct? Is that being policed by the Government to ensure that motorists can comply with it? Are gauges used by the police; if they use them, are they checked every day? I should certainly like to know that.

What constitutes a commercial vehicle for the purposes of the Act? Is it a station wagon? If my interpretation of the Act is correct, if a station wagon is a commercial vehicle it requires a rear vision mirror on both sides of the vehicle, and the same provision applies for a utility or a panel van. Surely there is an obligation on the Government, and in particular the motor manufacturers in Australia, to let people know whether vehicles comply with the Australian design standards.

**Mr Evans:** Have your read the Act?

**Mr HAMILTON:** How many people read the Act? How many people know where to get a copy of the Act? It was all very well when the Government introduced random breath testing; it wanted to educate the public. However, when it comes to these small fines with which to rip off motorists for \$30, \$40, or up to \$90, that is another question. The Government does not want to educate the motoring public in South Australia; it wants the opportunity to pull these motorists over and for an officer to say 'Yes, Sir, we will have a look. Your windscreen is dirty, headlight glass is dirty, and your windscreen wipers do not comply with the Act.' The officer may also ask whether a motorist's brake light is working and then test it. If the brake light is not working, I understand that a motorist can incur another fine.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** It is all very well for members opposite to laugh about it, but they should get out amongst their own constituents and find the hostility that has been generated because of the lack of education by the Government, which is not prepared to spend money to advise the travelling public about what constitutes an offence. The Government is not prepared to advise people what is happening.

A rather interesting exercise has been put to me. Some of my constituents are so incensed that they are considering asking many of their friends to ring up the local police station to find out what constitutes an offence in relation to these 200-odd fines listed within the Road Traffic Act. One can imagine the sort of work load that would be placed on police officers at their stations. It is all very well for the Premier to sit their like a pompous ass and pull faces, but the matter is certainly not funny to people in electorates who are being lumbered by these fines. I can assure members of that. It would be interesting to see what sort of work load police officers would be compelled to undertake because of this Government's stupidity. It has used the motoring public in South Australia as a milking cow in order to bolster up the incompetence of the Premier and Treasurer because he cannot manage the State's finances.

One other issue I would like to raise is the question of vandalism in South Australia. I raised this matter in a Question on Notice, No. 307, and asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many cases of vandalism were reported in each division during the year 1980-81 and in each month this year?
2. How many persons were convicted for vandalism in those periods, how many were juveniles and how many adults were released on bonds?

3. How many instances of vandalism during the year 1980-81 are still unsolved?

4. What specific measures has the Government taken to reduce vandalism?

I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* the statistics provided as an answer to question 307 given to me today.

**The SPEAKER:** As they already appear in the record of today's proceedings, under Questions on Notice (No. 307, headed 'Vandalism'), there is no need for them to be inserted again.

**Mr HAMILTON:** The amount and cost of vandalism in South Australia concerns me. I raise the question because in the district I represent, in the Woodville council area in the last financial year an amount of \$50 000 was spent due to vandalism. Can the Chief Secretary say what grants have been made available and to which bodies, for research and surveys into the problems associated with vandalism in South Australia? How many requests have been received and from which bodies seeking funds to research surveys on problems associated with vandalism? Have approaches been made to insurance companies seeking financial assistance for research?

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

Motion carried.

At 9.37 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 10 February at 2 p.m.

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 9 February 1982

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

## MINISTERS' OVERSEAS VISITS

5. Mr MILLHOUSE (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How many Ministers have yet to make a trip overseas since taking office and who are they?

2. When had it been planned that each should go and for what purpose?

3. Is each of them still going and, if so, why and, if not, why not and what disadvantage to the State is expected as a result?

4. What has been—

(a) the cost; and

(b) the benefit to the State,

of each trip so far taken by a Minister?

(Replied to on 10 December 1981.)

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

1. Six Ministers are yet to take a trip outside of Australasia, since taking office.

Premier

2. Not applicable.

3. Not applicable.

4. A. April 1980, \$30 867, includes Minister, Director-General, Premier's Department and Press Secretary.

September 1980, \$12 836, includes Minister and Press Secretary.

March-April 1981, \$48 672, includes Minister, Director of State Development, Research Assistant and Press Secretary.

B. Increased awareness and positive investment from overseas in South Australia.

Deputy Premier

2. Not applicable.

3. Not applicable.

4. A. October-November 1980, \$36 473, includes Minister, his wife, and Press Secretary (Deputy Director-General, Mines and Energy expenses paid from departmental lines).

B. Undertaking negotiations and obtaining information to ensure successful implementation of Government policy in relation to resource and energy developments.

Attorney-General

2. No intention at present.

3. Not applicable.

4. Not applicable.

Industrial Affairs

2. Not applicable.

3. Not applicable.

4. (a) The Minister of Industrial Affairs in 1980 attended the Duke of Edinburgh's Fifth Study Tour Conference in Ontario, Canada. The Minister also went to the United Kingdom, France, Germany and Denmark for discussions with senior Government officials regarding investment potentials in South Australia; cost—\$10 875.92.

(b) A number of potential investors were identified, and opportunities are being pursued. As a direct result of the Minister's discussions, Grundfos Pumps has established an assembly plant in South Australia at a cost of

over \$1 000 000. The French Minister of Industry, together with a group of senior French industrialists and officials, also subsequently visited South Australia in September 1980 to look at the potential for establishing investment ventures in the State. The Minister held discussions with two British manufacturers. One of these manufacturers has now established a joint venture in Adelaide to produce instant money tickets, while the other manufacturer is now in the final stages of a feasibility study to establish an appliance manufacturing facility in South Australia. In addition, discussions were held with other commercial interests where long-term benefits may develop for South Australia.

Education

2. No intention at present.

3. Not applicable.

4. Not applicable.

Chief Secretary

The Chief Secretary attended the Conference of Ministers of Prisons, Probation and Parole in Auckland, New Zealand, on Thursday 30 April 1981. He departed from Adelaide on Tuesday 28 April and returned on Sunday 17 May. The cost of the trip, which included travel, accommodation and expenses for the Chief Secretary and his Chief Administrative Officer, was \$6 170. During his visit he attended various Periodic Detention Centres, including prison farms which have been established for the offending person. It provided first-hand knowledge of the workings of such institutions. The conference provided an opportunity for the Chief Secretary to discuss with Ministerial colleagues areas of interest in the Correctional Services field. Discussions were also held with Fire Brigade and marine authorities.

Local Government

2. No date has yet been fixed. The purpose of the proposed trip will be to study local government administration prior to the rewriting of the Local Government Act, to study administration of subsidised theatre and performing arts, to visit Italy and Greece relative to immigration matters and to study welfare housing overseas.

3. Yes, for the reasons detailed in part 2 of this question.

4. Not applicable.

Agriculture

2. No intention at present.

3. Not applicable.

4. (a) June 1980, \$8 713, includes Minister and Director of Agriculture. November-December, \$19 656, includes Minister, his wife and Director-General of Agriculture.

(b) June 1980: A \$9 560 000 contract for a 5 000 ha demonstration farm with flow-on to South Australian industries. November-December: A feasibility study agreed to for the establishment of a demonstration farm in Tunisia. Clarification with the Algerian Government on future procedures and policies for agro/pastoral projects, ongoing development of potential fisheries and forestry projects. Strengthening of ties with Saudi Arabia.

Environment and Planning

Whilst trips have been made to New Zealand and New Guinea to attend conferences of Australian Environment Ministers and the Council of Conservation Ministers, no overseas trip has been contemplated at this stage.

2. No plans made.

3. No disadvantage is expected.

4. *vide* 2.

Transport

2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.
4. (a) \$45 294 includes Minister, his wife, Director-General of Transport and Press Secretary.
- (b) Developments of the north-east busway reached a point where it was essential the Minister visit the facility in Essen, West Germany, to further negotiations and contractual arrangements with Daimler-Benz and Ed Zublin, two companies preparing design work for the State Government. The trip also involved inspection of busway operations, the latest bus technology and discussions with transport planners in the United States of America, United Kingdom and France. Public transport ticketing and managerial processes were studied in detail, to develop more efficient methods in State Transport Authority procedures.

**Health**

2. and 3. The Minister of Health may travel overseas in early 1982 to study health education, health promotion, community health programmes, rehabilitation programmes and extended care for the aged and handicapped with a view to assessing the benefits of applying such programmes in South Australia. The opportunity would also be taken to examine the legislative and administrative arrangements applying in countries and States that have been effective in containing and controlling costs and improving the quality of health services. Selected tourism projects may also be studied.

4. Not applicable.

**Water Resources**

2. Not applicable. Includes Minister, Director-General and Engineer-In-Chief, Director-General of Agriculture and the Regional Manager—Riverland of the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

3. Not applicable. Includes Minister, Director-General and Engineer-In-Chief, Director-General of Agriculture and the Regional Manager—Riverland of the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

4. (a) \$31 224.51.

(b) It confirmed that the South Australian Government's objectives, policies and programmes in the areas of water resource management and irrigation—particularly with respect to the River Murray—are soundly based. Also, it highlighted the need to pursue a number of current Government initiatives more vigorously in order to protect and enhance the important Murray River irrigation industry as well as the interests of other South Australian users of the Murray River.

**STATUTORY AUTHORITIES**

15. Mr **MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How many statutory authorities are there now in South Australia and how many were there when this Government came into office?

2. What are they?

3. Pursuant to what Statute, or other authority, was each established and when?

4. How much was paid, and for what purposes, to each by the Government in each of the financial years 1979-80 and 1980-81?

5. How many of such authorities are required to have their annual accounts audited by the Auditor-General and

what financial supervision, if any, is exercised over the others and by whom?

6. What plans, if any, does the Government have to reduce the number of such statutory authorities and when will they be put into effect?

(Replied to on 10 December 1981.)

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

1. The member for Mitcham asked a similar question previously, which was answered on 31 July 1979 (House of Assembly *Hansard*, p. 207) and I refer the member to this answer for the details he requires concerning South Australian statutory authorities in existence when this Government came to office. The following authorities have been created since the Government came to office:

- Meat Hygiene Authority
- Ethnic Affairs Commission
- State Disaster Committee
- Non-government Schools Registration Board
- Industrial and Commercial Training Commission
- Correctional Services Advisory Council
- South Australian Urban Land Trust
- History Trust of South Australia
- The Handicapped Persons Discrimination Tribunal
- The Dog Advisory Committee
- Legal Practitioners Complaints Committee
- Legal Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal.

The following authorities have been abolished or replaced by authorities created since the Government came to office:

- Monarto Development Commission
- Apprenticeship Commission
- South Australian Land Commission
- Constitutional Museum Trust
- Central Dog Committee
- Statutory Committee of the Law Society
- Red Scale Committees
- San Jose Scale Control Committees
- Oriental Fruit Moth Committees
- Fruit Fly Compensation Committee

The following authorities are currently subject to repeal Bills:

- South Australian Development Corporation
- South Australian Council for Educational Planning and Research.

2. Refer to answer part 1.

3. Refer to answer part 1.

4. I refer the member to the answer provided to part 4 of his previous question referred to in part 1. The same answer is still applicable. In addition, the programme and performance budgeting papers presented to Parliament for the Estimates Committees provide greater analysis of the Government's expenditure and therefore allocations to statutory authorities.

5. For the audit arrangements of authorities existing when this Government came to office, refer to the previous answer mentioned in part 1 above. The following additional authorities will be audited by the Auditor-General:

- Meat Hygiene Authority
- Ethnic Affairs Commission
- History Trust of South Australia.

In the case of the other statutory authorities created since the Government came to office, those which incur expenditure that could include fees or travelling expenses will be subject to review by the Auditor-General as these expenses are paid by departments.

6. The Government will continue to review the need for the continuation or restructuring of certain statutory authorities. Apart from those already abolished or restructured as detailed in part 1 above, the Deregulation Unit of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet is continuing to review, in conjunction with the departments, the need for certain authorities. The Government has also introduced a Bill to establish a Statutory Authorities Review Committee in the Legislative Council and reference can be made to

the second reading speech, which provides full details on the proposed review mechanism for statutory authorities.

### ETHNIC LANGUAGE SIGNS

179. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Transport: Is there a need for erection of arrival, departure and other information sign boards in ethnic languages at Adelaide Airport, Adelaide Railway Station and major bus depots, respectively, and, if not, why not in each case and, if so, will the Minister take the necessary action to have such signs erected and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The Commonwealth Minister for Transport has advised that the policy of his Department in relation to the provision of multilingual signs in international airport terminal buildings is in keeping with the recommendations of the International Air Transport Association, which state that signs in terminals should be displayed in the following languages: native language; international aviation language (English); other languages where justified by the volume of passengers. As Australia receives overseas visitors of many nationalities, it would be difficult and confusing to accommodate the needs of all foreign visitors. For similar reasons such facilities are not provided at the current domestic terminal building at Adelaide Airport.

The proposed Adelaide international terminal building will include connection to the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs telephone interpreter service. The possible need for information in ethnic languages at Adelaide Railway Station will be examined as part of the current study into the station's potential for redevelopment and upgrading. The two bus stations in South Australia which appear relevant to the honourable member's question are those in Franklin Street operated by Ansett Pioneer and Central Bus Station Pty Ltd. Neither of these stations display such information (even in English) on boards of the general type used at airports.

### SAFETY FOOTWEAR

241. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How many Government departments supply their employees with safety industrial footwear, what are the names of the departments and what are the respective numbers of employees so supplied?

2. How many Government employees received foot injuries during 1980-81?

3. What is the basis of supply of safety footwear to each Government department (i.e., free, subsidised, etc.)?

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

	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3
Department of Agriculture . . . . .	Approximately 50	Nil reported	Free since May 1978, but the matter is under review
Department of Community Welfare . . . . .	Nil	17	Not Applicable
Department of Correctional Services . . . . .	Nil	11	Free
Education Department . . . . .	2	This information is not readily available	In accordance with section 3, 6 of volume 5 of South Australian Public Service Board Management Services Manual
Engineering and Water Supply Department . . . . .	2 573	107	In accordance with section 3, 6 of volume 5 of South Australian Public Service Board Management Services Manual
Department of Environment and Planning . . . . .	290	7	Footwear is issued and replaced free, excepting in cases of undue negligence
Department of Fisheries . . . . .	Approximately 60	Nil	All Fisheries Department personnel engaged on field duties are supplied free of cost with protective footwear
Department of Further Education . . . . .	79	14	In accordance with Public Service Board Industrial InstrucNo. 533
Highways Department . . . . .	Although records do not indicate the number of employees issued with safety footwear, approximately 280 pairs of rubber knee safety boots are supplied each year while approximately 350 employees were subsidised for purchase of safety footwear during the last 12 months	19	Safety footwear directly supplied by the department is confined to rubber knee boots, which are issued to employees required to work in wet conditions. These boots are supplied at no charge to the employee. In addition, the department subsidises eligible employees who purchase approved safety footwear for their normal duties to the extent of \$14.30 per pair for up to 2 pairs of boots or shoes per annum
Department of Lands . . . . .	1	Nil	In accordance with section 3, 6 of volume 5 of South Australian Public Service Board Management Services Manual
Department of Local Government . . . . .	Nil	6	Not Applicable

	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3
Department of Marine and Harbors .....	Nil	26	In accordance with section 3, 6 of volume 5 of South Australian Public Service Board Management Services Manual
Department of Mines and Energy .....	80	12	In accordance with section 3, 6 of volume 5 of South Australia Public Service Board Management Services Manual
Police Department .....	Nil	26	In accordance with section 3, 6 of volume 5 of South Australian Public Service Board Management Services Manual
Department of the Premier and Cabinet .....	Nil	1	Not applicable
Public Buildings Department .....	186	41	In accordance with section 3, 6 of volume 5 of South Australian Public Service Board Management Services Manual
Department of Public and Consumer Affairs .....	19	Nil	All safety industrial footwear is supplied free of charge to the employee who in the course of their employment need this type of protection
Department of Services and Supply .....	7	10	In accordance with section 3, 6 of volume 5 of South Australian Public Service Board Management Services Manual
Department of Transport .....	21	2	In accordance with section 3, 6 of volume 5 of South Australian Public Service Board Management Services Manual
Woods and Forests Department .....	Approximately 209	14	Subsidised

**LONG SERVICE LEAVE**

246. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What arrangements are to apply for long service leave in 1982?
2. Under what circumstances may applications be refused and in those circumstances, what alternative arrangements will be made to enable those teachers to have access to their long service leave entitlements?

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

1. In the 1981-82 financial year, sufficient funds have been made available for all teachers who have requested long service leave to have their applications approved. Consequently, all teachers who applied for long service leave during the first term, by the due date, have had their leave approved.

2. Because my department believes there will be difficulty in providing replacements for some teachers who requested leave in June, July and September, a small number of teachers will be asked to amend their application to a more suitable time. In this way, minimum disruption to children's educational programmes will occur. Those asked to defer their leave will be identified according to the criteria sent to schools in September. Those teachers whose leave cannot be approved will be able to take their leave during the first term, if that is suitable.

**RELEASE TIME SCHOLARSHIPS**

249. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many full-time and part-time release time scholarships, respectively, have been provided in each of the last five academic years?
2. How many of those scholarships in each year were purely for personal enrichment and how many were for the purposes of teacher development?

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

1. Release time teacher scholarships

	Full time One year No.	Full time One term No.	Fractional No.
1981 .....	23	59	20
1980 .....	91	120	10
1979 .....	117	91	15
1978 .....	125	58	53
1977 .....	177	31	97

2. In all cases there must be demonstrated benefit to the teacher concerned and to the Education Department.

**PRISON EDUCATION**

250. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education—In relation to prison education:

- (a) what educational staff are located at each prison;
- (b) what course offerings do they provide;
- (c) how many prisoners participate in those courses;
- (d) what access to classroom contact is available to prisoners who study;
- (e) is access to education in prison regarded as a right or a privilege;
- (f) what counselling is available to prisoners to further their education; and



- (g) how is prison education administratively handled and who are the educational staff employed by and responsible to?

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

- (a) Yatala Labour Prison—One Principal III ED, one full-time teacher, one half-time teacher.

Women's Rehabilitation Centre—Serviced by staff at Yatala

Adelaide Gaol—One half-time teacher.

Cadell—One hourly-paid co-ordinator, one half-time lecturer.

Port Augusta—One half-time lecturer.

Port Lincoln—Hourly-paid instructors.

Mount Gambier—Hourly-paid instructor.

- (b) Yatala Labour Prison: General education classes—Literacy/numeracy, languages, correspondence course tuition groups in Biology, English, economics and lateral thinking skills, pre-release classes, computer programming.

Technical Education classes: welding M, welding P, spraypainting, panelbeating, sign-writing, silk-screening.

Correspondence Courses: Various—individually chosen.

Adelaide Gaol—General Education: Basic literacy/numeracy, leathercraft, patchwork, art, basic computing, guitar, 16 mm projection.

Technical Education: Mechanics theory.

Correspondence Courses: Various—individually chosen.

Cadell—Basic literacy/numeracy, leathercraft, painting (art), welding, general education—tutorials associated with correspondence courses and Aboriginal Education at Cadell, many short courses are conducted with participants from the local community, through Riv-erland Community College.

Port Augusta—Basic literacy/numeracy, welding, painting, leatherwork, weight-lifting, correspondence courses and tuition. Aboriginal education, guitar courses.

Port Lincoln—Basic literacy/numeracy, welding, art, leatherwork and weight lifting and correspondence courses (individual).

Mount Gambier—Basic literacy/numeracy, weight lifting, leatherwork, correspondence courses (individual).

- (c) Correspondence Courses—approximately 660 inmates.

Class Courses Yatala—approximately 70 inmates per week.

Technical Courses—approximately 20 inmates per week.

Adelaide Gaol—approximately 40 inmates per week.

Women's Rehabilitation Centre—approximately 15 inmates per week.

Country Total—approximately 80-90 inmates per week.

- (d) At Yatala and Adelaide Gaol access to class is available during the day, for inmates on course, if they wish that contact. Contact varies, depending on study programmes and individual wishes from one period to 'full-time' education class contact. There is no evening contact due to custodial staffing limitations in the metropolitan area. In the country areas evening access varies with availability of supervising custodial staff and lecturer availability.

- (e) Inmates are regarded as having right to education, and every endeavour is made to give access to courses either in class or by correspondence mode, according to inmates' wishes.

- (f) Counselling of inmates for short or long term educational prospects is seen as a major concern of the education section. Accordingly, some 3 600 interviews were conducted in the State in this regard from January to August 1981.

- (g) The administration of prisoner education has been in a situation of transition from the Department of Education to Further Education since 1978. The Director of Correctional Services is regarded as having responsibility for the provision of prisoner education.

### JUNIOR PRIMARY SCHOOLS

251. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What is the Government's policy concerning junior primary schools?

2. Upon what criteria is disestablishment ever considered for junior primary schools?

3. Is it possible that junior primary schools, once disestablished, can ever be re-established?

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

1. Junior primary schools have traditionally been part of the organisational structure of South Australian schools, serving the needs of children in Years R-2. In recent years, a number of trends have emerged in the structure and administration of junior primary education and these reflect current departmental policy.

- (a) Curriculum in primary and junior primary schools is developing an R-7 perspective, administered by co-operative planning and curriculum development at the Year 2, 3 interface, and at the Year 1 Reception, and Child/Parent Centre interface.

- (b) Teachers in junior primary schools are increasingly encouraging parents to contribute to educational planning.

- (c) Staff in promotion positions in junior primary schools allocate a very significant part of their time to staff development, much of which is planned as an outcome of (a) and (b) above.

The departmental document 'Into the 80's' reaffirms the policy of diversity of school structure and administrative styles. Thus, junior primary schools will continue to make an important contribution to State education in the future.

2. Disestablishment may be considered:

If demographic trends show a significant decline in future student enrolment;

If a junior primary school is sited adjacent or nearby to a primary school, and the integration of physical facilities seems desirable for educational and economic reasons;

If the student group is, in general, not considered to have particular needs to an unusual degree;

If the level of other early childhood services in the community is adequate.

3. It is unlikely that junior primary schools, once disestablished, would be re-established.

### CADET CORPS

255. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What schools are involved in the Australian Cadet Corps programme?

2. How many students are involved, and what proportion of these are girls?

3. What costs to the Education Department or the individual schools, respectively, are associated with the operations of the corps and what recoup is achieved by charges to parents or the Federal Government?

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

1. Norwood High School, Gilles Plains High School—Open, Broken Hill Combined High Schools, Rostrevor College, St Paul's College, St Michael's College, Whyalla City—Open Unit (BHP), Noarlunga—Open Unit (10 RSAR), Warradale—Open Unit (27).

2. 934 in September 1981. No girls are involved.

3. Of South Australian Education Department schools, only Norwood High School sponsors a unit within its school. This involves no direct cost, only the provision of a storage shed, access to school camping equipment, and the guarantee of a place for parades to be held. Funds are raised by parents to cover camps.

### COPYRIGHT LEGISLATION

259. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What efforts have been made, and when, by the Minister to reduce the impact of the new copyright legislation upon schools sited outside broadcasting areas which have to rely on video-taped material?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Recent amendments to the Copyright Act, 1968 were concerned with copying by reprographic means such as photocopying. No action was needed to reduce the impact of the new copyright legislation upon schools sited outside broadcasting areas which have to rely on video-taped material as there was no change to the law in this area. I will be seeking advice from the Education Technology Centre should any change take place.

### SCHOOL CLOSURES

262. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Does the Minister intend to adopt recommendation 16.8 of the First Report of the Keeves Committee of Inquiry which states: 'procedures should be developed for discussion with school councils, regional education councils and teachers prior to the closing of a school, in order that the need for closure should be clearly perceived and consensus reached before a final decision is made,' and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The committee's final report deals further with issues relating to surplus facilities and closure of schools. Therefore, it would be premature to take a decision on recommendation 16.8 of the first report at this time.

### DRIVING OFFENCES

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

1. Is the Government considering introducing increased penalties for driving offences, similar to those outlined recently in the Victorian Parliament?

2. Does the Government support the Victorian Government's view of increasing dangerous driving fines up to a maximum of \$1 000 and, if so, why and, if not, why not?

3. Does the Government support the Victorian Government's view of penalties for probationary drivers convicted

of failing to stop at 'stop' and 'give way' signs and, if so, why and, if not, why not?

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

1. In April 1981 the Victorian Government increased maximum penalties for offences against Regulations under the Victorian Road Traffic Act by 100 percent. Prior to this the Victorian penalties had not been increased since 1973. The current maximum penalties in South Australia reasonably approximate the increased penalties applying in Victoria for similar road traffic offences.

2. The South Australian penalties for dangerous driving were increased from June 1981. The current penalties reflect the seriousness with which the Government views this offence and no further increases are proposed at this time.

3. The South Australian Motor Vehicles Act also provides, through the points demerit scheme, for the cancellation of a probationary licence, if a driver is convicted of failing to comply with a 'Stop' sign or failing to 'Give Way'.

### ONKAPARINGA ESTUARY

276. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning:

1. Is the Government still committed to the principles of the Hosking, Fargher, Oborn concept for the development of the Onkaparinga Estuary?

2. Has this plan been costed and, if so, what is the total cost and when will work begin and, if not, why not?

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

1. It is presumed that the question refers to the concept plan prepared by the Onkaparinga Estuary Steering Committee for the State Planning Authority, with consultant support from Hosking, Fargher and Oborn Pty Ltd. Whilst the Government considers a recreational concept may be appropriate to the estuary it has not committed itself to any particular concept plan at this stage.

The Government is carrying out some work relating to the future use of the area—

A tree planting programme was completed in Autumn of 1981;

The feasibility of low cost water supply for irrigation purposes is being investigated.

2. The concept plan prepared for the State Planning Authority has been costed at approximately \$5 400 000 in October 1979 values. However, the Government is of the view that the potential for private capital investment in the recreational development of the area should be investigated and is proceeding accordingly. An assurance can be given that any development would have to meet strict principles of environmental management.

### FIRE BRIGADE BOUNDARIES

278. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Have the boundaries of the South Australian Fire Brigade been changed such that all areas of residential subdivision in the electorate of Salisbury are contained within that zone and, if not, when is it proposed to make such changes?

2. How many houses in residential subdivisions are still outside that zone?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The replies are as follows:

1. No such request has been received from the Salisbury council. However, there is an area of some 12.08 square kilometres being considered for inclusion in a fire district.

2. Approximately 2 900.

## WEST LAKES PRIMARY SCHOOL

287. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Will a new primary school be built in the West Lakes area within the next three years and, if so, when, where and at what cost and if, not, why not?

2. What is the expected enrolment of the following schools in the next two years—

- (a) West Lakes Shore Primary School;
- (b) Semaphore Park Primary School;
- (c) Hendon Primary School; and
- (d) Seaton Primary School?

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

1. No. The peak primary school enrolment at the school in the West Lakes area is anticipated to take place some time in 1985.

2. The anticipated February enrolments of the following schools during the next two years are as follows:

	1982	1983
West Lakes Shore Primary School . . . . .	640	680
Semaphore Park Primary School . . . . .	370	360
Hendon Primary School . . . . .	400	380
Seaton North Primary School . . . . .	295	280
Seaton Park Primary School . . . . .	380	360
Seaton Park Junior Primary School . . . . .	110	105

## LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT CENTRES

297. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. For each of the last three years what has been the breakdown between permanent appointments and contract appointments at the Language Development Centres at Gilles Street and Port Adelaide, respectively?

2. If there has been a trend toward the use of contract appointments during that time, why has that been so?

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

1. The Port Adelaide Language Centre was established at the beginning of 1981; a breakdown of staff is as follows:

Permanent Staff . . . . .	1.5
Contract Staff . . . . .	8.1

Gilles Street Language Centre was established in 1979, a break-down of staff for the subsequent three years is as follows:

1979 Permanent . . . . .	4.0
1979 Contract . . . . .	0.6
1980 Permanent . . . . .	5.6
1980 Contract . . . . .	5.6
1981 Permanent . . . . .	4.5
1981 Contract . . . . .	7.6

2. The trend towards increased years of contract appointments is because of the uncertainty of continued funding for Commonwealth funded projects.

## MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

298. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: How much was allocated in the budget for English as a second language and multicultural education, respectively, and what are the constituent components of those allocations?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The reply is as follows:

## English as a Second Language

	\$	\$
Salaries—		
Teachers . . . . .	2 838 000	
Ancillary Staff . . . . .	22 000	
Hourly Paid Instructors . . . . .	16 000	2 876 000
Contingencies . . . . .		110 000
Total . . . . .		\$2 986 000

## Multicultural Education

Salaries—		
Teachers . . . . .		84 000
Contingencies . . . . .		243 000
Total . . . . .		\$327 000

The above figures are based on average rates of pay for the respective employee groups at the beginning of the 1981-82 financial year and include pay-roll tax. Actual expenditure is expected to exceed these sums as salary and wage increases occur during the year.

It is not possible to directly compare this figure with the proposed Commonwealth allocation of \$3 187 000 for 1982 as the figures above are expressed in July 1981 terms, whereas the Commonwealth Government recommendations are expressed in December 1982 dollars. State allocations will increase during the year as a result of salary award increases. The same circumstances apply to the multicultural education department.

299. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many teachers are there at present under the auspices of multicultural education or English as a second language?

2. Are teachers who are employed under multicultural or E.S.L. programmes required to teach only according to programme guidelines and, if so, what are those guidelines?

3. What action is taken by the department if such teachers are used by schools for mainstream teaching and not for specific multicultural and E.S.L. purposes?

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

1. At present there are 156.1 (F.T.E) people employed under the auspices of multicultural education/English as a second language.

2. The guidelines which govern the way in which multicultural education/English as a second language teachers operate derive from the Schools Commission's Triennial Report for 1979-81, which outlines in broad terms the way in which teachers may be employed under the grant for migrant and multicultural education.

It is specified that such teachers should be seen as full staff members and be involved in planning and programming within their schools.

3. Multicultural education/English as a second language teachers' appointments to schools are subject to annual review, and when teachers are seen as being used inappropriately, their continued appointment at the school would be discussed with the school at the time of the review. However, it is difficult to identify something like 'mainstream teaching' as being inappropriate use of a teacher since, in many cases, that may be interpreted under 8.13 (a)—Schools Commission Report—as providing 'assistance to regular teachers to enable them to attend more adequately to English language development across the curriculum for second language learners'. In fact, the role of the multicultural education/English as a second language teacher differs markedly between schools in accordance with each school's stated policy.

## GILLES STREET LANGUAGE CENTRE

300. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What funding arrangements were made in

previous years for the holiday programme at the Language Development Centre at Gilles Street and is it proposed to continue that programme this year and, if so, what funding arrangements will meet its costs and, if not, why not and what alternative arrangements are to be made to cater for the special needs of students arriving in December, who will otherwise have no instruction until February?

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

1. In previous years, holiday programmes for refugees and immigrant pupils have been supplied on a needs basis from Commonwealth funds. Severe restrictions in the level of Schools Commission funds available for new arrivals programmes in 1982, together with the discarding of objective criteria for the establishment of needs, have made it impossible to provide a holiday programme from Schools Commission funds in January 1982. The State Government will provide the funds for a holiday programme in 1982. These funds will amount to approximately \$10 000 and the programme commenced on 4 January 1982 conducted at the Gilles Street Language Centre.

**SPECIAL PURPOSE PAYMENTS**

302. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Treasurer: Do special purpose payments from the Commonwealth Government go direct into general revenue accounts for disbursement or are they paid into special accounts?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The majority of special purpose payments from the Commonwealth Government are paid into a trust account entitled 'Commonwealth Grants for Special Purposes'. Depending on arrangements applicable to each programme, the funds may then be credited to the consolidated accounts, to departmental deposit accounts, or other departmental trust accounts.

**ETHNIC AIDE**

303. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Premier: Did Cabinet recently reject an application for the appointment of an ethnic aide in an Education Department facility for which position Commonwealth funding had already been approved and, if so, why?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** No. Cabinet has not recently rejected an application for the appointment of an ethnic aide in the Education Department.

**VANDALISM**

307. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many cases of vandalism were reported in each division during the year 1980-81 and in each month this year?

2. How many persons were convicted for vandalism in those periods, how many were juveniles and how many adults were released on bonds?

3. How many instances of vandalism during the year 1980-81 are still unsolved?

4. What specific measures has the Government taken to reduce vandalism?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The replies are as follows:

1. See column III of attached table. Statistics for 1981-82 are not yet available.

2. See column IV

3. See column V

4. Statistical data on crime, based on geographical location, are monitored by the Police Department and appropriate campaigns mounted to counter trends shown by this data.

Vandalism 1980-1981

I Police Division	II Headquarters	III Reported	IV Cleared up	V Unsolved
Region 'B'	(Adelaide)	2055	355	1700
C. 1 Division	(Port Adelaide)	1516	277	1239
C. 2 Division	(Darlington)	1295	175	1120
D. 1 Division	(Para Hills)	1569	216	1353
D. 2 Division	(Holden Hill)	1135	179	956
G. 1 Division Lower Murray	(Murray Bridge)	341	91	250
G. 2 Division Lower Northern	(Nuriootpa)	140	42	98
G. 3 Division South Eastern	(Mount Gambier)	391	90	301
G. 4 Division Riverland	(Berri)	225	67	158
G. 5 Division Mid Northern	(Kadina)	169	45	124
H. 2 Division Northern	(Port Pirie)	248	50	198
H. 3 Division Far Northern	(Port Augusta)	317	132	185
H. 4 Division Western	(Port Lincoln)	287	87	200
H. 5 Division North Western	(Whyalla)	675	104	571
Location not specified		12	2	10
		10375	1912	8463

Vandalism includes:

- Section 43 Police Offences Act (Wilful damage).
- Section 94 Criminal Law Consolidation Act (Attempt destroy building with explosives).
- Section 96 Criminal Law Consolidation Act (Injuries to building by tenant).
- Section 98 Criminal Law Consolidation Act (Destroying machinery).
- Section 100 Criminal Law Consolidation Act (Damage tree, shrub over \$2 value).
- Section 101 Criminal Law Consolidation Act (Damaging trees, etc.).
- Section 102 Criminal Law Consolidation Act (Destroying fences, etc.).
- Section 104 Criminal Law Consolidation Act (Damaging Mining machinery).
- Section 112 Criminal Law Consolidation Act (Injuries to electrical cables).
- Section 126 Criminal Law Consolidation Act (Malicious Damage).
- Section 29 Crimes Act (Destroying or damaging Commonwealth property).
- Section 90 Telecommunications Act (Damage to installations).
- Section 96 Postal Services Act (Injury to property of Commission).
- Bylaw 123 Railways Act (Injure, remove Railway property).

**SPENCER GULF FILTERED WATER**

310. Mr GUNN (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What is the anticipated total cost to provide filtered water to the northern Spencer Gulf regions?
2. When is it anticipated that work will commence?
3. Where will the filtration plant be situated?
4. When is it expected to be completed?
5. Will areas such as Peterborough be included in the filtration scheme?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. \$34.5 million (1980-81 values).
2. Work commenced in July 1981 with the engagement of the consultant Camp, Scott Furphy Pty Ltd, for the design of the Morgan Water Filtration Plant.
3. Water filtration plants will be located at Morgan and on the Swan Reach-Stockwell pipeline.
4. End of 1985.
5. Yes. However, local bore water is used to supplement supply to Peterborough occasionally.

**GROUP RECOVERY ORGANISATION**

311. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Health representing the Minister of Community Welfare: What financial assistance has been provided or allocated to the Group Recovery Organisation for the World for the years 1980-81 and 1981-82, respectively, and, if none, why not?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

- 1980-81, \$119 615
- 1981-82, \$119 615

**OPEN-SPACE PRIMARY SCHOOLS**

313. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. At which open-space primary schools were fixed partitions installed during the year 1980-81, and what were the respective costs?
2. How many schools will have fixed partitions installed during 1981-82?
3. What schools are on the list to be altered to the above system and what are their respective costs and completion dates?

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

1.

School	Cost
(1980-81 financial year)	
1 Risdon Park Primary	\$17 000
2 Renmark North Primary	\$ 2 500
(1981-82 financial year)	
3 Seaford Primary	\$46 250 (Group Contract)
4 Lonsdale Heights Primary	
5 O'Sullivan Beach Primary	
6 Christies East Junior Primary	\$17 400 (Group Contract)
7 Flagstaff Hill Primary	
8 Reynella Primary	
9 Hallett Cove South Primary	\$12 000 (Group Contract)
10 Coromandel Valley Primary	
11 Ridley Grove Primary	
12 Semaphore Park Primary	\$25 000 (Group Contract)
13 Ingle Heights Primary	
14 St. Agnes Primary	
15 Yorketown Area	\$ 9 800

2. It is hoped that an additional 11 schools will have partitioning installed in the coming financial year.

3.

School	Estimated Completion Date
1 Tumby Bay Area	April 1982
2 Port Lincoln Primary	
3 Streaky Bay Area	
4 Karcultaby Area	May 1982
5 Naracoorte Primary	
6 Penola Primary	
7 Glencoe Central Primary	May 1982
8 Padthaway Primary	
9 Mount Gambier East Primary	
10 Salisbury Downs Primary	May 1982
11 Lameroo Area	May 1982

It is not possible to give specific information on cost for individual schools as tenders have not yet been called.

**CANCER**

314. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many persons were treated for cancer during 1980-81 in Government hospitals?
2. What Government assistance is provided to patients who are required to regularly travel to hospitals for cancer treatment?
3. What voluntary organisations assist with such transport needs and what financial assistance is provided by the Government to such organisations?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. All of the statistical information necessary to determine the exact number of patients treated for cancer during 1980-81 is not yet available.

2. Patients with an entitlement card or who are otherwise disadvantaged are provided with appropriate free transport comprising either St John ambulances, clinic cars or taxis. Similar provisions apply to those patients who are obliged to attend the Royal Adelaide Hospital for radiotherapy treatment. In-patients are transported at the hospital's expense. Patients living in country areas who require radiotherapy treatment over an extended period (six weeks and over) may reside at Martin House, Gilles Street, Adelaide, during the period of treatment. Such patients are transported to and from the hospital by taxi.

3. The St John Ambulance Service is provided with extensive financial assistance by the Government towards the cost of transporting patients to hospitals. Such patients would include persons requiring cancer treatment. An amount of \$2 179 000 was provided to the St John Ambulance Service in 1980-81.

**STOLEN CRAFT**

315. Mr HAMILTON (on notice) asked the Minister of Fisheries: How many fishing boats, pleasure craft, etc., have been stolen in each of the years 1979-80 and 1980-81, what is the estimated financial loss to boat owners and how many were recovered in each period?

The Hon. W.A. RODDA: The reply is as follows:

	1979-80	1980-81
Vessels stolen	161	104
Estimated value	\$150 898	\$223 172

Information relating to the number recovered is not readily available.

## POLICE PATRONS

323. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Is it a fact that the police patrol vehicles are restricted to 300 kilometres per shift and, if so, why and, if not, what are the general instructions issued to patrols in relation to mileage and consumption of fuel?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** No, the only general instructions issued to patrols engaged in operational activities relate to aspects such as driving habits and patrol speeds. For reasons unconnected with mileage or fuel consumption, members are encouraged to perform foot patrol duties wherever that form of policing tactic can be used to advantage.

## SEAWEED

325. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning:

1. What action does the Government intend to take to clean up the seaweed along the beaches of the north-western suburbs and southern areas and what is the expected cost in each area?

2. What specific grants have been made to surf life-saving clubs for this purpose?

3. How many complaints have been received from residents relating to mosquitoes and rotting seaweed nuisance?

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

1. The Coast Protection Board and the Coastal Management Branch of the Department of Environment and Planning have expended considerable resource in investigating the seaweed problems on the metropolitan beaches, particularly at Taperoo. In summary, the conclusions are:

- (a) Seaweed build-up on the beaches is a natural occurrence;
- (b) Investigations by the Coastal Management Branch have shown that it would be extremely expensive to remove seaweed, and it is very likely that additional seaweed would return within a matter of days;
- (c) There are no known commercial uses for the seaweed, and potential uses such as for mulch material, would not be used in sufficient quantities to clear the beaches.

2. The Coast Protection Act only allows grants to be made through Councils. No grants have been made to surf lifesaving clubs through Councils from the Coast Protection Fund for this purpose. My Department has not received any applications for specific projects relating to the removal of seaweed.

3. Few direct complaints have been received from residents. However, representatives of residents of the area, such as the City of Port Adelaide, have advised of the problem. Whilst the Coast Protection Board does not normally involve itself in the day to day maintenance of beaches, the magnitude of this problem is such that the board has considered and investigated the matter in some detail.

## MANGROVES

326. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister and Environment and Planning:

1. Is it a fact that in tidal areas in the north and north-western regions of Adelaide, mangroves and sea grasses 'are dying and receding at an alarming rate' and, if so, what are the respective areas so affected, what is causing the problem and what action has the Government undertaken to counteract it?

2. What studies have been conducted to ascertain the likely effects upon the sea life?

3. Is it a fact that the outflow from the Bolivar treatment works is affecting the fish and fish stocks and, if so, what action is the Government taking to overcome the problem, and over what period of time have investigations been carried out on such effects on marine life?

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

1. There is no evidence to suggest that this is the case.
2. Not applicable.
3. See (1) above.

## OLYMPIC DAM

328. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

Have the following matters been monitored at Olympic Dam—

- (a) movement of radio nuclides from the ore body into aquifers;
- (b) movement of radio nuclides between aquifers;
- (c) negative uptake of radio nuclides; and
- (d) gamma ray and radon emanation from mud pits, cores, cuttings and cutting dusts, and, if so, what are the results and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The replies are as follows:

- (a) There is no movement of radio nuclides from the ore body into the aquifer as the holes are initially cased, then later plugged with cement.
- (b) There is no movement of radio nuclides between aquifers.
- (c) Negative uptake of radio nuclides is not a term in general use and it is assumed that it refers to losses to areas other than aquifers. The answer to this is that there is no negative uptake.
- (d) Tests have been made for gamma radiation or radon daughter levels, in the mud pits, the core yard and the sample preparation areas.

The results are:

- (1) gamma radiation measurements

(a) for the sample preparation area involving cores and cuttings showed a maximum of 0.4 uGy/hr

(b) for the drill rig sites 0.9 uGy/hr

(c) Further measurements have been made by the Health Commission.

(2) Radon daughter levels are being measured by officers of the Department of Mines and Energy and the Health Commission. In addition Roxby Management Services carry out tests. The results of these have been outlined in answer to Question on Notice 331.

329. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: How and where are drilling residues stored at Olympic Dam, how will drill holes be plugged, how many drill holes are there, how close together are they and has there been any loss of drilling muds into the aquifers?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Residues from diamond drilling are stored in clay based, plastic lined mud pits located close to the drill rigs. On drying the muds are removed to an approved waste disposal area located near the shaft site.

The drill holes are pre-collared and cased using a percussion drilling rig with a down-hole hammer. About 100 000 metres of steel casing has been used and this is now being recovered. The drill holes are plugged with cement at 600 metres and at the granite basement/shale contact at around 310 to 330 metres and this prevents the loss of any mud

resulting from the cutting of core in ore to the upper and lower salt rich aquifers. The number of drill holes is in excess of 300.

No mud is used to aid drilling. The mud results from the mixing of injected water and the ground up limestone, quartzite, sandstone and shales that cover the basement rocks to a depth of in excess of 300 metres. Any loss of this mud to the upper aquifer is minimal as the holes are drilled and cased in a matter of days and that mud has no detrimental effect.

The spacing of the drill holes varies according to the copper and uranium grades intersected below the granite/shale contact. A 50 m x 50 m grid is used in areas of interest to follow up the intersections on the initial 200 m x 200 m grid in the areas of significant mineralisation.

330. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: Was the background radon concentration rate at Olympic Dam monitored before any drilling commenced and, if so, what was it and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The background radon concentration rate was not monitored before any drilling commenced at Olympic Dam as the presence of uranium was not identified until the cores had been examined. However, since the initial drill hole, background monitoring has been carried out to give the following results:

Gamma radiation, 0.1  $\mu$  Gy

Radon, 0.037Bq/l

331. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: Is radon emanation from drill holes and in the main shaft at Olympic Dam being monitored and, if not, why not and, if so, what quantities of radon are being released to the air as a consequence of drilling?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Radon emanation from drill holes is not being monitored. A check has been made on the radon daughter levels associated with drilling by officers of the Department of Mines and Energy. These checks showed that there was a slight enhancement of the radon daughter levels near the surface of the drilling mud ponds compared with the air in immediate vicinity. These tests were undertaken when copper uranium ore was being cored and are as follows. A result of a test in Hindmarsh Square by the Health Commission is included for comparison.

In area of drill 0.0008 WL Rn. daughters

Near Sump 0.002 WL Rn. daughters

Adelaide 0.0006 WL Rn. daughters

Roxby Management Services has specialised staff who are monitoring radon daughter levels at the main shaft. In addition, checks are being performed by officers of the Department of Mines and Energy and of the Health Commission.

The quantities of radon released to the air as a result of drilling are at present insignificant compared with the natural release of radon from the surface at the Olympic Dam site. The radon emanation rate from the sand dunes and clay pans at Olympic Dam is known not to be significantly different from the normal surface radon emanation rate of soils in Australia.

332. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. What is the quality of water in the general area of Olympic Dam, is it present in large quantities and in which direction does it flow?

2. Is there intermixing between the waters of the various aquifers and, if so, to what extent?

3. To where is water from the main shaft being pumped?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The replies are as follows:

1. Groundwater in the general area of Olympic Dam is of very poor quality (comparable in total dissolved solids to sea water). It occurs in fractures in precambrian rocks which yield only small supplies. The high salinity is a reflection of the fact that there is no detectable movement of the groundwater.

2. There is no intermixing with other aquifers. The Great Artesian Basin aquifer lies 75 km north of Olympic Dam.

3. The small amounts of water intercepted in the shaft are pumped to a pond at the surface where its quality is regularly monitored. Water is withdrawn from the pond for dust suppression on roads and for drilling purposes.

333. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: Are health records of people working at Olympic Dam being kept and, if so, what tests are being undertaken, who is responsible for the programme and are these records available to the individuals so tested and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Pre-employment medicals are being undertaken by the company on all employees including contractors. This includes a chest X-Ray, a pulmonary function test and a general medical examination. The medical practitioner informs the employees in writing of their fitness for employment.

#### ANIMAL REGISTRATION

334. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning:

1. Is it proposed to alter the present Animal Registration Scheme and, if so, why, in what respects will it be altered, and when will the alterations take effect?

2. How long has the present scheme been in operation?

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

1. Yes. Changes to the present Animal Registration Scheme are under consideration. These proposed changes will increase control over threatened species and will involve a revision of the permit system. The increased computerisation of information will provide quicker access to records. The changes to the Animal Registration Scheme will involve some legislative changes and this may take up to twelve months to implement. Some administrative changes may be implemented before that time.

2. The present Animal Registration Scheme has been in operation since 1973.

#### T.A.B.

335. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport:

1. What is the date of retirement of Mr Sexton as General Manager of the T.A.B.?

2. How long had he been employed by the T.A.B. and what was his annual salary?

3. Is Mr Sexton entitled to superannuation and if so—

(a) how much;

(b) on what terms; and

(c) what financial contribution, if any, has Mr Sexton made towards his superannuation?

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

1. 12 March 1982 or such earlier time as may be agreed.

2. Commenced 12.12.66. Salary: \$39 226 (at present).

3. Yes.

(a) \$165 000 approximately depending upon actual date of retirement.

(b) As prescribed by the provisions of the Superannuation Trust Deed.

(c) 5 per cent of salary up to 30 June 1977. 6 per cent of salary since 1 July 1977.



**MURRAY PARK KINDERGARTEN**

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

1. Has the Minister seen the letter of 11 October 1981 written to his colleague the Minister of Health as member for Coles by the President of the Murray Park Kindergarten concerning staffing at that kindergarten and, if not, will he ask the Minister to show it to him?

2. If the Minister has seen the letter, does he agree with the arguments and the calculations therein concerning staff entitlements for the kindergarten and, if not, why not, and if so, what action, if any, does he propose to take to ensure that the kindergarten receives its proper staff allocation?

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

1. A letter dated 15 October was received by the Minister of Health from Murray Park Kindergarten and was forwarded to me.

2. Calculations for staff entitlements as contained in the letter are in excess of the entitlement under State policy or that available to other centres under similar circumstances. All kindergartens in the State network are reviewed in March and August of each year to see if staffing adjustments are warranted.

**STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY**

338. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Who now has the contract for arranging advertising for the S.T.A. and for how long has it run?

2. For how long had Australian Posters Pty Ltd had the contract with S.T.A. and its predecessors, and when did it expire, and why did that company lose it?

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

1. A contract for the right to advertise on State Transport Authority vehicles has recently been let to Buspak Advertising Group Pty Ltd, for a term of five years commencing from 1 January 1982.

2. Australian Posters Pty Ltd and an associated company have been advertising contractors to the State Transport Authority and its predecessors since 1930. The present five year contract expires on 31 December 1981 with a run-down period to 31 December 1982. The principal reason for allocating the contract to Buspak Advertising Group Pty Ltd was the price tendered by that company.

**ZONING REGULATIONS**

340. **Mr ASHENDEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning:

1. Why has action been taken against the District Council of Victor Harbor in relation to non-compliance with zoning requirements?

2. Why has action not been taken against the Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully in relation to several breaches of requirements under planning and zoning regulations within the hills face zone at Banksia Park?

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

1. Zoning regulations do not apply to the District Council of Victor Harbor. It is, however, subject to interim development control vested in the State Planning Authority. This control, as was the case with the District Council of Victor Harbor, may be delegated to a council by the authority. Following breaches of that delegation, the State Planning Authority recently saw fit to withdraw that delegation, such that approval of applications for shops, offices, hotels and motels within the urban area of Victor Harbor now rests with the authority.

2. Due to administrative error, the Tea Tree Gully Council issued building approvals for a number of dwellings and other buildings in the hills face zone without referring the applications to the State Planning Authority for planning consent. Acknowledging its error, council subsequently submitted, on behalf of the owners, applications for the authority's consent. In view of the circumstances involved, the State Planning Authority granted its consent for these dwellings and buildings on 31 October 1980. As the result of a recommendation from the Inquiry Into the Hills Face Zone, regulations were made on 19 November 1981, excluding the allotments concerned from the hills face zone. They are now included in the residential zone and are subject to the Tea Tree Gully Council Zoning Regulations, which are administered by the council.

**BAY SHEFFIELD**

341. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport: Why is the Government not going to carry out its undertaking to allow betting on the Bay Sheffield?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The Government has considered the matter and has decided not to allow betting on the Bay Sheffield.

**UNEMPLOYMENT**

342. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Has the Education Department any statistics on the number of unemployed persons in the Elizabeth area who are aged between 15 and 20 and, if so, what percentage of those young people in that age group are unemployed?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** No, the Education Department does not keep statistics on unemployed persons and their ages for particular areas.

**UNEMPLOYED PERSONS**

343. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Has the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment any statistics on the number of unemployed persons in the Elizabeth area who are aged between 15 and 20 and, if so, what percentage of those young people in that age group are unemployed?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** No. Any statistics required in the past have been obtained from the Commonwealth Employment Service.

**ROXBY DOWNS**

344. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. In the event that the Roxby Downs development proceeds, how many jobs will be created on site at Olympic Dam in each of the years 1982 to 1985?

2. How many drillings is it anticipated will be built at Roxby Downs in each of the years 1982 to 1986?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The replies are as follows:

1. The Olympic Dam Project is still in the exploration stage. The numbers of single men's quarters and houses on site relate to the requirement of the above programme, and will continue to do so until final approvals are given and the Joint Venturers commit to the project. At this time there has been no decision beyond the exploration stage.

2. As above.

**TUBERCULOSIS**

346. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many cases of TB have been notified in South Australia in each of the last three years?
2. Has there been any increase in the incidence of TB during the last six months?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. 1978, 92; 1979, 119; 1980, 130; 1.1.81-4.12.81, 93.
2. No.

**POLICE FORCE**

347. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Attorney-General:

1. Did the Attorney-General receive in October a report or document from or prepared by a Federal Police Officer named Winchester and, if so, on what date and, if not, when did he receive the report?
2. Did the report list allegations of corruption within the South Australian Police Force including allegations that certain officers associate with or in any other way are linked with organised crime figures from interstate?
3. Will the Attorney-General as a matter of urgency make the report available to members of this Parliament and the public of South Australia?

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

1. No.
2. Not Applicable.
3. Not Applicable.

348. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Did the Minister or the Police Commissioner receive in October a report or document from or prepared by a Federal Police Officer named Winchester and, if so, on what date, and if not, when did he receive the report?
2. Did the report list allegations of corruption within the South Australian Police Force including allegations that certain officers associate with or in any other way are linked with organised crime figures from interstate?
3. Will the Minister as a matter of urgency make the report available to members of this Parliament and the public of South Australia?

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

**PRIMARY SCHOOL STAFFING**

350. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Has there been a change in the primary school staffing formula for 1982 and, if not, why was Reynella Primary School informed that there was a change and that (up until 21 October) there would be the displacement of one staff at that school?
2. Will schools where enrolments have not declined be subject to staff displacements and, if so, why?
3. Will the Minister amend staffing procedures so that displacement manoeuvres are undertaken with minimum disruption to schools and staff involved and, if not, why not?

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

1. There has not been a change to the primary school staffing formula for 1982. For schools which admit children once each term, the formula is applied to estimates of the February enrolment. For schools which enrol by continuous intake, the formula is applied to estimates of the September enrolment.

Reynella Primary School admits enrolments once per term, and therefore is staffed on February estimates.

2. Some schools may be required to lose a teacher by displacement if specialist teaching skills required for the education programme are not available from current staff. Such displacements in Primary Schools are relatively few.

3. I have no intention of amending staffing procedures, as I am confident that officers involved do all they can to effect displacement and relocation as carefully and sympathetically as possible.

**CLEVE KINDERGARTENS**

351. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Is the Minister aware of the proposal to reduce the staffing hours at St Paul's Kindergarten, Cleve?
2. What are the projected enrolments of the kindergarten for each of the first six months of 1982 according to:
  - (a) the Childhood Services Council; and
  - (b) St Paul's Kindergarten Committee,
 and which figures are being used for the 1982 staffing allocation?
3. Is it proposed that Cleve Area School will continue in 1982 with two intakes of school beginners and, if so, will that be taken into account in staffing St Paul's Kindergarten and, if not, why not?

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

1. Yes.
2. No staff are provided to any kindergarten on the basis of projected enrolments. Allocations are made on the basis of regularly enrolled and attending children at the time of rationalisation exercise, which is generally held each March and August.

St Paul's Kindergarten predicts February 1982, enrolments of 39 four and 5 five-year olds. Staff allocation of 1982 is to be based on August 1981, enrolments of 30 four-year olds and 7 five-year olds.

3. Cleve Area School will provide three intakes of school beginners in 1982. Yes.

**TEACHERS**

352. **The Hon. R. G. PAYNE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Is it a fact that 80 salaried teacher positions are not yet allotted in primary schools and, if so, why has there been a delay in allotting these positions, what effect is this delay having on programme and curriculum planning, and when will these positions be finalised?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** It is not correct that 80 salaried teachers are not yet allotted in Primary Schools. Fifty teacher salaries have been held back to help meet the needs of schools whose enrolments increase above their February enrolment levels. Schools which enrol children continuously have been allotted staff to cover anticipated enrolments. Placement of these positions is a matter of continuing review.

**ADELAIDE AIRPORT**

353. **Mr TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Is the Premier aware that the number of passengers per year currently passing through Adelaide Airport is nearly double the number that used Melbourne (Essendon) Airport in 1961 when the Federal Government purchased the site for Tullamarine Airport and, if so, what submissions has he made in relation thereto in negotiations with the Federal Government regarding a new airport for South Australia?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** It has proven unnecessary to use such statistics—the State and Federal Governments have jointly set up a State Airfields Committee which has amongst its terms of reference to identify a site for the new airport for the Adelaide region.

**BICYCLE LIGHTING**

354. **Mr TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Has the Government considered the possibility of making lighting a compulsory item of equipment on adult-sized bicycles and, if so, what conclusions have been reached as a result of that consideration?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** Regulation 8.02 of the Road Traffic Act requires that any pedal cycle which is being ridden on the road between the hours of sunset and sunrise, and during periods of low visibility, shall display a lighted head lamp and rear lamp. There are no proposals to amend the legislation to require that lighting equipment must be fitted to adult sized pedal cycles which are only used during daylight hours.

**GARDEN ISLAND BOATS**

355. **Mr TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Have the police received a significant number of reports

related to theft of and damage to property of boat owners using the Garden Island boat ramp at Port Adelaide and, if so, what attempts have been made to apprehend the offenders?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** There has been no significant number of property related offences reported with respect to the Garden Island Boat Ramp. Apart from six recorded incidents in November, 1981 there has been an average of only two recorded incidents per month. No persons have been apprehended for these offences. Police will continue to pay attention to the area as circumstances permit.

**COMMUNITY WELFARE DEPARTMENT**

356. **Mr ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What changes, if any, have been made since September 1979 to the permanent staff establishment in each of the units of the Department for Community Welfare which offer a direct service to the public (that is, district offices, branch offices, training and assessment centres, project centres and residential care units)?

2. What vacancies in these units remained unfilled for periods of over eight weeks since September 1979 and for what length of time did each such vacancy exist?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

**DEPARTMENT FOR COMMUNITY WELFARE**  
Changes to Permanent Staff Establishments (Detailed breakdown of regions follows)

Location	21.9.79	18.1.82	Variation
1. Central Western Region			
District Offices and Branch Offices	72	76.7	+4.7
Youth Project Services and Residential Care	22	27.5	+5.5
2. Central Southern Region			
District Offices and Branch Offices	51.5	54.2	+2.7
Youth Project Services, Residential Care and Crisis Care	55	54	-1
3. Central Eastern Region			
District Offices and Branch offices	55.5	60.3	+4.8
Youth Project Services and Residential Care	206.5	198.5	-8
4. Central Northern Region			
District Offices and Branch Offices	94	95.3	+1.3
Youth Project Services and Residential Care	49	46.7	-2.3
5. Northern Country Region			
District Offices and Branch Offices	90	79	-11
Youth Project Services	3	7	+4
6. Southern Country Region			
District Offices and Branch Offices	48	52.5	+4.5
Youth Project Services	0	6	+6
<b>Total</b>	<b>746.5</b>	<b>757.7</b>	<b>+11.2</b>
1. Central Western Region			
District Offices and Branch Offices			
Port Adelaide District Office	16	18.5	+5
Taperoo Neighbourhood Office	2	Transferred to Port Adelaide	-
Thebarton District Office	11	12	0
Henley Visiting Office	1	Transferred to Thebarton	-
Woodville District Office	18	15.2	-2.8
Hindmarsh Branch Office	7	7	0
The Parks Community Welfare Centre	10	15	+5
Kangaroo Island Branch Office	NIL	1	+1
West Torrens Branch Office	7	8	+1
	<b>72</b>	<b>76.7</b>	<b>+4.7</b>
Youth Project Services and Residential Care			
Central Western Project Team	5	5	0
Hay Community Unit	8	5.5	-2.5
Central Western Group Home	NIL	5	+5
Central Western Admission Unit	9	7	-2
Youth Project Service	NIL	3	+3
Alberton Resource Centre	NIL	2	+2
	<b>22</b>	<b>27.5</b>	<b>+5.5</b>

Changes to Permanent Staff Establishments (Detailed breakdown of regions follows)—*continued*

Location	21.9.79	18.1.82	Variation
<b>2. Central Southern Region</b>			
District Offices and Branch Offices			
Noarlunga Community Welfare Centre	NIL	18	+2.5
Christies Beach District Office	11.5	Transferred to Noarlunga	—
Morphett Vale Branch Office	4		—
Victor Harbor Visiting Office	NIL	1	+1
Gleneig District Office	5	6.5	+1.5
Marion Community Welfare Centre	21	19.3	-1.7
Mitcham District Office	10	9.4	-0.6
	51.5	54.2	+2.7
Youth Project Services, Residential Care and Crisis Care			
Crisis Care	17	19	+2
Kandarik Cottage	7	7	0
Marion Units	5	5	0
Slade Cottage	4	5	+1
Seaford Unit	3	2	-1
Central Southern Admission Unit	7	7	0
Central Southern Group Home	5	6	+1
Glandore Unit	7	NIL	-7
Youth Project Service	NIL	3	+3
	55	54	-1
<b>3. Central Eastern Region</b>			
District Offices and Branch Offices			
Adelaide Community Welfare Centre	15	20.4 Transferred to Adelaide CWC	-2.6
Country and Interstate Liaison Office	8		—
Adelaide Hills District Office	5.5	8.5	+3
Campbelltown District Office	15	16.9	+1.9
Norwood District Office	8	10	+2
Unley Branch Office	4	4.5	+0.5
	55.5	60.3	+4.8
Youth Project Services and Residential Care			
Norwood Project Centre	6	5	-1
Magill Project Centre	7	5	-2
Stuart House	5	6	+1
Community Services Support Scheme	NIL	1	+1
Klemzig Home	1	1	0
Kumanka Hostel	5	NIL	-5
Malvern Cottage	2	NIL	-2
South Australian Youth Training Centre	113.5	114.5	-3
	+*4		
South Australia Youth Remand and Assessment Centre	61	66	+3
	+*2		
Ningana Unit	6	Transferred to SAYTC 4 SAYRAC 2	—
	206.5	198.5	-8
<b>4. Central Northern Region</b>			
District Offices and Branch Offices			
Elizabeth District Office	25	28.6	+3.6
Enfield District Office	17	16.2	-0.8
Hillcrest Branch Office	5	5.2	+0.2
Gawler District Office	3	5.5	+2.5
Clare Branch Office	4	3.6	-0.4
Modbury District Office	14	13	-1
Nuriootpa District Office	4	3	-1
Salisbury District Office	17	15	-2
Ingle Farm Branch Office	5	5.2	+0.2
	94	95.3	+1.3
Youth Project Services and Residential Care			
Central Northern Project Team	NIL	2	+2
Gilles Plains Community Unit	6	6	0
Central Northern Admission Unit	7	7	0
Central Northern Group Home	5	5	0
Colton Cottage	4	4	0
Youth Project Service	NIL	3	+3
Lochiel Park	27	19.7	-7.3
	49	46.7	-2.3

Changes to Permanent Staff Establishments (Detailed breakdown of regions follows)—*continued*

Location	21.9.79	18.1.82	Variation
<b>5. Northern Country Region</b>			
District Offices and Branch Offices			
Ceduna District Office	8	8	0
Cooper Pedy District Office	4	5	+1
Leigh Creek District Office	3	3	0
Port Augusta District Office	17	16	-1
Port Lincoln District Office	10	9	-1
Port Pirie District Office	12	10	-2
Whyalla District Office	20	17	-3
Peterborough District Office	3	3	0
Oodnadatta Branch Office	3	NIL	-3
Indulkana Branch Office	1	NIL	-1
Amata District Office	2	NIL	-2
Alice Springs District Office	NIL	4	+4
Kadina District Office	4	2	-2
Maitland District Office	3	2	-1
	90	79	-11
Youth Project Services			
Northern Country Youth Project Services	NIL	1	+1
Ceduna Youth Project Services	NIL	1	+1
Port Pirie Youth Project Services	NIL	1	+1
Whyalla Youth Project Services	NIL	2	+2
Point Pearce Unit	3	2	-1
	3	7	+4
<b>6. Southern Country Region</b>			
District Offices and Branch Offices			
Berri District Office	12	15	+3
Mount Gambier District Office	12	12	0
Millicent Branch Office	5	4	-1
Naracoorte Branch Office	3.5	3.5	0
Murray Bridge District Office	15.5	18	+2.5
	48	52.5	+4.5
Youth Project Services			
Berri Project Service	NIL	1	+1
Mount Gambier Project Service	NIL	3	+3
Murray Bridge Project Service	NIL	2	+2
	NIL	6	+6

2.

Vacancies of Over Eight Weeks in the Department for Community Welfare Between 21.9.79 and 22.1.82

Location	Position	Length of Time Vacant (months)
<b>1. Central Western Region</b>		
Thebarton District Office	Community Welfare Worker	2.5
Thebarton District Office	Clerk CO-1	3.5
Port Adelaide District Office	Community Welfare Worker	3.5
Port Adelaide District Office	Aboriginal Community Worker	8.5
West Torrens Branch Office	Clerk CO-1 Family Day Care	4
Central Western Project Unit	Group Worker	2.6
Alberton Resource Centre	Community Welfare Worker	4
Hay Community Unit	Residential Care Worker	3
<b>2. Central Southern Region</b>		
Noarlunga Community Welfare Centre	Community Welfare Worker	2.5
Noarlunga Community Welfare Centre	Aboriginal Community Worker	8
Noarlunga Community Welfare Centre	Community Welfare Worker	3
<b>3. Central Eastern Region</b>		
Campbelltown District Office	Community Welfare Worker	4
Norwood Project Centre	Group Worker	2.5
S.A. Youth Training Centre	Community Welfare Worker	2.5
Colton Cottage	Residential Care Worker	2.5
<b>4. Central Northern Region</b>		
Enfield District Office	Aboriginal Community Worker	5
Elizabeth District Office	Community Welfare Worker	2.5
Elizabeth District Office	Community Welfare Worker	3
Nuriootpa District Office	Community Welfare Worker	4
Nuriootpa District Office	Community Welfare Worker	6
Clare Branch Office	Community Welfare Worker	4
Central Northern Project Team	Group Worker	5
Central Northern Region Group Home	Residential Care Worker	3
Central Northern Youth Project Services	Group Worker	2.5

Vacancies of Over Eight Weeks in the Department for Community Welfare Between 21.9.79 and 22.1.82—*continued*

Location	Position	Length of Time Vacant (months)
5. Northern Country Region		
Leigh Creek District Office	Clerk CO-1	3.1
Port Lincoln District Office	Community Welfare Worker	6
Port Pirie District Office	Clerk CO-1	9
Port Pirie District Office	Community Welfare Worker	4.5
Port Augusta District Office	Community Welfare Worker	2.5
Port Augusta District Office	Community Welfare Worker	7
Whyalla District Office	Community Welfare Worker	4.5
Ceduna District Office	Community Welfare Worker	9.5
Ceduna District Office	Aboriginal Community Worker	5
Ceduna District Office	Aboriginal Community Worker	12
Ceduna District Office	Community Welfare Worker	6
Peterborough Branch Office	Community Welfare Worker	5
Whyalla Youth Project Service	Group Worker	5.5
6. Southern Country Region		
Murray Bridge District Office	Community Welfare Worker	3
Murray Bridge District Office	Aboriginal Community Worker	6
Millicent Branch Office	Aboriginal Community Worker	7
Mount Gambier Project Service	Group Worker	7

## PERMANENT POSITIONS

357. Mr ABBOTT (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What vacant positions in direct service units of the Department for Community Welfare formerly filled by permanent staff have been filled by temporary or contract

appointees during the period since September 1979?

2. What has been the average length of time taken during the current financial year to date to fill vacant permanent positions in the department and how does this compare with the average length of time required to fill permanent positions in 1979-80 and 1980-81?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Since September 1979, temporary appointments only have been made to all positions funded by the Australian Government in the areas of Aboriginal welfare and family day care. Positions filled which previously had permanent occupants were:

Aboriginal Community Worker	Noarlunga District Office
Aboriginal Community Worker	Enfield District Office
Aboriginal Community Worker (2 positions)	Port Adelaide District Office
Aboriginal Community Worker	Ceduna District Office
Aboriginal Community Worker	Murray Bridge District Office
Aboriginal Community Worker	Millicent Branch Office
Aboriginal Community Worker	The Parks Community Welfare Centre
Aboriginal Community Worker	Port Lincoln District Office
Family Day Care Co-ordinator (3 positions)	The Parks Community Welfare Centre
Family Day Care Advisor (2 positions)	The Parks Community Welfare Centre
Family Day Care Co-ordinator	Noarlunga District Office
Family Day Care Co-ordinator	Campbelltown District Office
Family Day Care Co-ordinator	Whyalla District Office

2. Temporary appointments have been made to positions where the permanent occupant is temporarily absent because of long service leave without pay or acting in another position.

These have included:

Community Welfare Worker	Port Adelaide District Office
Community Welfare Worker (2 positions)	Noarlunga Community Welfare Centre
Community Welfare Worker (2 positions)	Murray Bridge District Office
Community Welfare Worker	Elizabeth District Office
Community Welfare Worker (4 positions)	Crisis Care
Community Welfare Worker (3 positions)	Port Augusta District Office
Community Welfare Worker (3 positions)	Mount Gambier District Office
Community Welfare Worker	Coober Pedy District Office
Community Welfare Worker	Naracoorte Branch Office
Community Welfare Worker	Whyalla District Office
Community Welfare Worker	The Parks Community Welfare Centre
Community Welfare Worker	Woodville District Office
Community Welfare Worker	Millicent Branch Office
Community Welfare Worker	Whyalla District Office
Clerk CO-1	Mount Gambier District Office
Group Worker	Central Western Group Home
Group Worker	S.A. Remand and Assessment Centre
Night Officer	

3. A contract appointment was made to the position of Supervisor, S.A. Youth Training Centre.

Average length of time to fill vacant permanent positions in the Department for Community Welfare:

- 1.7.79-30.6.80, 8 weeks
- 1.7.80-30.6.81, 6.6 weeks
- 1.7.81-21.1.82, 6.2 weeks

**YATALA GAOL PRISONER**

358. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Did a prisoner in Yatala Gaol commit suicide on Tuesday 1 December by hanging himself in his cell?

2. Did the prisoner also attempt suicide by setting fire to his cell on 11 October and as a result of this was he transferred to Northfield Security Hospital and, if so, on what date was he transferred back to Yatala Labour Prison, did he agree to go back to Yatala and what was his medical diagnosis at that time?

3. If he was no longer considered to be a suicide risk by prison authorities following his return to Yatala, why was he placed in a cell without furniture except for an iron bed and porta-potty?

4. Was the prisoner placed in S and D Division on or about 29 November and did this punishment arise out of a charge relating to an incident during a visit on that day?

5. Was the prisoner let out of S and D Division on the day of his death?

6. In the light of this prisoner's recent history of depression and attempted suicide, what special steps were taken by the prison authorities on his release from S and D Division to ensure that proper treatment was given to him?

7. Did this prisoner request treatment at the Northfield Security Hospital and, if so, when and was this treatment granted?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. The prisoner set fire to his cell equipment on 11 October 1981. He raised the alarm, the fire was extinguished, and he was subsequently transferred to the observation cell in D Division.

3. The prisoner was placed in a cell with furniture restrictions on 10 September 1981 because he was aggressive, abusive and threatened to damage his cell.

4. The prisoner was again placed in D Division on 29 November as he was aggressive and stated that he wanted to burn or smash his cell up. The transfer was not a result of a minor incident during a visit on that day.

5. Yes, at his own request.

6. The inmate received prescribed medication authorised by the Prison Medical Officer.

7. The inmate requested treatment at the Northfield Security Hospital in August 1981. He was admitted to the hospital on 2 September 1981 and discharged from the hospital on 10 September 1981.

**POLICE SHOT GUNS**

359. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Have any police cars had special modifications to enable the carriage of shot guns under the dash board and, if so, why and do certain police officers regularly carry shot guns whilst on duty?

2. Are some police officers issued with shot guns on a regular or permanent basis?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. Shot guns are issued to supervisory sergeants attached to metropolitan patrol bases as part of their normal patrol equipment. Certain other trained personnel may also be issued with a shot gun where a special need for such a weapon has been determined. Country personnel have access to a shot gun through their local headquarters. No individual member is issued with a shot gun on a permanent basis.

360. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Does the Police Department have a policy on the use and carriage of shot guns by police officers and, if so, what is that policy?

2. What system is used to control the issue to and use of Police Department shot guns by police officers?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The replies are as follows:

1. Instructions relating to the use and carriage of firearms are contained in police general orders issue to all police personnel.

The use of shot guns and other firearms is restricted to circumstances where the police member believes on reasonable grounds that such use is necessary for the protection of life or to prevent serious injury and only then when the member is satisfied no other means are available. They may also be used for the lawful destruction of animals.

2. Shot guns are issued only to and carried by selected personnel who have been trained in their use and safe handling.

Strict documentary and time constraint control is exercised over their issue and subsequent return at the completion of each tour of duty. In addition, each incident of use by a member is required to be reported to a commissioned officer.

**HOLDEN HILL ARREST**

361. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Why was a shot gun used in the arrest of a person in the Holden Hill area recently?

2. Was the shot gun used owned by the Police Department?

3. Are police officers permitted to carry guns other than police issue weapons in carrying out their duties?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The replies are as follows:

1. A shot gun was used in an endeavour to stop or retard the progress of a vehicle occupied by known drug traffickers who were fleeing from the scene of an incident to avoid apprehension by police.

2. Yes.

3. No police member on duty is permitted to carry a firearm other than the normal police issue except with express approval of the Commissioner of Police.

**CORRESPONDENCE SCHOOL STAFF**

362. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Is it a fact that special senior masters appointed to the Correspondence School are paid at a higher rate than the deputy principals and, if so, why?

2. Is it a fact that at the Heights School, where otherwise a similar situation would occur regarding the primary deputy principal, an adjustment has been made to equate that salary with the secondary deputy and, if so, will the Minister extend that precedent to the Correspondence School and, if not, why not?

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

1. The two Special Seniors at the Correspondence School are paid \$24 893 per annum as opposed to the two Area Deputies on \$24 208 per annum. These rates are fixed by the Teachers Salaries Board. There is no stipulated establishment of Special Seniors for any school but rather as the name implies, their tasks relate to special needs usually in secondary schools, sometimes of limited duration.

There is no similarity between the roles of Special Seniors and Area Deputies at the Correspondence School. Both the



deputies at the Correspondence School have roles relating more to leadership in the primary area.

2. The Heights School has only one person in a position that could be described as equivalent to Primary Deputy Principal, viz. the teacher in charge of the junior primary area. That teacher is paid at primary deputy level of \$23 178 per annum. There are, however, two special positions at the Heights with coverage of primary years—the Primary School Head and the Middle School Head. These sub school leaders exercise greater responsibility than deputy principals in primary schools and have therefore been classified at the more appropriate level of Primary Principal II with a salary of \$26 407 per annum, i.e. at the same level as the special position of Secondary School Head. The Teachers Salaries Board has determined the salary levels of Primary Principal II and Secondary Deputy Principal to be the same.

### OPEN COLLEGE ENROLMENTS

363. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Has an enrolment ceiling been placed in third term 1981 on the English as a second language correspondence course at the open college and, if so, why?

2. How many new enrolments were accepted during this term and how many rejected?

3. Will the Minister ensure that this barrier to integration will be removed and, if not, why not?

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

1. Yes. The quota was necessary as there was uncertainty regarding the extension of the appointment of the lecturer in this area for 1982.

2. In term 3, 1981, a quota of 40 E.S.L. enrolments was imposed. This quota comprised 20 new students enrolling in E.S.L. I and 20 students who had completed part of the course and were enrolling in E.S.L. II or E.S.L. III.

In term III, 1981, 26 students had their enrolment deferred until 1982, their names being placed on a waiting list.

3. Approval for the extension of the employment of the lecturer has now been received and it is not expected that a quota on enrolments will be required in 1982.

### HALLETT COVE TRANSPORT

364. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Is the Minister aware of an approach from the Hallett Cove Beach Progress Association to the principals of Brighton and Mawson High Schools, outlining the transport problems faced by secondary students living in the Hallett Cove area?

2. In the light of the decision not to proceed with a secondary school in the Hallett Cove area in the short to medium term, what proposals is the Minister or his department putting forward in order to meet the transport needs of secondary students in that area and if no proposals are being put forward, why not?

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

1. Yes. I am aware of an approach from parents of children attending both high schools. I understand that the Hallett Cove Progress Association intends to submit a request to the STA for these services.

2. Students from this area are provided with free passes by the Education Department to enable them to attend high school. They do not qualify for an Education Department bus service since departmental policy provides that a school bus service will only be considered where groups of 10 or more children reside beyond 4.8 kilometres of the

nearest school or transport service to that school, provided half the number reside beyond 8 kilometres.

### POLICE FIREARMS USE

366. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Does the Police Department have procedure whereby, whenever a police officer has need to discharge a police fire-arm, a detailed report of the circumstances is submitted to a senior officer, and, if not, why not, and will the Minister undertake to institute such a procedure, similar to that which has applied in Victoria for many years?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The Police Department does have a procedure whereby any police member who discharges a police firearm is required to submit a report to his superior officer. The relevant General Order is 645 (4).

### PROJECTIONISTS' LICENCES

369. **Mr TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs:

1. What were the reasons for the abolition of licences for cinematic projectionists and, prior to this step, how many licences were involved, what administrative costs were involved and how much was recouped in licence fees?

2. What steps were taken to notify cinematic projectionists of the abolition and were any representations received from them requesting some form of continuation of the licensing system and, if so, on what grounds?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Licences for cinematograph projectionists were abolished as from 1 January 1982 as part of the Government's de-regulation programme. This initiative abolished a statutory authority, repealed a licensing requirement, and implemented a recommendation of the Report of the Working Party on Small Business Licensing. At the same time, it was considered that public safety would not be jeopardised. There are 342 licensed 35 mm operators and 518 licensed 16 mm operators whose licences are current until 31 December 1981. The administrative costs for the year 1980, apart from stationery and postages and salaries, amounted to \$1 341 as payment to two non-government members of the Board of Examiners. During the year 1980 the amount of \$768 was received in examination fees and \$1 700 in licence fees.

2. Yes, the views of the principal motion picture exhibitors were sought and received, and were considered together with representations made by a number of other interested organisations and persons. The majority of those representations favouring the retention of the licensing system were not so much concerned with public safety and convenience as they were with retention of a system which could be used to set a standard of competence to operate equipment.

### CARCLEW

370. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning representing the Minister of Arts: Further to the letter of the Minister of Arts to the Lock Area School Council on 9 November indicating that he had asked the Carclew Youth Performing Arts Centre 'to assess the feasibility of providing an alternative service' for ballet tuition in country areas, has that assessment been completed and, if so, what recommendations were made and what action is proposed to be taken on those recommendations?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The assessment by Carclew Youth Performing Arts Centre was completed at the end of December 1981, and the following recommendations were accepted by the Minister of Arts:

(a) That each regional cultural centre trust offer umbrella support for all dance teaching which was previously provided by the S.A. Ballet Company.

The fees for the service and the tutor's wages would be administered by the regional cultural centres and community dance aspirations would be focused on the regions.

(b) That the Youth Performing Arts Council provide as a service to the regions a classically trained dance consultant, with a broad knowledge of all modern developments in dance.

The role of the consultant would be twofold:

(i) To advise the cultural centre manager as to the quality of the work in the region and help with staff replacement when required, and

(ii) To hold on a monthly basis, classes in the cultural centres for tutors and teachers of dance in order to support their creative energies and help develop new teaching techniques for the community.

(c) Through the Carclew Youth Performing Arts Council, the dance group 'Energy Connection' be supported in order that they can for at least one week per year base themselves at each regional cultural centre and provide open workshops for all the community, as well as the performances that the Arts Council is currently supporting.

The development of this home-grown dance company, comprised of eight young people between the ages of 19 and 25, has rapidly achieved State and national significance. They are currently in receipt of \$15 000 Australia Council funds and \$12 000 State Government funding for 1981-82. They emerged two years ago under the direction of Flinders University graduate, Gale Edwards. Their work, whilst based on great energy, is essentially accessible to all young people and it can be accompanied by classes and workshops taken by the performers.

The managers of the Regional Cultural Centre Trusts will be holding meetings with the schools and the communities who were in receipt of the old service as soon as the school term commences, to pursue these recommendations. In the case of the Lock Area School Council, that meeting will be in the week of 15 February 1982.

### CRYSTAL BROOK SCHOOL

371. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Is the Minister aware of the concern expressed by some staff at the Crystal Brook Primary School concerning the cut in ancillary hours at that school and the expected impact on its programme to help children with special learning problems?

2. Does the Minister accept the contentions made by those staff in this matter and, if not, why not?

3. What action does the Minister propose to take to ensure that children with special learning problems at that

school will not be disadvantaged by the cut in hours and, if no action is proposed, why not?

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

1. Yes.

2. Special learning problems have always been faced by the teaching profession. Ancillary staff are not employed to rectify those learning problems, but to assist teachers in meeting children's needs. Principals of schools are responsible to see that these difficulties are overcome with the resources made available.

3. The special education area of education has a number of ancillary staff employed through the Regional Education Office to meet the needs of children.

The Principal at this school has been invited to consult with the Regional Principal Education Officer, to make a submission for ancillary staff assistance.

### HILLS KINDERGARTEN

372. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What staffing allocation changes will there be at the Hills Kindergarten, Stirling, for the 1982 year and, if any, why have these been proposed?

2. Has staffing for 1982 been based on August 1981 enrolments and not on the number estimated for 1982 and, if so, why?

3. What were the actual enrolments and staff allocation for the kindergarten in August 1981 and what was the student/staff ratio at that time?

4. What are the estimated enrolments and staff allocation for first term 1982 and what student/staff ratio will those estimates produce?

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

1. Staffing at the Hills Kindergarten, Stirling, will be reduced by the equivalent of a half day aide position. The change is made necessary by a reduction in the number of children attending the centre.

2. Yes, it is normal practice in determining the future staffing complement for all centres.

3. As at August 1981, the centre had a director, teacher and aide, all full day. Enrolments were 44 four-year-olds, 12 five-year-olds and 18 3½ and four-year-olds. The student/staff ratio at that time was 1:9.3.

4. Estimated enrolments for first time 1982, are 54 four-year-olds and 8 3½ to four-year-olds. Based on a staffing allocation of 2.5 FTE, this would represent a staff/student ratio of 1:10.8.

### HOUSING IMPROVEMENT ACT DECLARATIONS

373. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning, representing the Minister of Housing:

1. How many declarations have been made pursuant to section 23 (1) of the Housing Improvement Act since 1 July 1981 and by which local boards have such declarations been made?

2. How many such declarations were made and by which local boards in the corresponding period in each of the years 1976 to 1980?

3. How many notices have been served pursuant to section 52 (1) of the Housing Improvement Act since 1 July 1981 and by which housing authorities have such notices been served?

4. How many such notices were served and by which housing authorities in each of the years 1976 to 1980?

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

1. In the period 1 July to 30 September 1981, local boards of health in the metropolitan area issued 17 orders under the Housing Improvement Act. The local boards involved were Mitcham, Port Adelaide, Payneham, Noarlunga, Adelaide, Unley, St Peters, and Burnside.

2. In the period 1 July 1980 to 30 June 1981, local boards of health in the metropolitan area issued 41 orders under the Housing Improvement Act. The local boards involved were Mitcham, Port Adelaide, Payneham, Henley and Grange, Noarlunga, Unley, St Peters, Burnside, Walkerville, Prospect, and Enfield.

3. Only the trust, as the proclaimed State housing authority, can serve notice pursuant to section 52 (1) of the Housing Improvement Act, and since 1 July 1981, no such notices have been served.

4. During the period 1976-1980, the trust, as the housing authority, served notices pursuant to section 52 (1) of the Housing Improvement Act as follows:

Year	Total
1976 .....	783
1977 .....	677
1978 .....	581
1979 .....	560
1980 .....	386